

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 18 OCTOBER 1951

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy



Queensland Parliamentary Debates.

Legislative Assembly.

SECOND SESSION OF THE THIRTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT.

Appointed to meet

AT BRISBANE ON THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF AUGUST, IN THE FIFTEENTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF HIS MAJESTY KING GEORGE VI., IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1951.

[VOLUME 2.]

THURSDAY, 18 OCTOBER, 1951.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. J. H. Mann, Brisbane) took the chair at 11 a.m.

QUESTIONS.

TULLY FALLS HYDRO-ELECTRIC SCHEME;
FRENCH FIRM'S OFFER.

Mr. WATSON (Mulgrave) asked the Acting Premier—

“In reference to the report in the ‘Courier-Mail’ of 16th instant that the international firm, Etudes Et Enterprises, has offered to build the Tully Falls hydro-electricity scheme for more than £2,000,000, will he kindly advise—

“1. Whether tenders have been invited for this job?

“2. If so, when did tenders close and what are the details of the tenders received?

“3. If tenders have been received, has any tender yet been accepted and, if so, which tender?”

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

“1. Tenders were invited by the Department of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works for civil engineering works under the following specifications:—TF/5, Pen Stock and Haulage way; TF/6, Pressure Tunnel and Surge Tank; TF/6A, Underground Power House, Pressure Shaft, Tail-race Tunnel; TF/6B, Diversion Weir, Hydro-electric Intake, Surface Power House, Tunnel, Surge Tank, Penstock and Haulage Way, as an alternative to works covered by Specifications TF/5 and TF/6; or Diversion Weir, Hydro-electric Intake, Underground Power House, Shaft and Tunnel, as an alternative to works covered by Specification TF/6A.

“2. Tenders closed on 1 October, 1951. A number were received, including one from 1951—2c.

Etudes Et Enterprises. They are on alternative bases as indicated in 1. and are still being analysed.

“3. No. See 2. above.”

SORGHUM FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, QUEENSLAND-BRITISH FOOD CORPORATION.

Mr. SPARKES (Aubigny), for Mr. LOW (Cooroora), asked the Acting Premier—

“In reference to his answer on 29 August in which he stated that the Queensland-British Food Corporation had provided 1,216 tons of grain sorghum from the current season's crop for home consumption, will he kindly advise—

“1. Whether such sorghum was sold?

“2. If so, to whom, and at what price?”

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

“1 and 2. The Queensland-British Food Corporation retained 1,212 tons of grain sorghum from the current year's crop for its own use as seed and pig feed, the remaining 4 tons being sold chiefly to the Woorabinda Aboriginal Mission and a number of small buyers as seed or feed at an average price of 44s. per bag.”

ROAD PASSENGER SERVICES, SOUTH BURNETT BEACHES.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah) asked the Minister for Transport—

“In reference to the statement in the Annual Report of the State Transport Commission that consideration is being given to the development of passenger services to North Coast beaches, will he kindly give favourable consideration to the licensing of similar services from the South Burnett to the seaside resorts of that area?”

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

“Consideration is being given to applications received.”

BUILDING OF FLATS, TOWNSVILLE.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

“1. Are there any restrictions on the building of flats in Townsville, and if so what are they and why were they imposed?”

“2. In view of the serious shortage of roofing and building material and the number of people requiring accommodation, will he consider lifting any restrictions on the building of flats in Townsville?”

Hon. A. JONES (Charters Towers) replied—

“1 and 2. Present policy of the Department does not favour the granting of building permits for the construction of new blocks of flats. For obvious reasons it is considered desirable to have families housed as far as possible, in separate dwelling units. However, in cases involving the use of a minimum of building materials, such as the subdivision of large and commodious dwellings or the enclosing underneath of existing dwellings, to provide accommodation for additional families, favourable consideration is extended. Each such case is dealt with on its merits and this policy has application throughout the State, except in Zone B.”

RADIOGRAM EQUIPMENT, STATE SCHOOLS.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Murrumbidgee) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

“1. How many applications for the supply of radiogram equipment for schools, (a) battery-operated and (b) electric, have been received?”

“2. How many of each type have been supplied to date?”

“3. Can he give any indication as to when the balance of outstanding orders will be fulfilled?”

Hon. A. JONES (Charters Towers—Secretary for Labour and Industry), for **Hon. G. H. DEVRIES** (Gregory), replied—

“1. Three hundred and seventy-one schools have applied for the supply of battery-operated radiogram equipment and 264 for electric radiograms.

“2. To date the Department has supplied 218 battery-operated and 148 electric radiograms.

“3. At the present rate of supply it will take eighteen months to complete the outstanding orders, but the difficulty of securing the various component parts, especially loudspeakers and gramophone motors, makes it impossible to give a definite time.”

QUALIFICATIONS OF MANUFACTURING CHEMIST.

Mr. LUCKINS (Norman), without notice, asked the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs—

“What qualifications are necessary for a person or company to commence in this State as a manufacturing chemist?”

Hon. W. M. MOORE (Merthyr) replied—

“None is required unless the person desires to compound poisons or restricted drugs; in such cases he is required to obtain a licence from the department under the Poisons Regulations of 1947.”

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Bureau of Investigation under the Land and Water Resources Development Acts, 1943 to 1946, for the Year 1950.

Report of the Queensland Meat Industry Board for the year 1950-51.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Report of the Brisbane Milk Board for the year 1950-51.

Report of the Auditor-General on the Books and Accounts of the Brisbane Milk Board.

Orders in Council (5) under the Aliens Acts, 1867 to 1948 (11 October).

SUPPLY.

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Farrell, Maryborough, in the chair.)

Debate resumed from 16 October (see p. 784) on Mr. Walsh's motion—

“That there be granted to His Majesty for the service of the year 1951-52 a sum not exceeding £745 to defray the salary of the Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor.”

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (11.12 a.m.): At the outset I should like to compliment the hon. member for Port Curtis and to support what he said about continued unity between this Commonwealth and Britain. I do not think—and here I am trying to be generous—that the hon. member for Coorparoo intended to convey that we should dissociate the future of this country with that of Great Britain, but he said several things that require answering, because his statements could be interpreted, as suggesting a severance of Australia's unity with the British Commonwealth.

Mr. Dewar: That would depend on your outlook.

Mr. LLOYD: It would, to some extent, depend upon the interpretation placed on the hon. member's speech. At the moment Great Britain is endeavouring honestly to carry out her commitments by paying her overseas indebtedness; at the same time, she is committed to a very heavy rearmament programme. This year she has shown a deficit but £100,000,000 of that deficit is due to the fact that she is engaging in strategic stockpiling. Her rearmament programme is her attempt to carry out her responsibilities to the democratic world. If she goes into

debt, and if her balance of payments falls into deficit as a result, it is up to this and other members of the British Commonwealth to support her.

I do not like engaging in personalities, but when vicious criticism is levelled at members of this party and at the Australian Labour Party as a whole, that criticism must be answered. The hon. member for Coorparoo was not alone in suggesting that we should desert Great Britain in her hour of economic crisis. The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha also said that—I think these were his words—“Britain was rotten to the core.”

Mr. MORRIS: I rise to a point of order. That statement is not true. It is deliberately false, it is offensive to me, and I ask that the hon. member withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member for Kedron to accept the denial made by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha.

Mr. LLOYD: I accept the hon. member's denial.

Mr. MORRIS: I rise to a further point of order. I ask that the statement be withdrawn, not only that the hon. member accept my denial. I ask for the withdrawal of the statement, because it is untrue and offensive to me.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have asked the hon. member for Kedron to accept the denial of the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha and I am not going to the extent of asking for a withdrawal and an apology.

Mr. MORRIS: I still rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Kedron stated that I made a certain statement. That statement of his is deliberately untrue, as I did not make the statement. I ask that it be withdrawn because it is offensive to me.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think I have made myself perfectly clear. The hon. member for Kedron has accepted the denial asked for by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha.

Mr. LLOYD: I accept the denial of the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha but I will quote direct from his statement.

An Opposition Member: What, from “Hansard”?

Mr. LLOYD: The statement the hon. member made was—

“Now, however, when England is weakened internally by a Government rotten to the core—and I say that advisedly . . .”

That Government were elected by the people of Great Britain on a democratic franchise, and they are the Government who are allegedly rotten to the core. I do not think it is necessary for me to withdraw my statement; on the contrary, I think it would be proper for the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha to withdraw a statement such as that.

Let us see what this Government who are allegedly rotten to the core have done.

Before getting on to that, however, let us see what happened in 1938, in the pre-war days, when a Conservative Government were in power in Great Britain. That Government refused to accept any of the information received from the Continent as to the preparations being made by Germany in the shape of underground hangars and with respect to the might and power of the German Air Force and Army. They refused to accept responsibility for the defences of Great Britain. That Government allowed Britain's defences to fall into such a parlous state that in the first 18 months of the last war Great Britain was on the verge of defeat for the first time in history.

And now see what the present Government have done since they got into power in 1945—and I quote from “Home Affairs Survey” under the heading of “National Economy, Defence”—

“Outlining the new defence programme, the survey recalls that at its peak in 1944 the United Kingdom defence expenditure exceeded £5,000,000,000 and accounted for well over half of the national income; total defence expenditure has now to be raised at a rapidly increasing rate from £830,000,000 in the financial year 1950-51 to £1,300,000,000 projected in 1951-52, and over £1,600,000,000 in 1952-53.”

A Labour Government are accepting their responsibilities to the people of Great Britain and the Western democracies and endeavouring to make sure that the defences of the Commonwealth will not fall into the same condition as they were in 1938. In 1950 Great Britain, for the first time since the end of the war, was showing every sign of recovery from her economic crisis.

There was a surplus of £229,000,000 in her balance of payments, and for the first time since the war she was able to dispense with outside aid. It is only as a result of her heavy rearmament programme, heavy increases in import prices and her sense of responsibility in meeting her overseas indebtedness that Great Britain is again facing an economic crisis.

Since they came into power in 1945, the Government of Great Britain have raised the living standards of the people, and the rate of infantile mortality is now only half the pre-war rate. In addition, Great Britain has now the lowest incidence of death from disease. This is a Government, according to hon. members opposite, who are rotten to the core! Only recently a friend of mine arrived here from England and he told me that the health scheme in Great Britain is one of the finest things that have ever happened in her history and that because of it the health of the people of Great Britain is steadily improving.

Several statements have been made about the British Government's conduct in relation to the Persian oilfields affair, and a lot of discussion has taken place as to whether Britain should send troops to Persia and forcibly maintain her interest in the oilfields. To realise the hypocrisy of the statements that are being made about this

matter, both in the newspapers and orally, we must first of all remember that an International Court of Justice has been established by the Western democracies and the carrying out of any aggressive policy against Persia would be making a farce of the establishment of that International Court of Justice.

Mr. Evans: Persia is doing only what Britain herself did.

Mr. LLOYD: That is quite possible, too.

Let us go back to 1938. In the "Economist" of 21 July, 1951, we see an article headed, "Mexican petroleum since expropriation." In March, 1938, the Mexican Government expropriated the Mexican oilfields and established the Pemex Company. On that occasion nothing was said to the effect that America should go to war with Mexico because the Mexican Government had expropriated the oilfields; there was no song and dance about that. The Mexican Government were allowed to go ahead and they ejected American and British officials from the Mexican oilfields and established their own company. However, the big oil companies in America bailed up on the Pemex Company and prevented it from exporting oil. I quote an official of one of the Australian State Governments, who about that time was in America seeking supplies of bitumen. The prices demanded by the American oil companies were so high that he approached the Mexican Government to see whether the Pemex Company could supply the oil. The Mexican Government were quite willing to supply his requirements at almost half the price that the American companies wanted. They placed the bitumen on a wharf ready for shipment, but the captain of the ship informed them that he had received instructions from the owners of his ship not to shift that cargo. The Mexican Government did not worry unduly about that and attempted to get another ship elsewhere, but they were unable to get any shipping to supply the Australian order. The consequence was that the oil company lost its deposit and the Australian State was unable to get the goods at the price quoted. When it made a further approach to the American oil company for supplies the price had increased still further. That stands out as a famous incident in the operation of free enterprise.

Mr. Sparkes: I am sure that on the quiet you favour it.

Mr. LLOYD: In certain circumstances, where it is not allowed to exploit the people.

One statement by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha puzzles me somewhat. While he was speaking about the present British Government, who according to him are rotten to the core, he said that not more than 10 years ago—I think it was when Australian troops passed through Cairo and Alexandria on their way to El Alamein—the people in the various places waved Australian and British flags acclaiming the Australians as the saviours of Egypt.

Mr. Morris: The Australians and the British.

Mr. LLOYD: I do not know whether the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha knows it or not, but at that time—I was with my squadron—we had definite instructions from headquarters in the Middle East prohibiting our entry into Cairo without an armed escort and without being armed ourselves. At that time Australian and British troops were being murdered by the Egyptians. Rommel was on the doorstep and the Egyptians were merely waiting to help the German army to throw the Allied troops out of Egypt. At no time did the Egyptians regard the Australians and the British as the saviours of Egypt.

Mr. Morris: Of course they did.

Mr. LLOYD: I was in Alexandria and Cairo. I was in Egypt for 18 months and at that time there was no reason why the Egyptians should murder Australian troops but they were robbing and murdering them. I repeat that we had instructions from headquarters in the Middle East not to enter Cairo unarmed or without an escort because the Egyptians were ready to swing as the pendulum swung.

Mr. Morris: No-one was murdered.

Mr. LLOYD: The Australian troops were not allowed to enter Cairo.

Mr. Morris: They were forced to go through Cairo on their way to the battle-front.

Mr. LLOYD: There were troop movements through Alexandria at the time.

I am afraid that the hon. member's attack on the Labour Party is bitter and intense and I strongly resent his criticism. I strongly resent also his attempt to link the Labour Party with the Communist Party and I do so because I regard it as a personal attack. The hon. member fails to realise that he is out of step with the rest of the people of Queensland who support the Labour Party. (Opposition interjections.) We have noisy interruption from them on every occasion on which it is pointed out the people have supported the Labour Party and placed them in Government in this State. We remember that only a few years ago the members of the Country Party, in Opposition, were crying out for additional representation for the country in Parliament, and when the Government gave country members the further representation they sought there was a terrific howl from hon. members opposite on the ground that the Government had gerrymandered the electorates.

Let us consider the position in Adelaide, South Australia. The seats held by members of the Labour Party in the South Australian Parliament, those in Adelaide itself, consist of up to 30,000 electors, whereas in the country, where the Tory Government get their strength, the electorates consist of only 3,000 to 4,000 electors. If it can be said that our system of distribution here is a bad

one, my retort is that compared with South Australia we are only amateurs. (Opposition interjections.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LLOYD: I could go on comparing the electoral policies of the South Australian and Victorian Governments with the policy of the Government in this State and I could show that Queensland knew very little about the subject compared with them. They learn much quicker than we do.

I was very interested in the long and rather learned address delivered in this debate by the hon. member for Coorparoo, but he made one statement that I find it very difficult to understand. He said Australia was suffering from two distinct forms of inflation, namely, demand inflation and cost inflation. On an uncontrolled competitive market it is a recognised fact that demand and supply control costs or the market price. As the demand increases continuously over supply, the prices on an uncontrolled market necessarily rise and inflation results as a matter of course. I do not know by what abstract methods we can obtain a surgeon's scalpel and dissect inflation. In an economy such as exists in Australia you have competition at all times with overseas and interstate markets. The market is uncontrolled and demand and supply completely control your prices and consequently govern inflation and deflation. It is a fact that spiralling costs are continuously ahead of wages. I got the impression from the hon. member's speech that inflation occurred as wages increased, and that prices varied with increased wages, whereas the fact is that as costs increase wages lag behind to the extent of approximately three months and never seem to be able to catch up with the rising costs. As a wage increase is made, the ruling costs at the time are increased; that happens every time when a cost-of-living adjustment is made in wages. I cannot see how that disconnects cost inflation from demand inflation. Increased costs in our economy are a natural effect of the failure of supplies to meet the market.

It is a rather significant fact that in 1949-50 the population of Australia increased by 180,000. That was a very high rate of increase, and was equal to about 3½ per cent. In fact, it is the highest rate of increase in population that had ever taken place in Australia. On the other hand it has been estimated by our economists that our production of farm products compared with pre-war period has increased by only 10 per cent. as against 20 per cent. in Canada and 30 per cent. in the United States of America. The Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics believes that if the present rate of increase in our population is continued it will be necessary for our farm products to increase by 40 per cent. beef, 78 per cent. pigmeat, 31 per cent. eggs, 28 per cent. sugar, and 37 per cent. milk. That is a very grave warning to the national Government.

Mr. Ewan: The output per man has increased in the primary industries.

Mr. LLOYD: I did not go into that but the important fact to remember is there has been only a small increase in production as against a large increase in population. That is a grave fact that must receive the cognisance of the Commonwealth Government and force them to take steps to stabilise the whole economy of the nation.

Mr. Evans: And State Governments too.

Mr. LLOYD: State Governments too must not lose sight of their responsibilities. I want to place facts and facts only before the Committee. The State Government, as I said, must accept their responsibilities, and in fact have always recognised them. The Commonwealth Government must heed the grave warning given by these production figures as against increased population. In an economy such as ours the responsibility rests with the national Government, irrespective of their political colour. The heavy local demand for our products, interstate competition, and the demand by the export market, are the three factors that completely control our national economy. To say that the State Government must accept the responsibility is all wrong.

Mr. Evans: Accept their share.

Mr. LLOYD: They must accept their share, certainly; at the same time, we can only do it by means of a curative process. The Commonwealth Government have introduced a Budget providing for increased taxation—increased sales tax for example—and increased interest rates, all of which gets to a point where they seek to reduce demand. You cannot solve a problem by starting in the middle. First you must seek the cause and then devise the remedy. To do as the Commonwealth Government have done—attempt to reduce demand down to the level of supply—is the wrong attitude to adopt. It is necessary first of all to increase supply up to the level of demand. Three matters are aimed at with only one end—increased indirect taxation, higher rates of interest, and direct taxation—they are aimed at creating unemployment by reducing the purchasing power of the community. They create unemployment and eventually they reduce supply. That method was tried during the depression years by the Moore Government, and we all know the long, sad story of the deflation, recession, or depression that existed then.

Mr. Evans: If you say it is the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, you cannot blame the Moore Government.

Mr. LLOYD: They adopted the same attitude as the present Commonwealth Government are doing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask hon. members to refrain from carrying on conversational interjections.

Mr. LLOYD: Inflation cannot be cured by artificial methods. It is artificial to start in the middle, without seeking the cause and thus attempting to effect a remedy. (Opposition interjections.) The suggestion was

made by the British Chancellor of the Exchequer—and it was a very wise one—that world prices would have to be stabilised before the present trend of inflation could be cured. Until world prices are stabilised there is no sure cure of world-wide inflation. In the interim, surely Australia's most certain method is in reverting somewhat to the control that existed in the war years?

Mr. Sparkes: Increased production.

Mr. LLOYD: Production is not increased under inflation. The human element comes in; while you are receiving sufficient income from small production there is no incentive to increase production.

Mr. Sparkes: If I offered you a low price, would that encourage you to go in for it.

Mr. LLOYD: If I was offered a low price—the market value—the price I wanted to sell at would be reduced automatically, in sympathy with the price the hon. member offered me.

Mr. Evans: That means that a low price will increase production?

Mr. LLOYD: If the hon. member will allow me to finish my speech I may be able to throw a little more light on the suggestion I am making.

I was keenly interested in that part of the Treasurer's Financial Statement which said—

“The increased prosperity of the primary industries as a whole since the pre-war period is one of the main features of the economic life of the State. In 1938-39 the value of primary production was £51,479,787, whereas no less a figure than £146,333,336 was recorded in 1949-50.”

Mr. Evans interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: Let me finish.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member for Kedron that he is not required to answer interjections. If he desires to continue his speech without interruption he is at liberty to ignore interjections.

Mr. LLOYD: That quotation from the Financial Statement gives a clear indication of the effect the export prices received for our primary products are having on the local market. I have prepared a comparison of the prices paid for goods consumed locally in the years 1938-39 and 1949-50. Those prices were—

	1938-39.	1949-50.
Wool	10-56d. lb.	68-47d. lb.
Maize	4s. 1d. bushel	8s. 7d. bushel
Wheat	2s. 6d. bushel	7s. 4d. bushel
Sugar	£24 ton	£24 6s. ton
Beef	3-5d. lb.	7-5d. lb.

A comparison of the export prices paid for those commodities, while not staggering, does give a clear indication of the effect the export market has on the home market. The only industry that has a stabilised price for its product now, and has had very little increase

since 1938-39, is sugar. In 1938-39 the following prices were paid on the export and home markets—

	Home Consumption.	Export.
Maize	4s. 1d. bushel	2s. 11d. bushel
Wheat	2s. 6d. bushel	2s. 2d. bushel
Sugar	£24 ton	£8 4s. 3d.
Beef	3-5d. lb.	3-8d. lb.

In those days the home-consumption price was subsidising the export price. Now, the heavy demand on the export market for Australian products—and primary products give us 80 per cent. of our wealth—has had the effect, in an uncontrolled economy, of forcing the home market to compete with the export market to ensure supplies for home consumption. The effect is shown best by comparing the figures for the controlled sugar industry, in which the home-consumption price is established by agreement between the Commonwealth and the State and which is therefore a stabilised industry. Very little effect of the inflationary trend has appeared in that industry and if we made a similar approach to other industries, such as beef and wool, we should find that prices in this country would be stabilised automatically.

We have to face the fact that we have reached a certain stage in inflation and we can only reduce that inflation by reducing both wages and prices at the same time. If we were to establish prices at present export levels and at the same time establish a quota for home consumption in order to ensure supplies for home consumption, the effect would be that at least in some degree the inflationary trend would be arrested.

Mr. Sparkes interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: You would not pull back wool and meat; you would say that the home price would be set or established at its present figure. A quota of production would be allowed for home consumption and the surplus would be for export at the high ruling export price, and regardless of what happened to the export price there would be a fixed home-consumption price. The problem is up to the Commonwealth Government and it is for them to work it out, but we have to get to the root of the problem and we can only do that by the Commonwealth Government's accepting their responsibilities to the people of Australia and stabilising those industries at their present levels. They should accept their responsibilities of price-control for the welfare of the people of Australia. If we are to make our economy a controlled economy and if people will not co-operate, perhaps they will have to be forced to do so. Controls have always been with us. It is all very well for hon. members opposite to condemn them, but if we go back into history, even to the Ten Commandments, we realise that if the people of the world had accepted their moral responsibilities the Ten Commandments would not have been necessary. They are, in effect, the spiritual control over erring Christians. The same thing applies in business; if there

is not control business goes bankrupt. That is a control by fear. If people will not accept their responsibilities, their activities must be controlled.

This brings me to a subject in which I have taken a very keen interest and about which the people of this country should receive more information and with which they should become more conversant. In the past we have allowed uncontrolled business to graziers, pastoralists, sawmillers, and others to do, in the words of the Mexican, cut, plant, destroy, and move on. Any business must be begun with an original capital and from that capital there comes a recurring dividend but as soon as an amount in excess of the recurring dividend is extracted the business begins to go down and becomes bankrupt. There is no difference between private industry and business on the one hand and Governments on the other, because Governments have at their disposal the assets of the country and the resources of the nation—and, water, and vegetation—and when we take more than a recurring dividend from the permanent use of those resources we shall move towards a point where our production completely falls away and we shall be unable to sustain an increase in population or maintain our present population.

Mr. Sparkes: You take more out of the land than you put back.

Mr. LLOYD: That always happens—we always take more out of the land than we put back into it. The permanent use of our resources cannot be accepted as a temporary obligation. Unless the present policy of allowing our lands and our resources to be destroyed is stopped, we shall be unable within 20 years to feed the population of this country. I will go further than that and say that even within five years the yield received will drop progressively and noticeably as the result of the destruction of our land resources.

I should like to draw a comparison between what has happened in the United States of America and what is happening in Australia. The Soil Conservation Service in the United States reported that between 1909 and 1945 the forestry resources were reduced by 44 per cent., and that in 1946 the timber requirements exceeded the natural growth increment by 50 per cent. It estimated that the actual cost of run-off water, including erosion, railway and road damage, was 3,840 million dollars. In addition, it removed 21 times as much plant-growth from the soil as was removed in the form of crops.

Associated with the destruction of America's timber resources has been a terrific loss of revenue as the result of falling production brought about by soil erosion. Little is known of the actual cost of water run-off in Australia, as no estimate has been made, but it is known that in 1917 our forestry resources were estimated at 90,000,000 acres whereas in 1948 they were estimated at only 15,000,000 acres, a reduction of 83 per cent. When we add to that the fact that 90 per cent. of our waterways

and streams are no longer permanent, we cannot fail to realise how serious this ecological degeneration has been.

The whole of this destructive process is based on the degeneration of vegetal cover. In other words, the denudation of our forests and the destruction of our plant-life is the whole crux of the problem of water run-off and the eventual destruction of our soil resources. As the result of the destruction of our forestry resources, there is insufficient cover for the absorption of precipitation, not only in the ground itself but also in the trees. As a result of the destruction of our forestry resources, the water runs off the surface and springs no longer exist. In other words, the ground water-table is destroyed and springs that formerly ran from the forest hills and slopes cease to exist after the timber is killed. That is a scientific fact.

Mr. Sparkes interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: It may be that springs may break on small slopes for a short period, but as the forest is denuded in the watershed, the water runs off the surface instead of being absorbed into the ground water-table, with the result that springs are non-existent.

It is a paradox that biologically we are passing through a process of regeneration—we are curing diseases and prolonging the expectation of life—yet at the same time we are destroying the whole basis of our wealth and of our production. We must accept the fact that the destruction of our lands is caused primarily by the removal of vegetal cover and by the denudation of our forests. I repeat that an 83 per cent reduction in our timber sources took place between 1917 and 1948.

If we believe in the continuance of man on earth we must take steps to ensure its permanent use. They have succeeded in this respect in England and they have done so by laying down reconditioning rules or conservation rules, thus in one respect getting back to the times of the barons. When the land was received by the barons of England in fee simple for services supposed to be rendered the King, they placed tenants on the land but they ensured that the tenants would return to them a yearly income and so they laid down reconditioning rules and those rules have been abided by throughout time; after centuries of intense cultivation the land is still capable of production. That is an example of permanent use. If we are to permit of sole individual ownership without reconditioning rules we face a national tragedy. It does not matter who exercises the rules, the Government or private enterprise, so long as someone can say that you cannot use the land unless it is subject to some control. If it is required for forestry purposes there must be reforestation in order to prevent erosion and someone must have the right to enforce that control. I am talking of reforestation as it affects the permanence of the country, as it involves the destruction of the land, the destruction of the vegetal cover, in other words the destruction of our timber resources.

The hon. member for Aubigny is perhaps only interested in erosion of pastoral lands. If he wants a direct instance of what I say let him turn to the Mary Valley, an area well-known to the hon. member for Cooroora. The Mary River used to be a slow-moving stream, a slow-flooding waterway where the farmers could rest on their oars for days after rain before a flood occurred. But what happens now? The Mary River is a savage fast-flowing stream that will carry farms out to the sea. The water now moves quickly and the floods are more intense. The difficulties caused by the Mary River have been created through the destruction of the forestry resources in the Mary Valley.

Until we can carry out a complete survey of each river catchment area and the river valley we cannot hope to maintain permanent use of our land.

Mr. Ewan: Do you not think that nature will control forestry operations?

Mr. LLOYD: Nature wreaks vengeance on the people who destroy the land. That occurred in Assyria and Babylon, where the site of a town that at one time was a great shipping centre on the coast is now 100 miles inland.

We must seek to secure the permanent use, the continuous use of our resources and we can only do it, for instance, by saying to a sawmiller, "You can have the Crown right to that timber so long as you cut only to the extent of the sustained yield. In other words, you can cut only the amount that will enable the increment to maintain itself against the rate of cutting."

Mr. Sparkes: That is, that you can cut only timber of a certain girth?

Mr. LLOYD: You can do that in certain areas but in catchment areas it is not possible to do that. You must maintain the timber resources in the catchment area, otherwise the land will pass down the rivers and into the sea.

The party represented by hon. members opposite talk loudly about the nation's spending hundreds of millions of pounds on defence, but apparently are unwilling to spend any sum at all on the defence and maintenance of our resources. In fact, their policy means the continuous destruction of our assets. In their world they want free enterprise established as a sort of sacred temple. They want the people to believe that no one should be allowed to interfere with their holy of holies.

In the early days of Madagascar, before the European race penetrated that island, a man who exploited the timber resources was decapitated on the very stump of the tree he felled. Perhaps our methods of control should be more refined, nevertheless they should be just as effective.

Mr. Sparkes: On your philosophy no tree should be removed from our pastoral lands to run sheep?

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member should know that provision is contained in the Land Acts Amendment Act of 1948 to prevent over-grazing of properties.

Opposition Members: Ah!

Mr. LLOYD: Hon. members have been longer than I have in this Chamber and yet do not know that fact.

Whether or not a curtailment in the cutting rate of our timbers creates some hardship on the housing programme should not be taken into important consideration. There must be some alternative means of building houses than with timber. Every tree that is felled should be replaced by another. If we are not going to do that, we shall be housing our people in the present generation at the expense of future generations, and we have a duty not only to ourselves but to future generations. The whole obligation should rest on the whole community to safeguard the heritage that has been handed down to us for the future generations of Australia. At the same time, we should be alive to the importance of preserving the relationship between population and production, otherwise a position will be reached in this country which will be more serious, because of over-population, than any foreign political ideology. I am informed that in Russia it is estimated that by 1955 the population will be 240,000,000, which must be fed on 433,000,000 arable acres of land. We have a population of 8½ millions, which are fed on approximately 80,000,000 acres of arable land.

In recent weeks a number of statements have been made reflecting on the efficiency of the Queensland Housing Commission, directed particularly towards the cost of houses built by the Government. A great number of houses are being built by the commission in the electorate of Kedron, consequently I have studied the problem and have found that day-labour costs compare more than favourably and, in fact, are below contract prices, and that in efficiency and administration the commission is plainly superior to private contracts. The standard of homes being built at present in Trout road, Stafford, would surprise hon. members. Roads have been constructed, water channelling made, roads bitumened, and fencing built. It is a work the Government can well be proud of. If the hon. member for Aubigny doubts it I shall be willing to drive him out one day to have a look over the houses. I am sure he would be greatly surprised and it would open his eyes to see the efficiency of the construction and the different types of houses. Contrary to the statement made by the hon. member for Chermiside, the houses are of very fine construction. The standard is good and the administration of the project is handled in the right way, and the people are housed in homes of which they can be proud.

The only trouble at the present time with the Housing Commission is in regard to the facilities controlled by Brisbane City Council and Commonwealth authorities. The least that can be done by the Brisbane City Council in regard to these projects in new

suburbs is to supply them with the facilities to which they are entitled equally with the people residing in the older suburbs. It should go ahead with the street lighting to enable the people to get home with some degree of safety at night instead of, as at the present time, having street lights in wrong positions and the road services in bad condition. The first Stafford project was constructed four to five years ago and several of the streets were surfaced but the Brisbane City Council property has never been touched by the Council. The project controlled by the State Housing Commission had metal streets waiting for the bitumen from the City Council.

Mr. Dewar: That is the first project at which that has happened.

Mr. LLOYD: It probably will not be the last if the Brisbane City Council has anything to do with it. The condition of several streets is such that they are traversed by gullies and have become absolutely impassable. The council must realise its responsibility to the people and provide the facilities that are enjoyed by people in other districts. The Brisbane City Council has a responsibility to the people, just as much as the Queensland Government.

A further problem of the State Housing is the lack of telephone facilities. Many of the people live miles away from the nearest public telephone and there is no facility to enable them to ring for an ambulance or a doctor who may be required urgently. Representations have been made to the Commonwealth Government to have telephones installed, but without success. I suggest, as I did before, that there should be a greater degree of co-operation between the Commonwealth Government and the Brisbane City Council in an endeavour to fulfil their obligations to the people who are occupying homes in the outlying districts and the new suburbs. The people who are occupying these homes are paying rates just the same as the people in the older suburbs, and they are entitled to the same consideration.

In conclusion I wish to associate myself with the congratulations offered by hon. members on this side to the Acting Treasurer on the Financial Statement, which is a very finely compiled record. I am certain that in his administration of the department he will go to further success.

Dr. DITTMER (Mt. Gravatt) (12.10 p.m.): Congratulations to the Acting Treasurer on his presentation of a well-prepared statement. Those of us who know him realise that such a statement was only to be expected from him. If we had not received a logical, well-reasoned Financial Statement setting about affairs as they are and as we hope they will be, we should have been indeed disappointed.

I have listened to a number of hon. members opposite speaking on this debate but only two of them appeared to me to be outstanding, and by that I do not mean that they were outstanding for their quality.

I refer to the speeches delivered by the hon. member for Coorparoo and the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha.

You will remember, Mr. Farrell, that last year I made a plea for speeches on the Financial Statement to be restricted to the financial aspect of governmental activities. The hon. member for Coorparoo proceeded to do this in a well-considered speech, but certain features of that address were striking. First he set out to convey to us what he imagines to be the generosity of the Commonwealth Government. I leave that idea to be dealt with by our capable Acting Treasurer.

Then we were amazed to find that he initiated the "Cut the Economic Painter with Britain" policy when he suggested that a variant should be included in future contracts so that if Britain happened to fall economically we should not fall with her. If you are going to sever the economic painter you must inevitably sever the bond of racial affection that has existed for years between Great Britain and Australia. It was rather interesting to hear such a suggestion from the Opposition when, for years and years, indeed for a generation, the Labour Party has always been accused of disloyalty to the Crown and to Great Britain.

Another feature of the hon. member's speech, although he did not elaborate on it, was the suggestion of a possible upward revaluation of the £1. I am not going to deal with that because I believe that if the members of the Country Party are sincerely interested in the welfare of the primary producer and not the welfare of the importer or newspaper proprietors they will deal with the hon. member, just as Mr. Brimblecombe dealt so efficiently with a Mr. Russell not so long ago.

The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha accused us of being Communists. Actually the people have rejected that suggestion, and it is ridiculous to bring it up again. I have noticed that most hon. members opposite have dropped that cry and if the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha had been here when I spoke on the Budget last year he would have had a fairer opinion and a clearer understanding of where Labour stood in relation to its social-control policy, which on occasion develops into social ownership when public interest demands it. That is totally different from Russian communistic imperialism. Intelligent members of this Assembly said on many occasions that my speech was such that any intelligent schoolboy would have understood the difference between Queensland Labour and Russian communistic imperialism.

The hon. member for Aubigny suggested that I might on this occasion speak on medical subjects, but I am going to disappoint him just as he is usually disappointed at election time with the return of a Labour Government. I should like to say that some measure of congratulation is to be extended to the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha for bringing up the disabilities of the poultry industry. We realise that the real disability of this industry is not the price of eggs, as hon. members

opposite would have us believe so much as the excessive price of feed. The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha must have known, when he suggested that some measure of alleviation of the difficulties be given to the poultry-producers, that the Federal Government were going to assume their responsibility in some small measure. Just recently it has been announced that they will meet the difference between the home price of 7s. 10d. a bushel and the export price of 16s. 1d. a bushel for stock feed. That goes only part of the way along the road of real help, because it is not giving anything to those not dealing with the Egg Board. The Federal Government should face their responsibilities in a manly way and subsidise all poultry feed.

I do not propose to deal with the butter question, as I think everyone is quite happy with the efficient way in which the Acting Premier, his Cabinet and the Government handled it. It was rather unfortunate that legislation of necessity should have been introduced in an atmosphere of emergency, which legislation engendered hostility that ill became members of the Opposition. They realised that there was something missing in the marketing legislation; they realised that when that legislation was introduced it conferred authority associated with benefits but no responsibility associated with obligation. This has now been rectified by a Labour Government, who ever seeks to hold a proportionate balance as between the rights of the producer and the rights of the consumer. The answer is that if the boards are not prepared to accept responsibility for the benefits that go with authority there is only one thing to do—let the boards go, because they cannot have it both ways. They cannot have authority and benefit without responsibility and obligation.

Mr. Sparkes: What will you do if the people will not grow spuds?

Dr. DITTMER: The farmer is entitled to do what he likes, in a free State governed by Labour. He can grow what he likes; he can grow nothing at all if he so desires.

As they handled the butter situation, I feel certain that Cabinet, led by the Acting Premier will deal just as efficiently with the beef question. On the beef question, everyone realises—including some intelligent members who may be in Opposition—that the abattoirs were established under the slogan of "Cheap meat for the people." What has happened? When we assess what should be the function of the abattoirs we wish to make it clear that Queensland Labour does not wish to deny prosperity to graziers. We fully realise that as the result of such things as droughts and floods they have to contend with very variable conditions. That is why Labour, being interested in every useful section of the community, seeks to assure that they get a reasonable return and it does not begrudge them prosperity when it comes their way. However, the Government are fully entitled to examine the position of selling agents, who receive a commission of 3½ per cent., which on present prices is equivalent to 30s. or £2 a

beast. A commission of 3½ per cent. may have been quite reasonable when cattle were sold at from £8 to £10 a head, but today it is far too high when one considers the price of meat to the consumer. What do these agents do for the commission that they receive? They do not submit themselves to all the hazards and risks of the industry; the grazier is the one who has to do that. That is one of the factors associated with the present high meat prices that should be examined.

Mr. Sparkes: You do not object to my sending my cattle to New South Wales, do you?

Dr. DITTMER: The hon. member for Aubigny wants to send his cattle to New South Wales and leave the people of Queensland to starve, yet Queensland is the State in which he has prospered. That was one of the points of the attack that was launched against legislation recently introduced by the Minister for Transport, which hon. members opposite suggested might be used to divert cattle to Brisbane. Is there anything wrong with using a public utility to feed the people of Queensland, whether they are in Brisbane or anywhere else?

Mr. Sparkes: You admit that that is so?

Dr. DITTMER: Is there anything wrong with attempting to feed the people of Brisbane when they are starved for meat?

Mr. Ewan: Then you admit that that is what it was for?

Dr. DITTMER: Any legislation that is introduced by the Queensland Labour Party is introduced in the interests of the people of Queensland as a whole. That brings me to the role of the wholesalers at the Brisbane abattoir. By and large, what role do they play? Their main role seems to be to facilitate the movement of meat out of this State. Only about three weeks ago we were informed that two new wholesalers had been permitted to go into the meat hall at the abattoir, which will result in more meat than ever being exported from this State. For the privilege of doing that they pay the ridiculously low annual licence fee of £1. These people do not have to raise the beasts that are slaughtered at the abattoir. It is only after they have been wholesalers for a time that they join the ranks of the graziers. They garner a modicum of wealth as wholesalers sufficient to buy grazing properties. From what I have said, hon. members will realise some of the factors that are contributing towards the movement of meat out of this State, and they are contributing to the high prices that the people of this State have to pay for their meat. It is up to this Government, who are always interested in the welfare of the people, to see that those anomalies are corrected.

Mr. Sparkes: Do you not know that we have the cheapest meat in the world?

Dr. DITTMER: The wages here are not nearly the highest in the world, and wages must be related to food prices.

It is not a month since hon. members opposite were agitating for the decontrol of meat; they said it would rectify the position. However, decontrol did not rectify the position as it related to onions. The price of onions was pegged at 4d. a lb., and I should like to say at this stage that Mr. Fullagar is no Government stooge in his job of fixing prices.

What happened then? The black-marketeers were supplying them at 7d. and 10d. a lb. but immediately they were decontrolled onions jumped to 2s. and 2s. 10d. a lb., and they are no more plentiful today than they were when they were 4d. a lb. Similarly, what has happened to pork? When the prices of pig products were decontrolled, pork virtually vanished from the tables of the ordinary people. Ham is 7s. to 8s. a lb. Many will be the homes this Christmas without a ham. Here again we are faced with a similar position, the selling agent. In many instances, the people selling pigs get 5 per cent. That may have been all right when pigs were sold for £2 and £3 a head, but recently in the Toowoomba district two pigs fetched £78, and it cost about £4 to sell two pigs. If anyone wants any more information, let him get in touch with the Australian Mercantile Coy., and they will tell him who bought them.

These increases in prices do not benefit the people who grow the product or the consumer of the product, but they go to the parasitical interpositionals. The Government will have to look into the matter of the elimination of the selling agents at the abattoir, and as far as is practical, the elimination of the wholesalers with a view to permitting the abattoir to take over these functions itself, functions that were originally intended to be carried out by it. We hear the cry from the retailer, that is, the honest retailer in the meat industry, that he cannot make a living at present prices, but you cannot buy a butcher's shop at a reasonable figure. Not so long ago two butcher's shops were sold in one of the suburbs, one for £17,000—not the freehold—and the other for £8,000. Only a couple of weeks ago a suburban butcher's shop, not the freehold, sold for £15,000, and that included just the goodwill, the butcher's hooks, the refrigeration room, and the right to tip the scale.

Mr. Sparkes: What is the price of gold?

Dr. DITTMER: No good. That should satisfy the hon. member for Aubigny, who says he is not getting a profit out of the beef industry. Some of the money is going to people who do not grow the beef and it is the duty of the Labour Government to try to eliminate these intermediate agents who parasitically live on the industry and the people.

There is another aspect of man's personal life to which I should like to refer, and it is in relation to the Queensland Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1947. It is an estimable piece of legislation but possibly not strong enough or powerful enough to control the various practices that go on. We heard one hon.

member say that that power should be lessened. We heard another say that these powers are quite sufficient and that they work quite amicably. I agree with neither of them, and I hope to show that there is justification for a modification of the regulations under this Act.

As you know, the Liquor Act established the Licensing Commission, and by and large, and in some measure, it governs conditions. But we have to be careful about what happens when the regulations are not policed. We read recently that the New South Wales Legislature saw fit, because of anomalies existing in New South Wales, to set up a Royal Commission and rather interesting was the information disclosed. What did we find? Of the 2,000-odd hotels in New South Wales 85 per cent. were controlled or owned by the breweries or companies of similar kind. They were either controlled or owned by registered agreement, or by snide arrangement. But they were not content with that control. You found brewery officials lying in the witness box. You found one man forgot that he had a partner who lent him £9,250 and the partner was living in the same hotel. As though the partner would let him forget! You found another man forgot that he had been convicted of receiving stolen goods. You found adulteration of beer. You found snide agreements restricting the interstate free trade so loved by members of the Opposition. You found a brewery putting out a better product only until it eliminated an independent competitor, and as soon as it eliminated its competitor it reverted to a lower-grade product. So the story went on and is still going on. The picture is not so different from that which exists in this State.

Mr. H. B. Taylor: Are you suggesting the appointment of a Royal Commission in Queensland to inquire into the liquor trade?

Dr. DITTMER: I do not suggest a Royal Commission; I am suggesting that the powers under our licensing laws be used and if they are defective that any defect be remedied.

What do we find in Queensland? We find that of the 1,238 hotels in this State 123 are in the metropolis, and 1,115 in the country. In other words, 10 per cent. of the hotels exist for 45 per cent. of the population and 90 per cent. of the hotels for 55 per cent. of the population. The proportion of hotels is therefore 1 to 4,000 of population in the city and 1 to a little less than 600 in the country. That suggests a mal-distribution of licences, and when the fact is brought under the notice of the Licensing Commission it will probably attempt to rectify it.

There is little need to refer to the story of how hotels develop, the relationship of hotels to the people, and the primary purpose for their establishment. It was not for the purpose of selling liquor but the provision of accommodation. That is the principle we have got away from today. I am not making a plea for building any new hotels, should hon. members opposite suggest it, but what do we find in relation to the provision for accommodation? We find one hotel selling

over £200,000 worth of liquor and providing only approximately 20 beds. Admittedly, in this case an excellent liquor service is provided, but I believe that it is wrong and when that hotel was erected it should have been insisted on that at least 60 to 100 beds be provided.

An Opposition Member: Whom do you blame?

Dr. DITTMER: I am not blaming anyone. I am trying to suggest remedies in the interest of the people. That is all I am interested in. I am not interested in the mistakes of the past, except so far as they point the way to a better future.

You find five hotels selling £250,000 worth of liquor and not providing for any more than 50 guests—and that unwillingly. In Brisbane and suburbs it is not so much a question of which hotels do not provide accommodation as of which hotels do. You find the anomaly existing that one hotel in this city dares to charge customers 1s. on the glass. I am informed—and it would be reasonable to assume the figures supplied to me would not be far from the truth—that that represents at least £15 a week unearned money—undeserved money and money that is not their property; and probably money on which no taxation is paid.

Let us see what happens here in relation to accommodation. There have been pleas for the erection of new hotels. There is no justification for them. If you cannot replace the buildings with something providing more accommodation I believe you have no justification for a permit. I believe that if the hotels were renovated and no new material other than paint need be supplied, in addition to the few other items required for renovation, it would meet the purpose. They should be supplied with decent bedrooms and toilet and bathing facilities. Those facilities, together with decent beds and linen, and meals are all that the average man wants. There would then be sufficient accommodation in this State. Yet we find hotels with rooms closed and the licencees not prepared to provide any accommodation at all.

An Opposition Member: And no meals.

Dr. DITTMER: And no meals. Fifty per cent. provide accommodation unwillingly, 30 per cent. will not provide it at all, and 20 per cent. are prepared to stand up to their obligations under the licensing laws and the basic principle under which hotels were established.

In relation to the distribution of liquor, what do we find? The area up to Gympie, including the metropolis, is in the hands of the breweries, under an arrangement consistent with the interstate agreement referred to before the Royal Commission in New South Wales and consistent with the intra-state so-called gentlemen's agreement in which the State is zoned arbitrarily and handed over to the four breweries. The metropolis and Gympie are handled by the breweries themselves and in the rest of the State the distribution is in the hands of merchants and agents.

It is rather interesting to analyse how these two entities control hotels. They do not control the small or less remunerative hotels but the worth-while ones—the worth-while ones not from the point of view of service, but from the point of view of financial return. We find that the breweries own 18 per cent, and hold a head lease on 3 per cent., a mortgage on 1 per cent., and have other arrangements by which they maintain control of 8 per cent. The agents and merchants own 9 per cent., hold a lease on 7 per cent., hold mortgages over 4 per cent. and have snide arrangements affecting 12 per cent., making a total of a minimum of 62 per cent. controlled by manufacturers and distributors, something which cannot but contribute to an anomaly. We find that this is the position: when the distribution of liquor is made it is made in the interests of the people who control the hotels and not in the public interest. The hon. member for Flinders has referred to some anomalies in the liquor industry and so did the hon. member for Port Curtis. One owner was threatened that if he accepted a different licensee his quota would be reduced by 60 gallons a week. Although they say the quotas are based on the year 1942, we find arbitrary increases, we have brewery directors and managers telling us that distribution is in the hands of the agents and merchants, whereas the agents and merchants tell us distribution is in the hands of the breweries. One or all of the parties must be lying. There is no such basis as the year 1942 because increases and decreases are arbitrary. The hon. member for Port Curtis told us of a case in which there was a 50 per cent. decrease immediately the new licensee went in.

If these things are not controlled we shall soon be confronted with sloop parlours everywhere. In one big western town there were three hotels. Two of them came under brewery control, with the result that the third has not had a keg of beer for six years. Is that fair when we expect people to fulfil certain conditions laid down by law? I point out these anomalies because it is unreasonable to expect one group of men to do everything and it is our duty to point our fairly and in a constructive way, without bitter criticism, the anomalies that we see.

Mr. Muller: You ought to make that speech from this side.

Dr. DITTMER: It is expected of hon. members on the Government side that they make speeches in the interests of the people, so far as they are able, and I am trying to do that if hon. members opposite will only extend to me the courtesy of listening.

It is said that there is a shortage of bulk beer. There is a shortage for some hotels but with others, provided one is prepared to pay anything from 50 per cent. to 100 per cent. above the fixed price, beer may be bought in bulk. Some hotelkeepers who enjoy public goodwill often buy in bulk from other hotels that cannot sell it. I can mention one case in which the hotelkeeper was able to get 12 10-gallon kegs in one week and to repeat that not long afterwards.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

LUNCHEON TO RT. HON. D. S. SENANAYAKE,
P.C., PRIME MINISTER OF CEYLON.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! In view of the arrangements that have been made to meet Dr. Senanayake, the Prime Minister of Ceylon, I propose adjourning now and shall resume the chair at 2.15 p.m.

The House adjourned at 12.45 p.m.

SUPPLY.

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Dr. DITTMER (Mt. Gravatt) (2.15 p.m.): I had told the Committee that some hotels had no bottled beer. I was proceeding to say that some of the allegedly wholesale merchants were selling beer—half a dozen bottles of Australian beer and half a dozen bottles of imported beer—at retail or higher than retail prices.

Mr. Evans: That happened in North Queensland.

Dr. DITTMER: That happened in other towns. Hon. members can see what the picture is in relation to this self-interest. We do not find sly grog shops short of bottled beer—and I am not talking about cemetery soup; I do not know whether the name cemetery comes from the fact that it puts you under the tombstone or whether it is because it is sufficiently strong to melt tombstones—but I am talking of places that sell regularly bottled beer. Not far from Victoria Bridge there is a place that is notorious. It is not receiving it from the brewery but from a well-known South-side hotel, which must of necessity be getting a quota greater than its legitimate needs. And what about the night clubs that some of the Opposition members might frequent? (Opposition laughter.) We find bottled beer available at prices they can afford to pay. Only recently, according to the Press, a police officer suggested that this Government, interested in the people's welfare, should permit night clubs to exist similar to those rookery-nooks in Sydney. I hope that the day does not arrive when we permit night clubs in Brisbane.

Mr. Brown: Hear, hear!

Dr. DITTMER: I should like to emphasise that I am not trying to espouse the distribution of liquor. I believe there should be prohibition, if it is practicable, but history has taught the lesson that it is not practicable. We find that races, civilised or savage, must have their fermented liquors. We find, too, through all the pages of history, that prohibition has proved a tragic farce and left in its trail disease and degradation. America was not alone in that respect; eastern potentates in their absolutism have tried it and it ended in failure and tragedy.

So that is why I believe, if prohibition is not practicable, that we have to be rational in our approach to the manufacture, distribution, and sale of liquor. That is why I am putting forward some suggestions that may, if adopted, create an improvement. That is why I suggest that we take advantage of the liquor laws of 1912 to 1947 and permit the Licensing Commission to appoint inspectors. It is not necessary that they should be police. It would lessen the burden on the police if we zoned Queensland into districts, and determined areas and appointed inspectors to them.

Further, I suggest that in regard to the maldistribution I and other members have shown is happening in relation to the bulk and bottled beer, we should give the Licensing Commission the right to inspect books of distribution and give it power, if there was victimisation—and the cases of victimisation are multiple—to remedy the anomaly. Further, it should have the right to stop breweries and agents or merchants from distributing only to hotels in certain areas. The Licensing Commission should have the right to see that accommodation is provided for people and they should have the right to determine tariffs; and it should have its own accountancy staff. If we do that we shall be going somewhere towards finding a solution of the accommodation problem.

This Government, taking cognisance of their past history and how they have laboured for the useful people, dare not sponsor a rebuilding of hotels from black-market money while one family is looking for a house. There are hotels that if renovated and provided with decent beds, bedding, bathrooms, and toilet facilities could cater for the accommodation needs of the Queensland public and travelling public in general.

Those are a few points to which the Licensing Commission should give consideration. If the commission has not sufficient power, the Government should consider the matter and remedy any defects. Possibly we shall hear some speaker from the Opposition say that the Government dare not because of the power of the liquor money. I have contested a number of elections, including one for the Lord Mayoralty, which embraced the whole of Brisbane, and not one penny was contributed by any brewery, hotelkeeper, merchant, or agent. Does that suggest that the liquor interests keep Labour in power? We have had enough of this suggestion of pressure politics in relation to this party. Only recently I heard a suggestion that one man gave £500 in relation to a Federal election to the Labour Party and I was able to counter that with the answer that he gave £3,000 to the Opposition. In other words, he backed the Opposition to win but had a tote ticket on the Labor Party. He was going to have a bit each way but the bigger

amount went with the Opposition, and he would have demanded a bigger quarter from them.

An hon. member opposite made an interjection earlier in the debate in regard to gold. I had not intended speaking on that subject, but in view of the interjection I take this opportunity of commending the Secretary for Mines, Electricity and Immigration, a man who is synonymous with "Power for the people." Only so recently as the last few days, we have had evidence of his ability in his introduction of measures to consolidate the law relating to the inspection of machinery and weights and measures. The consolidation of all laws is long overdue and for that step, in addition to many other reasons, the Minister is worthy of commendation from both sides of the Chamber.

I should like to refer in particular to his broadcast a few weeks ago in which he asked the Federal Government to espouse the cause of an economic price for gold. Hon. members opposite do not yet know what happened with copper. They do not know that through the inefficient representation by the Federal Government at the Washington talks, the copper quota for Australia was cut 20 per cent. We all know that the price of gold, in terms of dollars, is the same today as it was in 1934—35 dollars an ounce. That is a totally uneconomic price in these days of rising costs and it is certainly inconsistent with world parity. It is absolutely unfair, because gold is almost the only product the producers of which are expected to sell solely to one agency at a fixed price. The result of this has been that various shows in Western Australia are closing down. Paringa is closing down because the price is uneconomic. The Secretary for Labour and Industry knows that on Monday the Black Jack, one of the producers of Charters Towers, closed down. The Hon. T. G. Murray, chairman, said last week that the New Occidental, which is the mainstay of Cobar, will close down in the first month or so of the New Year because of the uneconomic price of gold. Both the hon. member for Fitzroy and the hon. member for Keppel will verify the fact that if copper had not increased in price by 500 per cent. Mount Morgan would be closed today and £50,000,000 worth of gold would be buried, probably never to be recovered to the State.

Then hon. members opposite ask about the price of gold! They know full well that the present Commonwealth Government acquiesced in the maintenance of this uneconomic price. South Africa flouted the Bretton Woods Agreement, under which an international monetary commission to which Australia was a signatory, was established. South Africa realised what the world-parity price was and she exported her gold in the shape of door knobs. This meant that instead of receiving the equivalent of £15 9s. 10d. Australian she received in the vicinity of £30 an ounce for her gold. A few days ago Canada announced

that she was going to take similar action. Fiji announced an intention to do the same thing. Australia, on the other hand, has done absolutely nothing to help a dying industry, and all this because of a decadent Ministry. I can quote the case of one man who, through the uneconomic price of gold, has lost £200,000. I know of other men who have lost anything from £25,000 to £75,000. But we are not interested in individual losses; we are interested in an industry that has been the salvation of the country on many occasions in times of economic crisis.

I suggest that the Secretary for Mines and Immigration is worthy of commendation for his early espousal of the cause of gold and an economic price for gold, realising that this is a dying industry and entitled to consideration in the light of the service it has rendered to the economic needs of this country. It must not be forgotten that the Empire has been the major producer of gold in the world; it produces three-quarters of the world's gold. America is the major buyer, but has never been the major producer. It pays her to buy on the lowest market. Russia is not frightened concerning the future of gold. What do we find in that country? It is suggested, not by the Russians but by our own allies, that she has increased gold production from something over 1,000,000 oz. to 7,000,000 oz., and that would be a conservative estimate. In the Dalstoy area of Siberia she has a settlement of 500,000 people producing gold, and 500,000 people, whether they constitute free or forced labour, will produce a mighty lot of gold.

That should be sufficient answer for the hon. member who interjected this morning and asked about the position in relation to gold and gold price. If we do not follow the words of the Minister, the gold industry of Australia will die, and I suggest that urgent representations be made of the economic needs of the industry so that a right be given to it to sell on the open market. When I say, to sell on the market, that does not necessarily mean the black-market. The producers of gold are only asking for the right to sell a portion of the product—not 100 per cent.—on the highest market, as happens in regard to the beef industry. The best beef goes to the abattoir, allegedly for Great Britain, but the moment it is outside the 3-mile limit it goes to Singapore, not because the producers are interested in feeding the Asiatics but because it means the highest price.

I should like to refer briefly to some aspects of the law. I am just an ordinary man and I know what the ordinary man's interest is, and what his reaction is. We have heard of congestions in the law courts; we have heard suggestions of the creation of District Courts. New South Wales is not particularly pleased over the establishment of District Courts. I do not want to say anything derogatory of the appointment of judges, but as hon. members know, there are classes of judges and you have what is termed the half-bred judge. In approaching this question we have to have

a sense of proportion. In this State we have magistrates and judges and I think if we could enlarge the training of magistrates those officers could handle many more cases. I believe that somebody should be appointed to find a way of streamlining cases, because, whether it is justified or unjustified, there is a feeling abroad that magistrates are not handling cases as they should and that they are prepared to "pass the buck." In other words, they are not facing up to the responsibility of deciding that a prima facie case must be made out before an accused is committed. That is why I suggest they should face up to their responsibility. If that was done there would be little congestion in the lower courts.

In relation to the judiciary, I think it would be a big help if its unofficial midwinter vacation was cut out. They are on vacation from December till the middle of February, and they take an unofficial vacation in midwinter, allegedly for the reason that the High Court is here. I hope that the Government will be able to make available more space to avoid any congestion that would be caused if this unofficial vacation was not taken. I do not think our judges really want a midwinter vacation. I do not think they ask for it and that they would prefer not to have it. It would be much better if the Government would make more space available.

When any further appointments are made to the judiciary, although talent, intellect and energy are desirable in the appointee, I think that temperament should receive a good deal of consideration. There is a feeling abroad that some judges are in a measure affected by partiality. I do not wish to be offensive, but that is the feeling among many barristers and other legal men, that is, that some members of the judiciary want to be not only judge, but jury and prosecutor. That should be eliminated and temperament should be closely considered when an appointment to the judiciary is being made.

I should like to have a little longer to deal with the jury system and to analyse where the recent attack came from. I should like to deal with the source of its inspiration, how sinister it is, what it means, and how it was intended to deprive the individual of his liberty. When a list of 45,000 potential jurors is cut down to 28,000 there must be something sinister behind it. I have not the time to outline the factors that debar a man from having his name included in the jury lists, but men following certain occupations, such as wharf lumpers and meat workers, are struck off the list. An attempt is now being made to keep people who live in housing areas off the jury list. If there are to be special juries, as there were in the days of the Moore Government, let new legislation be introduced, but if we do not introduce new legislation, let us stick to the legislative directions as they are.

Further, I believe that if a man is to be put on trial he should not be pursued with inhuman ferocity. If a further trial must follow a disagreement—if it is not desired to accept a majority verdict—let the Crown

bear the cost of subsequent trials. That will make the Crown more careful in pursuing a man. It is inhuman to keep on putting a man on successive trial, because with each successive trial he is being weakened financially, mentally and physically.

As you say, Mr. Farrell, my time is nearly gone. I shall develop my argument on a future occasion. After all, time is the thief of the intelligent man.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS.

Righ Hon. D. S. SENANAYAKE, P.C.,
Prime Minister of Ceylon,

Hon. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE, Minister for
Lands and Agriculture, Ceylon.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform hon. members that we have with us the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister of Ceylon and the Honourable the Minister for Lands and Agriculture of Ceylon. Mr. Speaker has, on your behalf, extended an invitation to these distinguished visitors to take their seats on the Ministerial Bench.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Whereupon the visitors were seated on the Ministerial Bench.

SUPPLY.

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT— RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. GAVEN (Southport) (2.39 p.m.): I am very pleased indeed to see here with us the Prime Minister and the Minister for Lands and Agriculture from our sister dominion of Ceylon.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. GAVEN: As I am the first to speak since their arrival, I extend to them a very hearty welcome and express the hope that they will find many things to interest them in Queensland. I hope their stay will be pleasant and that they will take away from Queensland and from Australia many happy memories of their visit to this country. I hope, too, that their visit will cement and hold for many years to come the friendship that exists between our two countries.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. GAVEN: In this debate, members of the Assembly are afforded an opportunity of dealing with almost any subject. It is my intention to touch only briefly on the Budget before proceeding to discuss other matters of importance. After listening to the dissertation on the Budget by the hon. member for Coorparoo and the Leader of the Opposition, who dealt with their subjects in a very capable way and delivered excellent speeches, it would be superfluous for me to try to develop the case from this side any further.

Because I always like to be fair in debate, I take this opportunity immediately of congratulating the Acting Premier on the very fine job he did on behalf of this State at

the recent Premiers' Conference when discussion took place on ways and means of providing finance to meet the commitments of the States for 1951-52. He deserves the highest commendation for the fight he put up on our behalf—and we should give credit where credit is due irrespective of our political views. So I say to him that he has done a very good job and I thank him for the way in which he carried it out. Every penny, every pound that Queensland can get helps to build this State.

And because I am charitable I wish to congratulate the Acting Treasurer also on the success of this his first Budget. If it is not successful, it only means that we shall all be hit—hon. members on both sides. Therefore I say to him on the introduction of his momentous Budget, the biggest ever introduced into Parliament, "Good luck! I hope the money that will be raised will be spent wisely, judiciously and to the advantage of the people generally."

I listened very attentively on Tuesday last to the remarks of the hon. member for Haughton about local government in particular and I propose to deal with the subject too. However, let me refer first to the bottom paragraph of page 15 of the Budget, which says—

"The Commonwealth has recognised the necessity to have a minute examination by the Commonwealth Grants Commission of claims by certain States for special revenue assistance. Again the distribution of moneys under the Federal Aid Roads Act and other Acts has been on a defined basis, but two distributions have recently been made of special revenue grants where no particular inquiry was carried out, and the allocations made were at the whim or fancy of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth could very well obtain a power of influencing Budgets of the States if it is going to take to itself the right to assess the budgetary requirements of individual States and discriminate against certain of them."

I am of the opinion that Queensland has been rather liberally treated so far as the Budget is concerned and I find that the following amounts, to mention only a few, have been granted by the Commonwealth to the State in respect of the financial year 1950-51—

	£
Interest on public debt ..	1,096,235
Income Tax Reimbursement Grant	12,279,888
Special Grant	2,000,000
Social Services Grant	834,000
Pharmaceutical Benefits ..	106,383
Commonwealth Dairying Industry Grant	40,000
Payments by Commonwealth under Roads and Works Acts	2,685,672
Commonwealth Fitness Grant	8,487
Grant to Queensland Road Safety Council	11,000
Contribution towards Herd Recording	2,980

The special grant of £2,000,000 enabled the State to convert a deficit into a surplus. Those few figures clearly indicate that Queensland has been treated reasonably by the Commonwealth Government.

I fail to see how any Federal Government, no matter what their political colour may be, can survive under the present uniform tax system. That Government go to the trouble of levying taxes and "cop" all the rebuffs from the people. They then hand this money out to the State Governments, who spend it as they like. When State Governments commit themselves to greater expenditure on public works and there is money available from the Federal Government, they say to the people in extenuation, "It is not our fault; we have not been treated rightly by the Commonwealth Government."

Mr. Betts, the secretary of the Taxpayers' Association of Queensland, a body that has specialised in taxation matters, and therefore should be reliably informed, has this to say on the subject—

"Since uniform taxation began in 1943-49 Queensland taxpayers had paid 11.1 per cent. of total Commonwealth income taxes, and received 17 per cent. of the reimbursements to the States.

"This year Queensland had received 16½ per cent. of reimbursements and there was no reason why the relation of payments would be changed. Taxation had doubled since 1946, and reimbursements to the State had also doubled."

I would suggest that the distribution be made on a pro rata basis and that the same percentage basis should apply each year. If that test is applied, it will be seen that what I have said has been borne out and that we have been treated rather well.

I am prepared to concede that the Federal Budget is an abnormal one. It is the largest Budget on record and provides for the highest taxation that has ever been brought down in the Federal Parliament in the history of the Commonwealth. We must remember, though, that we are living in abnormal times. If so, we will concede that it is a very courageous Budget and that the Government are cognisant of the fact that the times are abnormal and that we must prepare this country for defence. When we visualise the fact that the Federal Government in their Budget have provided £180,000,000 for defence it shows they are alive to the fact that it is useless to talk about developing the country until provision has been made to defend it. The Federal Government are charged with that responsibility and have gone about that task in a practical way. If we want to hold this country we must be prepared to defend it, and in making preparations for its defence we must be prepared to make sacrifices. That preparation has been made by the Federal Government, even though it may cost them their political existence.

I want to deal with the subject raised by the hon. member for Haughton, an hon. member who has always been moderate in

his views and one who from time to time has made very fine contributions to our debates. He mentioned that the Ayr Shire Council in his electorate was thinking about making representations for the amalgamation of the local authorities in his area. According to figures he furnished, the Ayr shire and many of the surrounding shires have raised their rates to such a degree that the ratepayers will soon be unable to meet their local-government commitments. In other words, the rates that have been imposed on the unimproved value of their land have brought them to the end of their tether.

The hon. member for Haughton said the opinion was held in the area that an amalgamation of shires would bring about a lower rating and that the ratepayers would obtain better service. He furnished figures revealing that the rates in the various divisions differed to a marked degree. In some divisions rates had increased to 3s. in the £1. In other divisions the rate was not so high, but, generally speaking, for the other divisions it was well over 2s. Because of this fact the hon. member for Haughton believes that if an amalgamation of local-authority areas surrounding the shire of Ayr was brought about, they would have one chairman instead of a number and one rate could be levied for the whole area with advantage.

Having had some experience of the amalgamation of local-authority areas, I must admit that it has its advantages as well as its disadvantages.

Anyone who set about amalgamating shires would have to be careful to know his areas and be sure when the amalgamation took place that the new shire would not be unwieldy. In a small shire with a revenue of £7,000 to £15,000 there is not the required financial stability to carry on the necessary work and provide the necessary machinery. If we take our minds back 20 or 30 years, before the days of heavy motor traffic, we remember that most of the roads were used by horse-drawn vehicles, transport was slow and people did not travel long distances by road. It was not necessary to have amalgamation. Today, with fast-moving motor traffic local government has been revolutionised. In the area represented by the hon. member for Haughton there are many small shires with a revenue of from £7,000 to £15,000, and it would be to their advantage to amalgamate, if the new area does not become unwieldy. It is necessary to be careful that parochialism does not creep in and that the people are really desirous of amalgamation.

I listened carefully to the hon. member's speech, which showed that he had a thorough knowledge of the subject. It is absolutely essential to have up-to-date modern plant to carry out your work, in conjunction with the Main Roads Commission, and provide the right type of road. It is absolutely impossible for small shires without the necessary financial stability to pay interest and redemption on modern up-to-date plant. That is why the amalgamation of smaller areas is suggested. But I say advisedly that amalgamation will not solve the problems of local government

today; it is a temporary palliative. Local government finds that it has lost most of its taxing authority; the only revenue is the rate on the unimproved value of the land; it has lost land tax and the heavy-vehicle tax. The Federal Aid Roads Grant given to local authorities through the Main Roads Commission as a direct grant to local government has done more to help local authorities than any other assistance, and a better job would be done if more money could be made available. It is essential that local authorities have some other means of revenue. If the means are not given to them, every local authority will be in dire distress because of the rise in the cost of material and heavy vehicles and plant.

Local government is closer to the people than any other form of government. The average local authority man meets his people every day. He has to be able to stand up and take the gaff, otherwise his stay is short. The hon. member for Haughton mentioned the fact—and he has every right to do so—that men like himself and other chairmen who carry responsibilities should be remunerated for their services. That is essential if we are to attract men of the best type. The work of these men differ from the work of chairmen many years ago. In the old days the chairman came along and had a look at the clerk once a fortnight or once a month. A local authority has to be strong enough to employ the best clerk it can obtain. It is also essential to have a full-time engineer who is capable of giving expert advice to the council. Then again, some areas are separated by arbitrary boundaries and people on one side are paying 2s. and people on the other side are paying 1s. in rates, although they are all using the same roads. I can never understand why people on one side of a boundary fence should be forced to pay double the rates for which the people on the other side are liable.

I should like to compliment the hon. member for Townsville upon the excellent contribution he made to the debate the other day. He is a moderate-minded man, and this Parliament could do with more members of his type. We have far too many hon. members who think of nothing but slinging hot politics from one side of the Chamber to the other. We could do with more men like the hon. member for Townsville, who makes excellent contributions to our debates and who does think more of the development of the State and the welfare of the people than he does of slinging hot politics about the Chamber.

I come now to what is a very important question to this country today, the production of food, and I refer in particular to the dairying industry. I am very pleased indeed to see that the Queensland State Government at last have seen fit to give the primary producer a just, fair and equitable price for his product. No industry in the Commonwealth has done more to provide work for the family unit and to develop the State than the butter industry, and I am pleased that it is now receiving a price to which it is justly entitled.

When speaking at the opening of the Royal National Association Show, His Excellency the Governor said that the time has arrived when we should produce more and when more people should return from the cities to the land. As more than 80 per cent. of this country's wealth is derived from the land, I feel that unless we have a quicker return of people to the land and an increase in production, we shall have a breakdown in our economy. Every time I walk down Queen Street and notice the high buildings, I am reminded of the fact that these have all been built on the production of the land. Of course, to get people back to the land, we must provide some incentive both to attract and keep them there. An adequate price, a fair and reasonable price for their products, is one important incentive that they must have.

Primary producers of this country, of this State in particular, are charged with a dual responsibility. Theirs is the responsibility of producing foodstuffs not only for the people who live within the State but also for those who live outside the State. Last Tuesday and this morning we heard a great deal about the help we should give Great Britain. The old pioneers of this country who came out from Great Britain in pursuit of economic independence went out into the scrub and bush lands, carved out homes for themselves and developed the country to its present state. They have handed on to us a heritage of which we can be justly proud. Let us be worthy of that heritage, let nobody tell us we are not worth it. Everything we have in this country we owe to Great Britain, and I am sure hon. members on both sides want to do all they can to help our mother country.

In the early days when she sent her people out here to develop Australia, England, through her navy—the greatest the world has ever known—watched over the colony as a mother watches over her son. She helped us to grow and develop and looked after us and protected us from countries of the world who had their eyes on Australia. And today we have a population of 3,000,000 and we should be going out into the world ourselves and taking a greater interest in world affairs. We should be prepared to stand on our own feet. We cannot always look to Great Britain to protect us and look after us as she has done in the past. And therefore I say that there is no decent Australian who wants to “dump her.” Give her food if we can. It is our responsibility to produce not only for ourselves but for the Mother Country also, who has not the rich and large areas of land that we have.

If we feel that we shall not be able to produce sufficient food for the rest of the countries of the world and that we shall produce in this country only sufficient for ourselves, we have no right to retain this country. There are tens of millions of people to the north of us who have to have food and it is better to feed them than fight them. If we cannot or will not feed them they will look for countries where they can

grow food for themselves. The best way to win these people over and to avert war is to keep them with full stomachs, and with the 3,000,000 acres of land we have in this country we have an excellent opportunity of doing that. The sooner there is decentralisation the better for this country and the happier many people in the world will be, and we at the same time shall be building up an economic foundation and structure for the whole of the continent.

There is no need for me to reiterate what has been said about price structure and about the butter position, because that is history, but I do want to say that I was astounded and amazed at this Government's talking about lifting the restrictions upon the production of margarine. Labour Governments—and I have to give them full credit for it—are doing their best to obtain the best for the people who work. They want people to work and enjoy the best conditions and the best possible wages. It is our responsibility to see that industries can carry those wages, and allow the people to have those enjoyments, but if we are to say to the industries that provide people with work that they have to produce at less than the cost of production, then we shall not be able to give our people good wages and conditions. As we want to see good wages and conditions operating, we need to see that at the same time the men meeting trials and tribulations in the back country have good wages too. Anything the primary producer has given to him he is entitled to.

The Government have spoken about lifting restrictions from the manufacture of margarine. It should be remembered that 80 per cent. of the ingredients of margarine have been produced by the use of black labour. Coconut oil and all the other things that go to make up margarine are produced by black labour, and we do not want it said that we are going to get back to a black-labour policy. I am 100 per cent. behind a White Australia policy and the payment of good wages and the giving of good conditions to everybody. If anyone wanted to deal a deathblow to the butter industry and the dairying industry, the lifting of the restrictions on the production of margarine would do it. I say that if you give the incentive to the butter producer he will deliver the goods. Give him the full wage he is entitled to and he in turn will do the right thing. Do away with this business of lifting the restrictions on the production of margarine, as this is a threat and a menace to one of the greatest industries we have.

As to price fixation I say that the Labour Government in this State and in other States must see that people in the cities have the right to get food at the cheapest possible price. That is their policy and I cannot see anything wrong with it. There is nothing wrong with seeing that people get food at the cheapest possible price, if the man producing it is getting a fair deal at the same time. The quarrel I have with price-control is that it appears to work in the same way as one-way traffic; it controls the price to the consumer, but it does not control the

prices the producer has to pay for the commodities he needs to produce. Unless you are an outstanding man, there is only one place in Queensland where you can make a success of farming today. I do not care how good your land might be, one area in this State stands out as a place where tremendous fortunes have been amassed. The people in that area all own fine motor-cars and lovely homes. That area is Roma Street. The average producer in this State is not receiving sufficient for the goods he produces, although the consumer in the city is being asked to pay through the neck for them.

A Government Member: What is the marketing board for?

Mr. GAVEN: I believe in marketing boards, because they bring about orderly marketing. I have been a producer all my life, and I can remember the days when our produce was sent into the Roma Street merchants and there would be a glut for a fortnight. The farmer would get less than cost of production; as a matter of fact, it was quite common for him to receive a bill instead of a cheque. That was the idea behind the establishment of marketing boards, that is, that we could have orderly marketing. If we can retain orderly marketing, well and good, but if the boards cannot give it to us, they are of no use at all. That is why they were created in the first place, and I hope they are doing their job.

But let me develop my argument on price-control. I am a potato-producer, and when I had to buy my seed for the present crop it cost me £4 a bag. I have my receipts here and I am prepared to table them if anyone wants to see them. At the same time as I bought those seed potatoes at £4 a bag, I sold Grade 1 potatoes on the market and received for them only £2 4s. 5d. a bag.

A Government Member: When was that?

Mr. GAVEN: It was just before the recent increase of ½d. a pound.

If Grade 1 potatoes are worth only £2 4s. 5d. a bag, seed potatoes, which are only Grade 2 and Grade 3, should not be more than about 35s. The cost of production forces the grower to charge a higher price for his commodity. It takes about seven bags of potatoes to plant an acre, which means that it costs the potato-grower £28 an acre for seed potatoes alone. Then he has to buy fertiliser, unless he has new ground, he has to work his ground, and he has to pay rates and taxes. In addition, he has to pay high wages. In spite of what has been said to the effect that there is no award for farm hands, the farmer has to be very versatile these days, and if he wants a good man he has to enter into competition with outside people. He must pay his employees the same wage as they would get if they were truck-driving. After all, a farm hand is entitled to just as much as a truck-driver, because he has to work just as hard as if he was driving a truck, if not harder. However, we

must see that the farmer gets a sufficiently high price for his potatoes to enable him to pay the present high wages.

That is the point I am driving at in relation to price-control. If we are to control the price of potatoes to the consumer, let us see at least that the price of seed to the growers also is controlled and that it is not only one-way traffic. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Fullagar, the present Commissioner of Prices, who is charged with a very difficult job. He has to act as a buffer between the seller and the Government. He has a very big job to do and a very unenviable one.

Mr. Walsh: A very thankless one.

Mr. GAVEN: A very thankless job too, and one that I should not like to have. I am satisfied that he is doing the very best that he can. You can have control of prices but you should have competition also. You should encourage people to produce the food-stuffs and have the markets full all the time so that there will be keen competition between the producers. Then you will get cheaper food for the people but if you are going to embarrass the producer there will be a falling away in production and the people will have to pay heavy prices for the food they consume. Go back through history and you will find that no Government were able to legislate their people or their country into prosperity. There is only one way in which a country can prosper and that is by keeping the people happy, by keeping them working, keeping them producing. We must encourage the people to produce and keep the markets full. There is no shortage of markets for foodstuffs throughout the world and if everybody produced to their full capacity we could find a market for the entire output for the next 10 to 15 years, and at good prices too.

Have a look today at what is going on in Sydney and Melbourne. Have a look at the banana merchants there. The wealthiest people in this country are the banana merchants, not the cove who goes out into the bush, fells the scrub, plants the suckers, and looks after them for two years before he gets a bob and in the meantime takes a job on the roads to keep himself in food and keep him going generally. He works up the plantations and maintains them in production for two years before he gets a bob. Then he goes out in wet weather and dry weather, in all weathers, to cut the fruit and pack it and send it to the merchants in Sydney and Melbourne—and in Brisbane too. He has been in the scrub for 20 years growing bananas, still cutting and working and flogging along while the merchants, some of them who were not even in the business when he started out, are driving about in the best cars and owning the poshest homes on Sydney Harbour. That is the position of the banana merchant while the producer is not getting the price he should get for his products and the people in the city are paying more for them than they should.

'They are paying through the nose for them. The merchants are the people who are batten- ing on the producers and the consumers.

I agree most heartily with the remarks of the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt about the breweries, the hotels, and the like. A similar state of affairs applies there. Not only is bottled beer hard to get but people have to pay 1s. 6d. and 2s. a glass for ladies' waists, as they are called, in the posh lounges of the hotels, and in addition have to pay a cover charge at the door of anything between 5s. and 15s. before they can even get into the lounge to drink it. Those are the things that this Government should tackle. Never mind about the man outside who is working hard to produce food- stuffs. He will give you the foodstuffs that you require at a reasonable price. Let the Government deal with the monopolists. Let them have a look at what is happening in Sydney, where ham is priced at 7s. to 11s. a lb. Do you know what the pig-producer gets for his pork today? He gets 2s. a lb. for it, yet the consumers have to pay from 7s. to 11s. a lb. for ham and if anyone wants to buy a whole ham he will pay in the vicinity of £8 8s. for it.

Mr. Walsh: You have your co-operative associations.

Mr. GAVEN: The pig-producer is not getting a fair price for his product. I know what they are getting because I live amongst them and I know that they are getting only 2s. a lb.

Mr. Walsh: I am not denying what you say but you have your co-operative bacon associations. What are they doing?

Mr. GAVEN: It is time that someone did something about it. That bears out my argument that the producer is not getting what he is entitled to and the working people in the city are paying too much.

I want to draw attention to an article I read recently in support of the contention that if the butter-producers are given more money for their product it will not mean that more butter will be produced but it will be an incentive to the present producers to continue in production and stay on the land. It is our duty to step up our rate of production and output by adopting more modern and scientific methods. We must face up to the fact that our land industries are not producing as they did formerly. Land that has been worked for the last 20 years shows a falling-off in production and it is only by adopting scientific methods of farming that we shall bring it back into production. I was pleased to notice that the Federal Government have set aside £250,000 to help in the development of our primary industries, the improvement of our pastures, and other associated matters. I will quote from the article I mentioned to bear out my statement that we are not producing what we formerly did from our land. We will admit then that our production is slipping and we must galvanise ourselves into action to do something to hold our present development and encourage the use of scientific methods to step

up production. The cost-finding Joint Dairy- ing Industry Advisory Committee appointed by the Federal Government to inquire into the costs of producing butter visited over 1,000 farms and obtained evidence from them all. We are all aware of the fact that we may have two farms that are worked side by side with each other with only a fence dividing them, but that one farmer can make a success of his industry and produce butter for 2s. 6d. per lb. and do well, because he is producing under scientific methods and modern conditions. Because he knows his job he has mechanised his farm, he has built silos and gone about his work the right way. His next-door farmer, through no fault of his own, perhaps has not been able to buy machinery and build silos and has not been able to rotate his growing of food for his cows, and is not able to produce butter under 5s. per lb.

Mr. Foley: Very often he does not want to do it.

Mr. GAVEN: There could be something in that.

To give the Committee some idea where Australia and Queensland stand in the matter of production I want to read the article I have here. We have a magnificent country and all we have to do is to go the right way about working it.

This article states—

"We have natural assets, including climatic conditions, which should enable us to be placed among the leaders of the dairying countries of the world. But a glance at the tabulations in these columns reveals Australia in last position in a list of 10. And in the State breakdown of Australian figures we find . . . Queens- land last."

Then followed a table showing the average annual yields per cow in selected countries in 1947 and 1948. It reads—

	1947	1948
	Gallons.	Gallons.
Netherlands	385	723
Belgium	574	587
Denmark	568	587
Switzerland	518	582
Sweden	523	557
United Kingdom	501	544
United States	482	486
Canada	451	435
New Zealand	533	544
Australia	378	380

We can run down the scale of the States and have a look at the production in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania and, without wearying the Committee with all the figures, we find that Queensland is right at the bottom of the list with 292 gallons of milk per cow. That is an indictment against our industry. We who are producing must get to work and do something about it. The money set aside by the Commonwealth to obtain an improve- ment in our production must be spent wisely and in the right direction.

Mr. Foley: Half of our cows go out of production in the winter.

Mr. GAVEN: That is what we must not allow to happen. We have to reorganise our industry to see that our cows do not go out of production. We must put the feed down the cow's throat because if her body and heart are not right we shall not get the production we desire. As the Minister remarked, many farmers, sometimes through no fault of their own and sometimes through their own fault, have cattle that are not in the condition they should be in. Sometimes, when they finish lactation, they are turned out into the old bush paddock to fossick for themselves, and when they come into production again, instead of being fat they are as poor as wood. That is why we are in the position in which we now find ourselves. The farmer has to have silos; he has to have production in the winter and be able to force the cow all the time. To do that costs money. It costs money to mechanise a farm. Only recently I bought a tractor, a plough, and a mowing machine, and they cost me about £1,200. Silos also cost much money. It is all right for the man who is able to do it. Many farms are handed on from father to son and the son is in a position to do it, because he is established, but the average person who goes out to open up new country is faced with many hardships that were not thought of years ago. He has to have money to do these things, and if we have an incentive by way of price for his product, we shall be able to build up our industries to equal the production of the older countries.

The solution of the problem of cheap food and better production boils down to water and electricity. If we can harness the water of this great State and turn it back inland—as has been suggested by many brainy men—and make it available to the producer for irrigation purposes, I can assure you that this city and many others in this State will be able to get much cheaper food. Water is the secret of success in farming—dairying and any kind of crop-growing.

Mr. Sparkes: Not if they are paying £4 an acre for it.

Mr. GAVEN: I do not agree with the hon. member. I would pay any price within reason. Good water is worth anything. If I could get water for £4 an acre for irrigation purposes I would give you that amount for it in the morning.

That is something I hope the Government will go into. Give us a few dams to harness the water. If you constructed dams across the Logan, the Coomera, the Nerang and the Albert rivers, we could provide the producers with water for their farms and you would then be able to buy spuds for 30s. instead of £2 10s. That is the position as I see it. I am in the game and I claim to know what I am talking about. I should like the Government to do all that they possibly can for the producers—not to talk about it—and provide them with water for irrigation. That would solve the problems of the primary producers, who would be able to produce at almost half the present cost. The ordinary gardener knows that on third-class country, with a

bit of manure and water, you can grow anything. But if you have first-class country and no water you cannot grow anything. Take a trip round the State and see the pathetic conditions that prevail where they have first-class country but no water. The cattle are starving and men and women are lifting them up, carrying water and feed to them in an endeavour to keep them alive. If these people were given water for irrigation we should be able to grow anything on God's earth. If you want cheap food that is the way to get it.

Mr. Walsh: I cannot understand why a practical man like you should be mixed up with the Opposition. (Government laughter.)

Mr. GAVEN: I now want to say something that might put me back on the right side. (Laughter.)

The amendment of the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act means that the Government will have power to acquire compulsorily all the produce produced by the primary producer at any price they like to pay. I should be a very happy man indeed if the Government could see their way clear to repeal that legislation, because I do not think they will ever get anywhere by standing over a man and telling him he must grow onions, potatoes, pumpkins, or something else, whether he likes it or not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not propose to allow the hon. member to discuss the amendment to the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act as that matter has already been disposed of.

Mr. GAVEN: I remember reading about similar action that was taken on the Volga River in Russia. It resulted in an upheaval there and they got nowhere with it. I am sure the Government do not want to emulate anybody who did anything that took place in Russia and therefore will consider repealing this law.

The dairying industry is experiencing hardships that were unknown to it at one time, and these hardships are increasing costs of production considerably. As an instance of the hardship that can overtake one, I refer to the introduction of the legislation dealing with T.B.-infected cattle. As a result of compulsory tests, 250 head of dairy cattle were condemned from five farms. I was fortunate in that I had been testing voluntarily and I lost only one beast, but my neighbour, who was milking 109 cows, had 99 condemned. His next neighbour lost 77 out of 120, while the next man to him lost 68 out of 110. The net result was that from five farms a trainload of 250 head of cattle was condemned. I do not say that a cow that is condemned for T.B. is worth anything at all. Actually she is not worth anything, but the Government pay compensation amounting to £6 a head. After paying freight on the condemned beast the owner gets about £5 15s. a head in compensation and is then confronted with the task of finding more suitable cattle to rebuild his herd. At that time people were

in a panic. Those who had cattle would not sell them because they did not know how many condemnations they would have when the tests were applied. This meant that the farmers had to go outside the district for new stock and the only place from which we can draw cattle for that area are the Ipswich and Beaudesert saleyards. If we buy them from areas other than those places, we find that we lose them from redwater once they get into our area. Hon. members will realise that the man who has 99 beasts out of 109 condemned is virtually put out of the industry. My neighbour who had this experience was forced to mortgage his property in order to buy cattle to rebuild his herd. The only cattle available at a time like that are culls, cattle that others do not want, and to introduce these into a herd inevitably means a rapid decline in production. It takes a lifetime of line breeding to build up a herd. Big prices are paid for bulls and many thousands of pounds are spent over the years in an endeavour to build up herds, and it is the easiest thing in the world to get onto the wrong blood line with a bull and find that you are back where you started. After having expended a lifetime in the building up of a herd, a man is placed in a serious position if that herd is almost wiped out overnight as the result of the T.B. testing.

As the compensation fund has now a credit balance of £50,000, and as the levy on milk suppliers is down to about one-sixth of a penny a gallon, I suggest that the milk suppliers should be relieved of the need for paying that one-sixth of a penny in order to enable them to regain a little of the difference between the £5 15s. compensation and the £20 or £25 they are required to pay for new stock.

Mr. Foley: The solution is what you have adopted yourself.

Mr. GAVEN: That is the solution.

Mr. Foley: Why not adopt it?

Mr. GAVEN: The trouble is that these fellows were caught on the wrong leg and had no idea that they had such an amount of T.B. in their herds, and they have been virtually put out of the industry.

There is another very important matter that I wish to say something about—and I hope hon. members will not think I am parochial, because at a time like this one has the opportunity to say something about his own electorate—and it concerns the siltation of the Nerang River. As I pointed out in my speech on soil erosion when the Bill was before the Chamber, the siltation of the Nerang River is causing great hardship to the people. I have mentioned the Merrimac drainage scheme—and I have had a lot of correspondence with the Acting Premier in connection with it—and I want to say that an alternative to that scheme would be the dredging of 3 miles of the Nerang River. It has been brought to my notice by constituents in my electorate that the siltation of this river is becoming so bad that the bed of the river has risen some 7 or 8 feet. So much siltation has taken place that pleasure boats,

rowing boats, and fishing boats cannot now get up the river from Jubilee Bridge, past Surfers' Paradise, where they normally went. Parties used to go up that reach to fish, and tourists on pleasure trips. It is to be remembered that after all the tourist industry is a big industry and we should provide facilities for these people when they visit our State. This siltation is indeed serious. I understand that the last time this area was dredged was 36 years ago and that the dredge that carried out the work is now engaged at Bundaberg. I would not suggest for one minute that that dredge be brought down from Bundaberg (laughter) because I know it is doing important work to help the sugar people, who are having the same trouble as we are having. The sugar industry is an important industry, and so is the tourist trade to my electorate. I am wondering whether consideration could be given by the Government to doing something about the siltation. I am not suggesting that the work be done immediately but perhaps at a later date and I am sure that local authorities will fall in with anything the Government proposes to do. I am sure that a great deal of the expense involved could be offset by the selling of the silt and the stuff reclaimed from the bed of the river, as there would be many buyers for it. It is, besides being a good fertiliser, good for filling-in and reclaiming land, and much of the cost of getting the silt out would be recouped in this way. There is strong agitation in my electorate to have the work carried out and I hope that in the future the Acting Premier and his Government will be able to give us some help. Not only is the siltation preventing boats and pleasure launches from going up and down the river but it is affecting the work of several firms down there. For instance, there is the Southport Sand and Gravel Company that was taking gravel from the bed of the river, crushing it and using the crushings as bitumen screenings and dressing. If something could be done about the siltation it would help the company and the work would be of material value in keeping people in employment in the district.

For some time I have not mentioned the question of building control but today I want to say a word or two to show that I have it in mind. I know that very shortly we shall be getting a Bill to re-enact the controls and I hope that when the Minister in charge of the matter is giving consideration to it attention will be given to the modification of controls or at least making them more elastic, particularly in my area. The people down there have served many of the sentences imposed upon them and I am hoping that the Acting Premier will help them by eliminating altogether or modifying to some extent the controls that exist.

Mr. Gair: You agree that people with homes here should not be permitted to build seaside houses?

Mr. GAVEN: I agree with that but local people think that the conditions should be modified. I wish to say nothing more on that subject now. I agree that while

materials are short a person who already has a home in Brisbane, or anywhere else, should not be allowed to build another home, but I think a lot more could be done to help the people on the South Coast.

I thank the Committee for the attentive hearing I have received, and I hope that I have made some useful contribution to the debate.

Mr. RASEY (Windsor) (3.35 p.m.): In speaking to the Financial Statement, I desire to join with many other hon. members of this Assembly in congratulating my good friend the Acting Treasurer on the Financial Statement that he has presented. It is just what we should expect from a man with his ability and his application.

In complimenting the Acting Treasurer, I must compliment also the Acting Premier, because he was for a considerable time the Treasurer of this State, and I feel certain that he laid a solid foundation for the Budget that has been presented by his successor.

Queensland can regard itself as being very fortunate in that, year after year, she has had representing her at the various Premiers' Conferences and Loan Council meetings, men with a sound financial training who have thought in terms of doing the greatest amount of good for the State itself rather than for any section of the State. As a matter of fact, during the recent Premiers' Conference our Acting Premier was eulogised, not only by the anti-Labour Press of this State but by the anti-Labour Press of other States, for his sound counsel. The sound traditions that have existed in this State since the 1920s, through the days of the Hon. W. Forgan Smith and other Treasurers up to the present, have enabled us to be represented not only by politicians but by Government officials who have been honest in their outlook on budgeting. As an example, at the recent Premiers' Conference and Loan Council meeting it was admitted by even the anti-Labour Press that this State presented a more honest Financial Statement than any other State in the Commonwealth.

In the present inflationary period through which we are passing, it is my opinion that Queensland is leading the way in overcoming the difficulties that exist, just as it did in the depression of the early 1930s. At the present time the Queensland Government are showing great courage, foresight and sound administration in their handling of all matters affecting price-control and marketing. In the same way as the Hon. W. Forgan Smith and the late Hon. Frank Cooper did in the years after 1932, when they advocated a sound financial programme, Queensland is again showing the way to the rest of the Commonwealth. Those men to whom I have just referred brought Australia out of the depression by refusing to listen to the dictates of the private banks, which were opposed to the expansion of credit. That was a time of contraction of credit and scarcity of money. Now, however, there is an overabundance of money and an embarrassment of riches. I prophesy that as the result of

their sound and courageous policy and their refusal to be coerced by pressure groups, this State Labour Government will take the lead in placing Australia's financial structure on a sound basis.

During the debate on the Address in Reply and again now we have had the mournful complaints from hon. members opposite that although the Labour Government have been in power for 33 out of 36 years they have failed to develop the State properly. Let us examine their complaints in the light of the facts and especially from the financial viewpoint.

I have always found that the opponents of Labour desire to have things both ways. If they are bosses they want it both ways, and generally in the commercial, industrial, and political fields the employers want things both ways. It is generally accepted that the people who have more than their fair share of this world's goods invariably want it both ways, and in their complaints against the Labour Government for their alleged failure to develop the State they still want to have it both ways.

Let us for a moment return to the scene of 1932 when Australia should have been using all her available man-power for development. About that period the big bankers, the insurance companies, the financial monopolists generally, and the succeeding Federal Tory Governments, to mention only the Bruce-Page Government, the Lyons Government—as the Menzies Government now—endeavoured at all times to keep down loan expenditure to a minimum at the behest of the powerful financial groups that dictated their political policy. The State of Queensland was seriously hindered by the financial policy of the day and thus we were not able to do the work we should have liked to do. We had the State development tax which was opposed very strongly by the industrial unions. Hon. members opposite would have you believe that we would favour that section, that we would submit to its pressure, but even in those days, in our endeavour to raise money by way of loan and from taxation—we had the right to tax then—we had to take unpopular measures in order that we might find work for the available man-power offering. There was plenty of available man-power then. It was the people behind the Opposition who sought to tie the hands of the Government and prevent them from doing the work they would have liked to do. We were then a taxing authority, as I have said, but look back over the files of the newspapers in the 1920's and again in the 1930's and you will see that our political opponents were complaining that we were not attracting industries to Queensland because our income-tax scale was higher than it was in Victoria, New South Wales, and other Tory-governed States. They argued that our high scale of taxation discouraged the establishment of industries here, that it placed them at a disadvantage compared with their competitors in the South. They cannot have it both ways. At that time they used their influence to embarrass the Government, to prevent them from getting the money that

was necessary to develop the State, and they now have no right to criticise the Government on the score of lack of development in Queensland.

With the limited amount of money at their disposal, from both loan and revenue sources, the Labour Government have, over the years, done a mighty job. That can be seen by a visit to the Atherton Tableland, from a knowledge of the development of the various ports, by the establishment of commodity boards, and the help that has been given to primary and secondary industries generally.

These people need to examine their consciences and reflect on the past before starting to criticise the Government on the development of Queensland and endeavour to get a little co-operation from the present Federal Government who at present are embarrassed by their great wealth, as reflected in a Budget that predicts a surplus of £114,000,00. These critics should interest the Federal Government in the development not only of North Queensland but North Australia also. From what I observed the other day, I thought the Federal Treasurer, Sir Arthur Fadden, must have been in many, many shipwrecks, because he appeared to favour the women and children first.

Mr. Walsh: He taxed the women's cosmetics and children's ice-creams.

Mr. RASEY: That is so. Like these poor unfortunates in time of shipwreck, they are singled out for first consideration.

I want to touch on the subject of Communism and the hatreds engendered by many people with respect to it, irrespective of their political beliefs. I deprecate this class hatred. There are people of every political thought who may hate Communism who, through a long period of political prejudice, do not realise the harm they are doing when they are throwing the taunt of Communism at hon. members on one side of the House, and that of Fascism at those on the other. A few hon. members of the Opposition have time and again suggested that the Labour Party may be Commos or extreme Socialists.

Mr. Sparkes: I have not.

Mr. RASEY: I did not say it was the hon. member; I said a lot of hon. members over there. Many of the Country Party members very seldom stoop to that sort of thing. In fact, the majority of that party are a fine lot of fellows, although there may be one or two of whom I do not have the highest opinion. Some members of the Liberal Party, however, are suitable for the New Guard, as they apply that taunt to members of this party ever since they came into Parliament and continue to do so. We saw provocation given here the other night, and because of that provocation some members of the Opposition called us a bunch of Commos, and said we were doing nothing about Communism. We have a decent-living man on this side of the Chamber, the hon. member for Kelvin Grove, who hates both Communism and Fascism, and when taunted by some hon. members opposite with being

associated with Communism he threw "Fascism" at them. I know he would not do that in ordinary circumstances and it was only because of extreme provocation from the other side that he did so. We find that also in unions. These people do not know the harm they are doing to this lovely State of Queensland and country of Australia. I want to tell this Committee what the Labour Party has done about Communism and how Communism hates Labour, so that the fact will be recorded in "Hansard."

Mr. Sparkes: How do you account for the fact that the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt said there was Labour Communism?

Mr. RASEY: The hon. member knows quite well that he never said anything of the sort.

Mr. Sparkes: Yes, he did.

Mr. RASEY: It was merely a slip of the tongue. That hon. member was endeavouring to say something and the hon. member for Aubigny, who shows disrespect to the Chair by turning half-round in his seat, and endeavours to bait hon. members on this side with his interjections, tried to put those words into his mouth.

Mr. Sparkes: I might have pulled them out of his mouth, but I did not put them there.

Mr. RASEY: The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt made a slip of the tongue and the hon. member for Aubigny put his own interpretation on it. The hon. member for Aubigny endeavours to cause provocation, and puts his own interpretation on what is said. It is only fair to say that it is not so with other members of his party.

It has been suggested by members of the Opposition that the Labour Party has done virtually nothing about Communism and I wish to deal with Communism and some of the causes of Communism in Queensland. I can remember that in the early 1930s, when I first became an executive member of the Transport Union and was elected to the Trades and Labour Council, I was interested in national politics and I saw an organisation called the Unemployment Relief Workers' Council come in as a non-affiliated and non-voting body to the Trades and Labour Council. We members of the Labour Party in the industrial sphere were very vigilant about the activities of this council. We found that amongst those people—unfortunates who were thrown out of work because of the depression caused by the financial contraction, the banks and the Bruce-Page and other Governments—were some who were cultivated by the Communist Party, which started to prey on them and use them as feeders to the Communist Party. Amongst these men were professional men and accountants and small business men whom the Communist Party could see would make fine members of that party. They know that the man without great intelligence or who is not equipped to think for himself will fall for a catch-ery, whereas the man who is able to think for himself is less liable

to do so. However, these small professional men and trained executives were suffering from frustration—one of the worst things from which the human being can suffer—and the Communists knew that they were good ground for cultivation, so they cherished them and brought them into the party. That was in the period up to 1940, until the Communist Party was banned. The Communist Party used unemployment, the bad treatment of employees by employers, and the lack of amenities to win people over to them. During the late 1920s and 1930s many became members of the Communist Party. I was not on the Q.C.E., but my good friend, Alf. Milton, secretary of the Transport Union, was a member of the inner executive of the Labour Party, and he, together with me and others, set up our own organisation within the unions. We were members of the Labour Party, so the Labour Party was then doing its job.

Many of these men who were brought into the Communist Party from the Unemployment Relief Workers' Council and from amongst the unemployed rehabilitated themselves during the war, but numbers of them stayed in the Communist Party. They can be found in newspapers, in executive positions, and they are likely to be found in our universities. When talking of this subject we do not want to forget that. The Opposition would try to make us believe that Communism is only a menace in the trade unions. The Bill brought down to ban Communism set out to deal with those people and those people only. To my knowledge many of those men who did join the Communist party have gone to high positions. The other night I heard a man broadcasting on behalf of the Australian People's Union, over 4BH, and he was deploring the fact that there was a "No" vote and said that everyone who voted "No" was an idiot. He brought out one very interesting point. He said that at one stage of the campaign they were very sure of a "Yes" vote, but during the last one or two weeks he could see the position slipping. He said that the principal newspapers of Australia—I take it he meant the anti-Labour Press—were still advocating a "Yes" vote in their editorials, but many people did not read these editorials, and in the news sheets as much space as possible was taken up with material that advocated a "No" vote. This man then advised these great newspapers to search through the ranks of their staffs and weed out the Communists from among them. This served to show just where Communists are to be found and illustrates that the newspapers should clean up their own houses in addition to attacking industrial unions.

At the beginning of the war, the Communist Party was banned by the Menzies Government but this action only lulled the average industrialist and the people generally into a false sense of security. After it was banned, the members of the Communist Party set up such organisations as the Civil Rights Association, the Sheep Skins for Russia Movement, the Anglo-Russia Association and others. These attracted to their ranks men

of various religious denominations and other prominent men of all walks of life, with the result that instead of weakening the Communist Party the ban gave it the greatest possible opportunity in the world for consolidating and strengthening itself. I remind hon. members that this took place under the Menzies Government, and I should know what I am talking about here, because at that time I was a member of the Trades and Labour Council and was able to watch the machinations of the Communists.

It is said by the Liberals that we are friends of the Communists. I refer those people to the year 1948 when the Labour Party held a convention at Canberra, which I attended. The A.L.P. industrial groups of Victoria sent a deputation to complain to that convention of the Labour Party about the intimidation and violence offered members of the Labour Party by Communists at that time. My good friend Dinny Lovegrove, one of the finest of our anti-Communist workers in Victoria, was badly beaten up, but he came back and fought them, not with a New Guard, not with rifles, but by working 18 hours a day organising the industrial movement against them. The result has been that the unions of Victoria have gradually eliminated the Communists from their ranks.

This deputation to the 1948 convention in Canberra told us how, while they were working on jobs under a Liberal Government, the Communists came along and said, "We are declaring this work black because these men belong to the A.L.P. industrial group. If you don't put them off, you will not get the work done." The Liberal Government and private employers did this at the behest of the Communists. They had to go across to Canberra and have the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act amended and this was done by the Chifley Government to give these people protection.

What was the position here in Brisbane? I can recall sitting in a chair in the City Hall when Mr. Englart, then secretary of the Waterside Workers' Federation, came along to see somebody and had to pass me. At this time my friend the Acting Treasurer, Mr. Joe Bukowski, and a few others had formed ourselves into a very strong A.L.P. group under the direction of official Labour. Englart said to me, "I see you are having us on. Listen, you, you, and the rest of you, we shall be on top one day and you will go down the sewers of Brisbane as Hitler went down the sewers of Berlin." I was only acting as an executive officer of the Labour Party. What I am pointing out is that this is not being done only on an individual basis but on a party basis.

In the meat strike of 1946 there was a great cry about the need for a solid organisation. We saw that the Country Party and the Liberal Party and employers generally were doing nothing about the Communists. The only way to fight them was to give better conditions and make the people feel that they did not want the Communists. We decided to form a group directly responsible to the

A.L.P., the same as had been formed in Victoria and New South Wales, where they had highly-paid officers engaged full-time and paid by the A.L.P. to organise and fight the Communists. We did the same thing in Queensland. There were men like Joe Bukowski of the A.W.U., Hon. E. J. Walsh and myself, who were inner-executive members of the Q.C.E. You could not say that we were acting as individuals. We were given the resources of Dunstan House. We met there and when we had the storemen and packers with us and the meatworkers, the painters and the wharflumpers we met at Dunstan House every night in the week. For the convenience of the postal workers we met at 11 o'clock on a Sunday morning and for the convenience of the waterside workers on Sunday night. The doors of Dunstan House were open and we were always meeting there. We had the use of the telephone and we were using our own cars and paying our own expenses. We were not paid anything; the Labour Party as a unit was responsible. At present, because the hon. member for Bundaberg is from the country, he has resigned and the hon. member for Fortitude Valley has taken his place. The point I am making is that we do not act as individuals but as a unit.

I want to say a word or two about the Communist Party Dissolution Act. When the ban was put on them in 1940 the Communists consolidated and built up but we discovered that after the 1946 meat strike—when the men were out for 11 weeks and their wives were getting a severe punishment in that there were no wages coming in and there were concomitant troubles to the housewife because of the strike—the average man, because he was getting a hiding, realised that he had to do something for himself. (He was not protected by the ban).

After that strike the numerical strength of our A.L.P. groups increased tremendously. We had a meeting of 1,000 carpenters in the Brisbane Stadium, and they wanted to throw Gerry Dawson out. But what happened after a few months had elapsed? These men were no longer being hit, so that they forgot their responsibilities and once again became apathetic. In other words, they had a false sense of security.

The same thing happened in the 1948 railway strike. As an executive officer of the Australian Labour Party, I had to do many unpleasant things in 1948. We had to do many things that we felt at the time were not quite fair, but only because the average man had become apathetic and had forgotten the lesson of 1946. The 1948 strike was started on a good issue, but the Communists dragged in side issues. The real cause of the strike was marginal increases, and we knew quite well that the men had a just case but it was not for us to criticise the decision of the Industrial Court. However, when the strike eventually started the men were led into side issues by the Communists. If there had been a ban on the Communist Party at that time, exactly the same thing would have happened. After the 1948 railway strike, again everybody wanted

to join A.L.P. groups and wanted to do something about Communism. Why? Because they felt it was their responsibility to do something. They felt that they were bound to do something to protect themselves and their homes, and to protect the standards that the Labour Party had gained for them over the years.

I did not vote "No" because of a lot of legal technicalities; I voted "No" because I could see the futility of the legislation and because of the effect it would have on our nation. The banning of the Communist Party would make everybody complacent, which would be fatal. We must look to the future. We do not want to have the same things happening here as have happened in mid-Europe. We do not want to see armed gendarmes and military police keeping order in the streets. During the 1948 strike the Premier of this State was offered a body-guard composed of somebody other than members of the Police Force. The people who made that offer had not the slightest idea of the meaning of democracy or of the reaction that would result among their fellow men. I did not seek protection when I went up to the Trades Hall during the railway strike and addressed 600 men. Although it hurt me as an industrialist to do it, I kept those men out of a strike for the good of the State. I did not care if any Communist sympathiser told those workers that Tom Rasey was scabbing on them, nor did I want protection by any New Guard or by anybody other than the authorised Police Force. That is why I say that the Communist Party Dissolution Act was bad, and that is why I say that the Australian Labour Party has been the bulwark that has helped this nation to retain its democracy.

Mr. Sparkes: How do you account for the big "Yes" vote in this State?

Mr. RASEY: The people will listen to the newspapers. The Communists have been pretty clever in their tactics. They are using the same tactics now in the Commonwealth Engineering Works. They are snide tactics. They are not coming out in a full strike, but are holding little sectional strikes. They do not pull on any major strike now. The people are misled by the newspapers, and that is why they voted "Yes." If they were in the midst of a turmoil it would be a different matter. We have no truck with the Communists. During the railway strike, the meat strike, and the handling of the big coal strike in New South Wales by the Chifley Government, the attitude of the Labour Party was clear, but at no time would we have anything to do with the Communists. An aspirant for political honours under the banner of the Labour Party must sign a pledge that he will not join the Communist or Fascist Party. The communists have indicated their hatred of the Labour Party by endeavouring always to embarrass it by means of strikes, by subterfuge and by attacks on its members on the job.

Now let me have a look at the Liberal Party and its attitude to Communism. What is its theory for attacking Communism? Its

only suggestions to bring it under a ban, but I have proved conclusively, I think, that that would be futile, against all principles of democracy, against all reasoning and contrary to all the teachings of favourable reaction to fair treatment and human response and behaviour. It is also against the inherent reactions of human nature. Take small children. In order to induce them to be good, to do the right thing, they are offered a bribe, or some incentive, a lolly or a penny, or something to their advantage. The Liberal Party would simply ban the Communist disregarding all experience of human behaviour and human nature. I know some of the men who organised the Liberal Party and I have in mind one in particular who organised one of the old National Liberal Party groups in Queensland. He was one of the men in the New Guard that was formed about the time of the railway strike. He had the idea that that was the only way to fight Communism. It was a case of the Continental idea as against the English idea.

We in the Labour Party, a freedom-loving party, have an inherent desire to follow the great traditions of the English Parliament. We have always followed that view, that you should allow things to come to the top rather than ban them and force them beneath the surface. We feel in times of crises that common sense will prevail. The Labour Party's belief, in keeping with English ideas, is that there is a far greater proportion of the people of decent mind and high morality than there is of poor types who would turn to dictatorship. We feel that in time of crisis they will react favourably, in a responsible manner, and not according to the rule of force. On the other hand the Liberal Party is actuated by the principles that actuated Prussian militarism. We find the most vicious haters of the Labour Party among the most vicious advocates of Fascism and New Guardism. That weapon to fight Communism usually comes from a type of ex-military officers or service men who want to be swashbucklers and adopt the attitude of the old Prussian or old Austrian monarchist or France's old nobility, which caused revolutions and sectional hatreds on the Continent and trespassed on the tranquillity and peace and common sense of the people when leaders in such countries as England were endeavouring to solve great problems.

Mr. Nicholson: You are showing class hatred.

Mr. RASEY: I have not.

Mr. Nicholson: You have just shown you have.

Mr. RASEY: I am dissecting those people who accuse us of being a bunch of Commos and of doing nothing about Communism. I have traversed what the Labour Party have done in relation to Communism, and how the party through its industrial groups has stood up to intimidation and violence, and I am dealing now with members of the Liberal Party who have criticised us for allegedly not mending our ways.

I was speaking of the methods adopted by those people who would have the Communist Party banned, and how they in their blind hatred of the Labour Party talk about its members being a bunch of Commos and Socialists.

Mr. Sparkes: Are Healy and Roach Communists?

Mr. RASEY: Yes.

Mr. Sparkes: How did you come to march down the street with them?

Mr. RASEY: I did not. I said at an earlier stage of my speech that the hon. member for Aubigny totally disregards the chair and attempts by interjection to hang things on members of this party. I have that recorded in "Hansard." I have always done my part in the fight that Labour has put up against Communism, and I have always endeavoured to live according to decent Christian and high moral standards.

I do believe that the advocates of the Marx theory know quite well that its objectives can only be brought about by revolution. The Labour Party too knows that the Marx theory can only be realised by revolution. The Labour Party is sensible enough to know that democracy functions much more efficiently although it is more slow-moving than most totalitarian movements. That is because you can only go as fast as the people will let you go. If we must go through the process of evolution in democracy we must proceed slowly, and not with the speed of the Marx theorists. The advocates of a right-wing dictatorship would have us rule according to their political philosophy. I am not talking about controls in regard to prices, but political philosophy. We know those people who have right-wing tendencies would like to have a right-wing dictatorship, which they think would be much more efficient and which they think would return them bigger profits and give them greater power than a Labour democracy. The Labour Party goes down the middle of the road; as it always has. Although we may have one or two extreme Socialists who may lean to the left, we are no worse than the Country Party or the Liberal Party who have members who lean to the extreme right. Why should the great majority of the Labour Party and the Country Party fall into the disastrous habit of sowing hatred and suspicion in this country? When they talk about democracy they should realise what it means. In my opinion the answer to whether we go to the right, the left or keep to the middle of the road is co-operatives.

Mr. H. B. Taylor: Let us all be friends together.

Mr. RASEY: I know that human relations do not allow it. Watch two or three kiddies together on the road and you will find them fighting, one trying to take something off the other. I admit all these things. But if we are to get anywhere we must encourage the co-operative movement. The Bill introduced last week in relation to the co-operative movement is a good foundation,

but it is necessary that the people think co-operatively and that they favour the movement. It is the only movement whereby we shall give justice to all the workers. There is a great need in Australia for the forming of consumer and retailer co-operative movements. We have primary-producing co-operative boards and societies that have done a great job.

Mr. F. E. Roberts: They are not interested in the consumer.

Mr. RASEY: They are not much interested in the consumer. It is only human nature. If you have two or three little girls and one doll they are fighting and scratching one another for the doll; and it is the same with boys in relation to some other possession. It is the inherent selfishness of human nature and we cannot overcome it.

The co-operative movement in relation to consumer and retailer should be fostered by the unions. In England the unions have hundreds of thousands of pounds invested in the co-operative movement. In Sweden you do not find anyone wanting to migrate. They have a great co-operative movement there that gives some incentive to the workers. What we need to do is to encourage pride in workmanship in everybody, from the employer down. Unfortunately, in Australia the average employer has not enough pride in the output from what he controls. He has not sufficient interest in the workmanship and in his employees.

An Opposition Member: Is not the Labour Party against incentive payments?

Mr. RASEY: I think we all have to have an incentive and that is best provided through the co-operative movement.

There is no reason why the unions in Australia could not do the same as they did in England. The unions have kept their contributions low and they have not imposed a levy to provide a fund so that they could form consumer and retailer co-operatives. For instance, the balance sheets of the big retail firms of Brisbane disclose that they had been making tremendous profits. At a time when we are talking of checking inflation these people, who manufacture nothing but who are merely distributors or retailers, make 33 per cent. profit after allowing for depreciation and other things. You cannot keep wages down if you do not keep prices down.

Mr. Aikens: T. C. Beirne's showed a profit £100,000 greater than that of last year.

Mr. RASEY: And that is only one of these firms. Such people are doing a grave disservice to Australian democracy and they are helping the Communists in every way. Those of us who have been active in organising anti-Communist groups have found that in the industrial movement there are many intelligent men who read the financial columns of the "Courier-Mail" and the "Telegraph" each day and who thus realise what is being done. To these people the Communist agitator says, "Look at what

these people are making. The Labour Party is not able to do anything about it. The only cure for such evils is Communism." That is one avenue through which the Communist is able to keep the average worker in his present state of apathy.

As for retail co-operatives, if the Shop Assistants' Union of 7,000 or 8,000 members, the Electricians' Union, the Clerks' Union and the Transport Workers' Union had seen the wisdom of encouraging their members to contribute to a fund for the establishment of a large retail co-operative they would have been in the same position as some of the unions of England, which are able to defy the big manufacturer who would like to boycott them and force him to sell to them.

We know the tactics adopted by these big combines. The other day the hon. member for Cooroora told us how W. D. & H. O. Wills is refusing to supply tobacco to some of the small co-operatives. I know of other instances in New South Wales where the manufacturers refuse to supply co-operatives with such things as galvanised iron and other articles in short supply, thus forcing the shareholders of those co-operatives to go elsewhere for their goods.

Mr. Low: In Warwick they put one co-operative out of business.

Mr. RASEY: That is so. It is not too late even now for the unions to distribute propaganda with a view to educating the average man to a realisation that the co-operative is his salvation.

Mr. Dewar: That would be far better than having them give their funds to the Labour Party.

Mr. RASEY: I have a great deal of time for the hon. member for Chermide socially and privately, but his attitude in this Parliament is anything but becoming and I suggest that he read a copy of my speech and endeavour to inform himself.

I say that the Communist Party can only be beaten by a people of a high moral standard. I said this on the Address in Reply when I made a speech about employer-employee relationship and I appealed to all people of no matter what political party—whether belonging to the Labour Party or the Liberal Party, whether members of Chambers of Commerce or unions—to sway people of a high moral standing to do the right thing in the community. I say that if people will not discipline themselves to do the right thing, the only way is for the unions—and they have a membership running into hundreds of thousands throughout Australia—to use their funds and augment their funds by propaganda to inculcate into the minds of all their members the need for a reservoir to form co-operatives of every kind so that those who are not actually members of co-operatives will be able to share in industry.

Mr. Sparkes: You are worrying your mates now.

Mr. RASEY: My mates know me as well as they know the hon. member.

Before concluding I want to make a protest on behalf of a lot of unfortunate people who were forced into a state of mental disorder and anguish in the last few weeks because of the holding of the military tattoo on the Exhibition Ground. I make it clear to the Committee and I declare my own position by saying that I have no objection to the holding of a military tattoo. I realise, as a responsible member of the R.S.S.A.I.L.A. and a Digger of World War I who was in France for quite a while, the necessity for realistic training and the necessity for armed forces. In the interests of the lads and the people of Australia, in view of the confused state of world affairs, I am in favour of national military training.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. RASEY: I believe in it. I think that three months' training will not do anyone any harm. What happened at the Exhibition was necessary but my complaint is that the venue was wrong. In the hospital near by approximately 1,000 nurses were resting and there were many people in the hospital itself—people who helped to make Australia what it is. Those people should have received some consideration. In the hospital, too, there were many old people, sick people and those recovering from operations. I go to the hospital very often—perhaps more often than any other member of this Chamber. I am there virtually every week. I have spoken to members of the staff at the hospital; I was on the Brisbane and South Coast Hospitals Board. It was a tragedy that the inmates of that hospital, decent people who helped to make Australia what she is, had to suffer because of the blunder of the military authorities in selecting the Exhibition Grounds as the venue for the tattoo. I live on the city side of Brisbane and the noise shocked me. There was a Lincoln bomber of four engines flying over the area.

(Time expired.)

Mr. EWAN (Roma) (4.34 p.m.): On a close perusal of the budget as presented by the Acting Treasurer I feel constrained to say that this State will be offered budgetary equilibrium in the ensuing year. That will be highly commendable if the works programme is not pruned to any extent or tinkered with to enable an untrue picture of the State's finances to be presented next year.

The Acting Treasurer made strong references to the unsatisfactory position in which Queensland finds itself because of the allocation to it of Commonwealth funds in comparison with the other States. That is a direct tilt at uniform taxation, but the Acting Treasurer did not tell the Committee what efforts his Government have made to have taxing powers reconferred on the States.

Mr. Walsh: Do you think they should be?

Mr. EWAN: Of course I do. In 1942 the Commonwealth Government introduced the system of uniform taxation, but this

Government, and every other State Government, opposed the move bitterly. They even took the matter to the High Court—

Mr. Walsh: And lost.

Mr. EWAN: And lost.

Mr. Walsh: At least we fought.

Mr. EWAN: We want the Government to fight again to have those powers reconferred on this and the other State Governments. Although uniform taxation was adopted avowedly to enable the financing of the war to be carried out more uniformly, and perhaps more expeditiously, this and other States have made no effort at all to have their taxing powers reconferred on them. What a fortunate position any Government are in if they can get their money from another Government, if they can allow that other Government to collect taxation from the people, thereby making themselves unpopular, and at the same time slate the Government who are doing the taxing for gaining unpopularity? The Acting Treasurer has slated the Federal Government in his Financial Statement. He conveniently blames the Federal Government and any other Government, particularly if they are not Socialist Governments. Of course, if the Federal Government were a Socialist Government, the Treasurer would say nothing against them. What a glorious opportunity this Government have to slate the Commonwealth Government and to hoodwink the electors! In spite of all the talk we have heard from the Government benches, I challenge this Government to attempt to regain their powers in the income-taxation field. Let this Government assume full responsibility for their actions!

Mr. Walsh: Do you suggest that we should abolish the High Court and overrule its decision?

Mr. EWAN: Would not the Acting Treasurer love to do that? We have the example of the hon. member for Bremer, who suggested in this Assembly the other day, no doubt with the full concurrence of the Acting Treasurer, that that should be done.

I challenge this Government to attempt to regain their taxing powers and not to hide behind the skirts of the Menzies-Fadden Government. I challenge them to assume full responsibility for income taxation. I venture to say that within three years there would be a very different picture for the electors of the State of Queensland.

The Treasurer made a veiled reference to further deterioration in the disturbed international position and to the necessity to expedite our defence requirements. He then went on to say that expenditure on defence requirements produced an inflationary pressure on our economy, because such expenditure increased income, while there was a reduced quantity of goods on which the income could be spent.

Mr. Walsh: That is very obvious.

Mr. EWAN: I am delighted to hear the Acting Treasurer say that that is very obvious. In other words, he implies that by the draining off of excess income a lesser demand will exist for the available quantity of goods. He agrees with that.

Mr. Walsh: I am not agreeing with what you say.

Mr. EWAN: That is what the hon. gentleman said himself. That is a policy that we should expect from such a school of thought, from such half-baked economists, but his economic reasoning is fundamentally unsound. (Government interruption.) Judging by the row coming from the Government benches I know that I am getting under the skin of hon. members' opposite. They do not want to hear what I have to say, because it hurts them too much.

So far as his economic reasoning goes, the Acting Treasurer said that in so far as you drain off excess income you will create a limited demand for the short amount of goods available. I challenge him on that. I say that his reasoning is quite unsound, and I ask you, Mr. Farrell: what is the use in any Government's—no matter what their political persuasion—drawing off surplus spending power from the individual and continuing to spend it on so many doubtful projects themselves?

Mr. Walsh: You are putting up a case against the wool deduction tax.

Mr. EWAN: You see how the hon. gentleman is trying to crawl out of his difficulties, when I illustrate the unsoundness of his reasoning.

The Federal Government's Budget comes harder now because the application of the remedy has been delayed so long. If the inflationary spiral is to be checked, Governments must practise retrenchment. (Government interjections.) I see that the Treasurer, so ably backed by the hon. member for Mundingburra, supports my view and applauds my statement. And there must be a recasting of values. By a recasting of values I mean that a greater incentive must be offered to all the people, employer and employee alike, engaged in the production of essential goods and commodities. These people must necessarily be allowed to retain a larger measure of their incomes than those engaged in manufacturing luxuries, to enable them to expand their business in the production of essential commodities. It is not right that luxury industries, because of their greater rewards, should be able to attract labour from essential industries. If non-essential industries are allowed to offer a greater incentive for man-power to engage in them by the attractions of higher wages and greater amenities, and less difficulty in their work, then as a natural corollary there would be no check to rising costs of essential commodities such as food, clothing, and housing.

We must admit that a Government have power to direct labour but it is not desirable that a Government should exercise that power in spite of the fact that the Queensland

Socialist Government sought with every means at their disposal to direct primary producers. If any anti-inflationary policy is put into effect people must be encouraged with every means at our disposal to engage in essential industries, primary as well as secondary, to increase production as well as to bring down production costs.

A Government Member: Why do you not put these things up to the Menzies-Fadden Government?

Mr. EWAN: That is the sort of interjection I should expect.

Mr. Power: Why do you not provide accommodation for your workers?

Mr. EWAN: That is the sort of tactics this Socialist Government adopt because they are not prepared to assume their responsibilities to check the inflationary trend.

I would suggest as an anti-inflationary measure that the Queensland Socialist Government give some consideration to putting a stop to the wasteful duplication of Government services, both Commonwealth and State.

Mr. Cair: I put that up to the Prime Minister at the Premiers' Conference but he turned it down.

Mr. EWAN: We have many glaring examples of this duplication in Queensland. There is one that will appeal to hon. members opposite. All the States excepting Queensland have adopted the Commonwealth electoral rolls for their purposes but the State of Queensland persists in having its own Electoral Office.

Mr. Walsh: Why did not the Moore Government adopt the Commonwealth roll?

Mr. EWAN: They bring in the Moore Government! If they did not keep on with the parrot cry about the Moore Government the young fellows would not know what they are talking about.

Mr. Walsh: But your Government turned it down then.

Mr. EWAN: Hon. members opposite are only trying to sidetrack me. Why will not the Government abolish their Electoral Office and adopt the Commonwealth rolls? The "Courier-Mail" had a controversy on the subject with the Premier and Acting Premier, who stated that the other States did not use the Commonwealth electoral roll for other purposes, such as local government elections. But they do. Do not forget that about six months or three months ago I asked a question of the Acting Attorney-General and he was so indignant that he would not even discuss the matter; all he said was, "No." There is a duplication that could be well removed if the Government were sincere in their parrot-cry to put value back into the £1.

The Hon. the Acting Treasurer, aided and abetted by Labour members generally, charged the Commonwealth Government with having taken no positive steps to arrest inflation during the last 12 months. What have the Queensland Government done in this connection? A few days ago, in furtherance

of the Socialist pledge to nationalise the means of production, distribution, and exchange, they introduced legislation that has confounded the producers and is causing utter chaos, discouragement and lack of confidence, and, believe me, real fear in the minds of the primary producers of this State. It can be definitely said that this Government are aiding and abetting inflation rather than taking any anti-inflationary measures, and they are retarding production and thereby increasing the cost to the consumer. As a cover-up for these intentions this Socialist Government mouth platitudes about "A fair day's work for a fair day's pay" and "The labourer is worthy of his hire" and so on. Their action in introducing legislation during the last 12 months shows they are seeking to destroy those principles. While the Government manoeuvre for a servile State the consumers are going short of essential foodstuffs such as butter, meat, eggs, potatoes and onions.

The Government seek by the introduction of the legislation to which I referred—*iniquitous and insane legislation*—to regiment the primary producers of this State. I refer to the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts Amendment Bill and the Railways Acts Amendment Bill. I emphasise that this Socialist Government have wrongly assessed the temper of the primary producers of this State. Prior to the introduction of this iniquitous and insane legislation the primary producers were free people—and, believe me, they intend to remain free people. The fight goes on—and, believe me, it will go on because every day we have heard threats hurled across the Chamber by responsible Ministers of the Crown saying they would deal with the meat-producers and the producers of onions and spuds and everything else. While that fight goes on—and it will go on—what is going to happen to production and to our consumer economy? There will be added inflation, and that is all this Government seek to promote. The farmers must have a clear-cut, remunerative price structure; they must have an incentive to produce and they must have more labour. How are they to get that? Apart from the obstacles I have mentioned already, perhaps the greatest obstacle of all to increased production in Queensland is the occupation of the Treasury benches by a Socialist Government.

If we want to criticise other Governments, let us first put our own house in order. I have indicated clearly how sticky the path is, but let our Ministers tackle the problem seriously, with the object, not of embarrassing the Federal or any other Government, but of increasing production and providing an incentive for the people engaged in essential industries, employer and employee alike, rather than setting out on this wild-cat, stupid harebrained experimentation with Socialism.

Mr. Aikens: Tell us in simple words how you think it can be done.

Mr. EWAN: If the hon. member will emulate the wise old owl and listen more, he will hear a lot more and learn a lot more. It is my intention to offer to the

Ministers concerned constructive suggestions in that spirit of helpfulness which is characteristic of this side of the Chamber. In the first place, I believe that only schemes of a defence or development value should receive consideration at this juncture, because of our acceptance of the responsibilities of citizenship in the grave international position threatening us, to which the Acting Treasurer referred, with which we all agree.

Any national or State scheme for development must have also a defence potential and perhaps the greatest move this State could undertake is the rapid expansion of its all-weather road system. In determining the priorities to be allotted for the construction of the roads we should look at the matter from a State-wide, not purely parochial viewpoint. We must take the overall picture of not only Queensland but the Commonwealth, and I draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that there exists now an all-weather road from Sydney to Thallon and from Thallon to St. George.

Mr. Walsh: I take it that is a main road?

Mr. EWAN: Yes, a bitumen road. but unfortunately there is a stretch of approximately 70 miles between St. George and Surat—

Mr. Walsh: Is that still a main road?

Mr. EWAN: No.

Mr. Walsh: So the local authority would be responsible for that?

Mr. EWAN: At the moment. The Government could gazette main roads. As the responsible Acting Treasurer in this State, the Minister should pay attention to what I am saying, with the object of bringing about this all-weather defence road.

Mr. Walsh: And relieve you and the wealthy graziers of the responsibility.

Mr. EWAN: That sort of interjection leaves me cold; it does not worry me. He seeks to kick up a lot of noise about nothing, like a hornet buzzing about a teacup, trying to divert me, but I will not be diverted. I am speaking of the construction of an all-weather road from Sydney to Rockhampton. About half of the length of road from Surat to Roma will be bitumened within the next four or five months.

Mr. Walsh: Thanks to the Department of Main Roads and the Government again.

Mr. EWAN: Thanks to the taxpayers of Queensland. Part of the road from Roma to Injune is under construction and with the building of roughly another 120 miles you would have an all-weather road from Sydney to Rockhampton for defence purposes.

Mr. Walsh: It sounds like the parish pump to me.

Mr. EWAN: I thought the Minister would say that.

Mr. Aikens: There is a lot of Queensland north of Rockhampton. That might be news to you.

Mr. EWAN: I am speaking from a developmental point of view, and I can only speak of my own electorate and other parts of the State particularly well known to me. I should hesitate to make suggestions concerning areas with which I was not conversant.

Mr. Power: Don't come to Baroona!

Mr. EWAN: I shall tell the Minister something shortly.

On the foothills of the Carnarvon Range we have hundreds of millions of feet of hardwood and pine and although the Minister for Transport is not in the Chamber I will tell him that we have unlimited coal deposits—

Mr. Power: How do you know they are unlimited?

Mr. EWAN: The hon. gentleman knows that, too. Every bore put down shows that there are unlimited supplies of coal. I hope the Minister for Transport will make further use of this coal potentiality in the interests of the Queensland railways. At present the mine at Injune provides the means of raising power for the engines used west of Roma.

Mr. F. E. Roberts: Do you believe in the Federal Government's subsidising Indian coal?

Mr. EWAN: Shut up! We should expand the production of coal in the Injune area, and the Minister for Transport might see whether he could economically use some of that coal on the railways east of Roma, and so enable that mine to be further developed.

Let me tell the Committee something about oil at Roma. Incidentally, the Secretary for Mines and Immigration was going to come up and have a look at the field with me about 12 months ago. I am delighted to learn from the Press of last night and this morning that that hon. gentleman fully agrees with a private company's action in floating £1,250,000 in a further search for oil. The Minister said—and I hope he meant it—that he would do everything possible to help in the search for oil. I hope that he will station a geologist at Roma and open an office there for him.

Mr. Power: We will help all we can.

Mr. EWAN: I want the Minister to open an office at Roma. It is no use being told, "We will help you all we can." That usually means that we get nothing. Will the Minister station a geologist there permanently? I made certain suggestions 12 months ago, but according to the Press the Federal Government are doing just what I asked the State Government to do.

I should like to quote a journalist, Mr. John Higgins, and to place on record the thanks of the Opposition at least for an article that he wrote about what is perhaps one of the most important single items in the development of this State and of the Commonwealth.

That article reads—

"Active drilling is expected to start within 12 months, with at least one suitable structure capable of holding oil

deposits already proved to exist by recent scientific investigations of the field. A central headquarters for the new company is already being established three miles east of Roma on the Roma-Wallumbilla road.

"The new company is Associated Oilfields, N.L., which has acquired 20 acres in this area from the Federal Government.

"The company embraces certain rights belonging to the four companies which resumed in 1946 an active search for oil in the Roma district.

"These companies are Roma Blocks Oil Co., N.L., Roma North Oil Co., N.L., Kalinna Oil Co., N.L., and Australian Oil Development, N.L.

"The new company reports that it has obtained the most modern type of mobile 300A Sullivan Drilling plant through the co-operation of Enterprise Exploration Pty. Ltd.

"Decision to go into Roma in a 'big way' is a sequel to a comprehensive scientific investigation of the field, culminating last year in a seismic survey conducted by Commonwealth Government geophysical survey experts."

Mr. Power: At the request of the Queensland Government.

Mr. EWAN: Do not be so impatient.

Mr. Power: That is the truth.

Mr. EWAN: I know it is, but do not be so impatient. The hon. gentleman is acting like an advance agent for a theatrical company. The article continues—

"During the whole period, both the State and Federal Governments co-operated with the oil companies to the fullest extent, in every phase of the investigation.

"Already the company has begun the establishment of its main camp site, work on which has been proceeding quietly for two months.

"It includes a complete housing settlement, laboratory works area, and head offices.

"On the site of the wartime fuel depot, near the old aerodrome, it is proving an ideal site, complete with a nearby railway siding constructed by the State Government during the war.

"The company's petroleum prospecting permit No. 678 covers an area of 200 square miles, and includes Roma itself, Hospital Hill, Warooby, Blythdale, and a section of the Grafton Range beyond Mt. Bassett. In addition, authority is held for prospecting over an area of 10,000 square miles.

"The Commonwealth Bureau of Mineral Resources, Department of National Development, has indicated that it is prepared to undertake electrical and radiometric well-logging during the progress of the drilling, and to assist in the interpretation of the geological work previously done.

"The company is also negotiating with the Federal Government for a continuation of the seismic investigation of the field.

"The main part of the renewed search for oil at Roma will be undertaken on a domal-type structure indicated within the last two years by the scientific surveys carried out by the Bureau of Mineral Resources.

"This subterranean structure is roughly 2½ miles by 1½ miles in extent, and lies within a triangle formed by the deep wells which previously yielded crude oil, petroliferous gas or distillate.

"The Roma Blocks No. 4 well, near the junction of the Durham Downs road, and less than 400 yards from the Block 16 original discovery well, will first be re-opened.

"The object is to obtain the added information from this well to assist in the full-scale programme to penetrate the domal-type structure.

"The Roma Blocks No. 4 well in 1942 penetrated 11 ft. of oil sands, and yielded a light crude oil equal, on analysis, to the best Pennsylvanian oils. The well was cased and cemented, but further work ceased as a result of war conditions.

"On the recommendation of the Queensland Government's Oil Geologist (Mr. W. D. Mott), it is intended to re-drill this well and test it for production."

[I suggest with all due deference to the Secretary for Mines and Immigration that he might give consideration to the placing of a geologist on the field, because very important work is going on.

Mr. Power: We assured them that we would give them every consideration.

Mr. EWAN: But it is necessary to have a geologist stationed there, because no more important work is going on anywhere.

Mr. Power: Do you not think that private enterprise should provide its own geologist?

Mr. EWAN: But the Government should give some incentive to private enterprise by establishing a geologist on the field to help in the discoveries and activities of this company. The Minister said in the Press that he would do everything possible to help them.

Mr. Power: And they are quite happy about it. They thanked me.

Mr. EWAN: I know they would and I should thank the hon. gentleman too for everything that he does. I am willing to help him.

Mr. Power: You will not be there very long.

Mr. EWAN: The Minister says that I shall not be here very long; the wish is rather to the thought. If the Government wish to help in this great work they might consider providing a bridge over Blyth's Creek at a cost of about £3,000 because it will

have some bearing on the search for oil in the Roma district. Certain local authorities have applied to the Minister for help in this connection and I hope that he will grant their request.

I come now to a consideration of the road system, particularly an all-weather road from Brisbane to Darwin. I described certain sections of this road in my maiden speech in this House. So far it has been built only as far as Roma and it should be extended along the railway line through Muckadilla, Mitchell, Mungalalla, Morven and Charleville. The Main Roads Commission has men working on it just now and I hope the Minister will give this road system No. 1 priority when he is considering the allocation of the money in the Estimates. We have been told time and again by hon. members opposite that the Commonwealth Government are not doing anything in the interests of the State of Queensland and I think it was the hon. member for Haughton—I hope I am not doing him an injustice—who criticised the Department of Civil Aviation. At Roma the Commonwealth Government are making a £70,000 all-weather strip, a magnificent strip. A Flying Doctor service is to be started at Miles. Several local authorities in the area, and particularly the Bendemere Shire Council, have asked for an advance from the Queensland Government to help in the clearing of land at Yuleba. They got a polite reply from the Acting Premier to say that the Government intended to build an all-weather road from Yuleba to Roma and that would include the building of the Blyth's Creek road. That landing-strip at Yuleba will be finished at Christmas time but I hope the Government will consider the construction of the all-weather road I mentioned.

I propose now to deal with railways and will take the most important matters first. I cannot for the life of me imagine why the Government, who claim to be a responsible Government—and the Acting Treasurer stated in his Financial Statement the Government must necessarily put to the forefront of their programme purely developmental or defence works—should proceed with the electrification of the metropolitan railway system at this juncture. The people of Brisbane should have their railways electrified when it is possible to give it to them, for they require faster, cleaner, and a more efficient service, but it is clearly wrong that at this juncture the Government should consider the expenditure of an amount estimated variously from £10,000,000 to £15,000,000—if past performances are any criterion an actual cost of probably £20,000,000—to carry out the electrification scheme when there are railway links of such tremendous defence and developmental value as the Charleville-Blackall line awaiting construction, as well as the Cunnamulla-Bourke and Dajarra-Camooweal links. These would be of inestimable value for defence purposes and would give a through railway to Darwin. How any responsible Government can proceed with the electrification of the Brisbane railways when these links have not been completed, or in spite of the fact that a survey

of the Blackall-Charleville link was carried out years ago, one cannot imagine. The Government are very ill-advised in proceeding with the electrification of the metropolitan railways until these links are made.

It will be noticed that not one of these links is in my electorate, so I cannot be accused of being parochial. Nevertheless, I have a suggestion to make in connection with the construction of the Wandoan-Taroom-Springsure railway. It is not my intention to embarrass the Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation because he has promised to review certain action that will make it possible to have that railway built, although if the Government's present intention is carried out it will have to be abandoned.

I am sorry that the Minister for Transport is not in the Chamber because I want to add my measure of support to an application by the residents of Roma for a road service. We know that the railways at present cannot cope with the whole of the loading offering. In a number of instances there are considerable delays, as the Minister for Transport has indicated in various debates. We appreciate the fact that he is doing everything possible to alleviate the position, but he cannot possibly alleviate it in a reasonable time without the expansion of the road services.

Furthermore, I would ask the Minister to carry out some investigation as to the method of loading merchandise in trucks at the Roma Street railway yards. Many trucks arrive in country areas with the goods in a shocking condition. There was an instance of a porcelain bath with wire netting stuck in it and a hole rubbed in the middle of it. A kitchen cabinet has had a roll of barbed wire stacked on top of it. I could quote numerous instances but I shall refrain from embarrassing the Government any further. I do seriously ask that an investigation be made into the method of loading. I suggest someone should be made responsible for the initial loading of the trucks before they are dispatched from Brisbane. The Minister knows what is happening and I do hope there will be some investigation with the object of giving justice to the country people. They can get no compensation for the furniture that is broken in transit. Very often they do not know it has been damaged until they have taken it home and unpacked it.

Mr. Power: Do they not pack it properly when they send it away?

Mr. EWAN: Yes, they pack it with straw and put hessian round it. When they take delivery they sign a delivery note, which precludes a claim for compensation. They do not know the furniture is damaged until they take the covering off it and if they put in a claim it is refused on the ground that they have signed a delivery note. If no action is taken the people will insist that the articles be unpacked in the goods shed so that they can see whether they are damaged and if so put in a claim. That would cause chaos in the goods shed.

Mr. Power: You might have to pay demurrage.

Mr. EWAN: You would not. The goods would be taken out of the truck and put in the goods shed. I hope the Minister will give sympathetic consideration to the suggestion I have made because these happenings to goods in transit are causing much difficulty in the country areas.

I congratulate the Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation on putting out the little booklet I have in my hand. In it he says:—

“An important overall requirement is to increase stock fodder and to build up reserves of fodder. With the destruction of millions of acres of useless timber and the sowing of improved pastures carrying capacity will be immensely improved . . . The State can be relied upon to help in every possible way towards the very desirable objective of increasing and stabilising herds and flocks and increasing pastoral production generally.”

That is a very laudable suggestion. I wish to point out to the Minister what is going on in these inland areas. I quote from what was said by Mr. McLennan, of Yuleba, who is one of the most progressive mixed farmers in that area and who is carrying out, more or less, the suggestions contained in this booklet issued by the Minister. But I want to tell the Government exactly what has happened to Mr. McLennan for carrying out these suggestions. The following article, written by him, was published in “Country Life”:—

“The political angle may force the closing of a four-year-old experiment in pig raising at Cypress Downs, Bendemere, in Yuleba district. Mr. L. G. McLennan told ‘Queensland Country Life’ that this venture was subject to the same conditions which had made crop fattening no longer payable.

“The Bendemere pig venture was commenced when the economy of production of pig raising made an appeal to a man who was intensely interested in the combination of stock and agriculture.

“The piggery normally turns off up to 400 pigs a year, some as stores and the remainder as baconers. A feature of the establishment is the minimum of capital improvements for housing the pigs, sows are run and farrowed in open paddocks.

“Splendid results have been obtained in this way, although there is always some risk from crows, dingoes and goannas taking the young.

“Under normal economic circumstances grain can be fed to pigs to show a profit’, Mr. McLennan said ‘and it was not his intention to be a grain grower, preferring a form of livestock agriculture which preserved soil fertility and helped to eliminate the effects of drought.’

“The pig husbandry at Bendemere has been based on agricultural grazing, supplemented with grain and meat meal. The pigs have free range of the surrounding country which is mostly brigalow and

belah, with shady wilgas. Two large cultivation paddocks close at hand can also be grazed if desired.

“Storage of grain, mostly wheat grown on the property, is provided for by a 6,000-bushel grain silo constructed of timber, coated with tarred hessian and covered with an iron roof.

“Announcing that he was considering closing the venture, he said that considerably more could be made from grain by direct sale than by marketing it through pigs. Again, pig raising made heavy demand on available labour and required considerable capital improvements. He considered that a big outlay must be made at Benedemere in this regard for the efficient working of the piggery, and capital improvements today are a problem of organisation, supply and cost.

“Against this was the knowledge that at some future date this method of pig production would be a very valuable form of balanced farming, and it could form a sound portion of grazing and cropping businesses.

“The country around Yuleba—Jackson, where the pigs are run, is considered by Mr. McLennan to be a marginal grain growing area, the rainfall being too light and erratic and the soils lacking the depth necessary for a straight farming venture. Continuous grain growing on this country would result in rapid deterioration and the eventual breakdown of the soil structure.

“However, by combining stock with cultivation, soil fertility can be maintained and erosion prevented.

“While a few sows will breed a lot of pigs, production is limited to the labour, machinery and capital improvements which can be provided.

“‘We are now at the political stage of the pig business,’ said Mr. McLennan. ‘Five months ago the boars were taken out, and the last of the sows have been sold off as backfatters for, like crop fattening, costs are overtaking the pegged prices of the finished article.’

“This policy of the politician is forcing landholders to become opportunists, providing only the goods that will have the benefit of political protection, even though this is forcing an unbalanced economy, defeating all efforts to build a degree of security and balance to the land usage.

“Price-fixing has prevented the customer from paying the additional price necessary to stimulate the production of a first-class article at a time when it is so badly needed.”

In conclusion, I should like to make one or two constructive suggestions to the Minister which, knowing him, I feel confident will receive his sympathetic consideration. I trust that he will give consideration to the statements I am about to make. In the first place I impress upon the hon. gentleman the

immediate necessity for a consolidation of the Land Acts. Believe me, very few people who read them can understand them.

Mr. Walsh: Was this discussed at the graziers' meeting yesterday? They gave you a pretty rough time.

Mr. EWAN: Without being drawn off the point I ask the Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation to give consideration to the easing of existing conditions of balloting for land for settlement other than soldier settlement.

A Government Member: In what respect?

Mr. EWAN: To make it possible for jackeroos, shearing hands, station hands, to ballot for blocks. The Minister knows all about this, because I asked him to do it some 12 months ago. He apparently has not come round to it yet, but I trust that in due course he will do something. Because of the present system a highly desirable section of our people are precluded from balloting. Barmaids and barmen are allowed to ballot, whereas the jackeroo and the station hand cannot. Ex-service men are under entirely different conditions. The Minister is fully seized of the position and I am just mentioning it briefly, as I am trying to save time.

Mr. Walsh: Do you want to stop the city worker from getting a block of land?

Mr. EWAN: Yes, until he has a bit of experience. Let him go out as these other men have done and work in the industry and get practical experience. I will not be led astray by the Acting Treasurer. By their unsympathetic legislation and their attitude towards the primary producers the Government have made the position intolerable. In this morning's Press we read of the Premier of New South Wales, Mr. McGirr, saying “We will take the farms off the farmers in New South Wales if they don't get back into production.” That is an indication of what Socialism will do. There are all sorts of intimidatory legislation that has brought about a lack of incentive to increase production. I say to this Government that they should not run in double harness with the New South Wales Government, whose Premier has threatened to take over the farms from the people. If Queensland takes over the farms of the State, the Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation knows what the result will be because he knows how successful civil servants would run them. The Government have had experience with State stations and State butcher shops, and, believe me, the Acting Treasurer indicated in no uncertain manner yesterday that that would probably be the action of the Government in dealing with the vicious producers of meat—these inefficient people! The very actions of this Socialist Government are causing fear; there is a lack of confidence and there is discouragement in the minds of the primary producers of this State—

Mr. WALSH: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has said that I made a statement yesterday in connection with the

State Government's taking over meat production in this State. I never made such a statement.

Mr. Sparkes: It was the hon. member for Kedron.

Mr. Lloyd: What is that?

Mr. EWAN: I say that every action of this Government has tended to discourage production of food in this State. (Time expired.)

Mr. INGRAM (Keppel) (5.34 p.m.): I heartily congratulate the Acting Treasurer on bringing down such a splendid Financial Statement and I am satisfied that the people of this State will be very pleased with the work to be carried out in the next 12 months. Every Financial Statement brought down to this Chamber has been severely criticised by the Opposition, out of pure ignorance and for political propaganda and nothing else. They start off by saying, "I congratulate . . .," and all of a sudden they say, "but . . .," If we had fresh milk here and they "buted" so much we should have better butter in the place of the stale stuff we are getting today.

I ask hon. members to compare this Government's Financial Statement with the one that was delivered in the Federal House by Sir Arthur Fadden. We have a Budget that will allow Queensland to progress, whilst the Federal Budget will bring nothing but starvation and poverty to the workers of the Commonwealth. The Federal Government have declared such things as razor blades, hair-brushes, ice-creams, and radios for the people in the out-back to be luxuries. Such a disgraceful thing has never previously happened in this country. That Budget was brought down by a Government whom the Opposition laud to the heavens.

A Government Member: They are worse than the Moore Government.

Mr. INGRAM: The Opposition thought I would mention the Moore Government, but they will come a thud on this occasion.

Hon. members opposite have accused this Government of being communistic, which is something they do during every election campaign. I say emphatically that this Government are not communistic. No other Government and no other party have fought Communism more than the Queensland Labour Government and the Australian Labour Party. The people are now wide awake to these deliberate mis-statements that are made throughout the Commonwealth by the Opposition during every election campaign. They are sick and tired of this propaganda that we are a communistic Government. They know full well that we are not associated in any way with the Communist Party. I challenge both Opposition parties in this House to show me a clause in our rules that permits Communists or Communist supporters to become members of our organisation. We are the only party in the Commonwealth with a rule that prohibits Communists or Fascists, or their supporters, from becoming members of our organisation. Before any man can belong to our party, he must sign a pledge

that he is not associated with the Communist Party. Furthermore, we have a credentials committee in every branch that inquires into the character of every man before he is admitted into the party. I challenge the Opposition parties to show me any of their rules that prohibits the admission of Communists.

What have the Tories done about banning the Communists? Absolutely nothing! In 1938, when the Lyons-Menzies Government were in power and there was a nation-wide coal strike that lasted eight weeks, what action did that Government take? Absolutely none! Again in 1940 there was another nation-wide coal strike that lasted for seven weeks. What did the Menzies-Fadden Government do then? Did they gaol any of these Communists who were supposed to be responsible for the strike? Not one thing did they do. Not one member of the Communist Party did they gaol. It took the Labour Government, under the leadership of the late Ben Chifley, to gaol the Communists for subversive action.

Mr. Sparkes: What did you pay to get them out?

Mr. INGRAM: We paid nothing. I throw that lie back into the teeth of the hon. member for Aubigny. That question was asked Julius when he was addressing a meeting in Rockhampton. He was asked, "Who paid to get the Communists out of gaol?" He replied, "The Communist Party paid to get them out of gaol." I challenge the hon. member to prove that the Labour Party had anything to do with getting them out of gaol. I throw that lie back into the teeth of the hon. member for Aubigny and other members opposite.

The Country-Liberal Party are the greatest breeders of Communism. They do that today by their unfair advocacy, as they did it in 1929-32 when they promised to help the people. What did they actually do? They starved the workers of this State. Then they talk about Communism and what ought to be done. What about the action of the Butter Board recently, which forbade the supply of butter to the people of this city. That board is controlled by Tories; three Tory members of this Parliament are members of the Butter Board. Do not forget also the attitude of the manager of the Port Curtis Dairy Association at Gladstone who said that he was big enough and heavy enough to fight Mr. Gair to a finish rather than supply butter from his factory. Then hon. members opposite will say that the Labour Party favours Communism. Nothing is further from the truth.

The Liberal Party would sink to the lowest depths to defeat the Labour Party. One of its members, the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, said that the British Labour Government were rotten to the core. I am not going to say that the Liberal Party is rotten to the core but it is a disgrace to the country. We know the snide tactics that it employs to prevent people on the roll from having a vote. Hon. members opposite cannot deny it. They even sent out application forms ready filled in to people in

country centres and some of their application forms were returned with a note stating that they did not require a postal vote. These are the snide tactics this Liberal Party adopts.

Mr. Bruce Wight, a Tory member in the Federal House, said that the conditions at Eventide were shocking and a disgrace and that a man who had died recently on a Friday could not be pronounced dead until the doctor came the following Monday. What a disgraceful statement for him to make in the Federal Parliament! The State Government have spent hundreds of thousands of pounds at Eventide to provide accommodation for aged people. When the manager of Eventide, Mr. Cramb, interviewed Mr. Bruce Wight the latter was unable to produce one shred of corroboration on any point and later he agreed that most of the original complaints were without foundation in fact and were very unfair. That is what members of the Liberal Party will do—they will stoop to these dirty snide tactics to try to defeat the Labour Party.

I will go a little further and indict another member of the Liberal Party, the hon. member for Sandgate.

Mr. Walsh: Who is the member for Sandgate?

Mr. INGRAM: Mr. Decker.

When Dunwich was being removed to Sandgate he wrote to the "Courier-Mail" on 7 October, 1946, stating that Sandgate was seething with a sense of the injustice, not only to the town, but to the inmates. He further stated that some inmates were drinking methylated spirits, and that the Government were trying to stack the Lilley and Sandgate rolls. He returned to the attack in the "Courier-Mail" on 9 October, 1946, demanding an inquiry into the whole question of the change. He suggested there was something sinister behind it. Then on 12 November, 1946, that hon. member endeavoured to cause dissension by making many half-truth charges such as loss of accommodation, loss of belongings, not enough bread, and so on. Again, in "Truth" of 24 November, 1946, he excelled himself in the following charges—

"That there has been a nasty deterioration in the food, and that there has been 'absolutely putrid' meat, so 'high on the nose' that inmates could not eat it;

"That, because of the almost entire absence of shade, old men and women have to remain sweltering in their huts on hot summer days;

"That practically no reading matter is provided for the old people, and that the delay in transferring the library from Dunwich is causing much sorrow;

"That 157 women are segregated behind an 8 foot paling fence, in what was known as the 'W.A.A.A.F.'s. Room.' There is a

sign on the gate marked 'No Admittance' and a big double gate with heavy chains and a big padlock. Mr. Decker thinks this is worse than Boggo-road."

There dirty and untruthful insinuations were levelled against a Government who have done everything possible to house these old pioneers rather than let them die on the roadside, as the Opposition did when they were a Government many years ago. (Opposition laughter). I have visited these homes and I am of opinion that nothing better can be obtained anywhere in the world. They are an absolute credit to the Labour Government. I am satisfied that not very many members of the Opposition have taken the trouble to visit and inspect them.

The hon. member for Fassifern in this debate last week said he did not believe in subsidies because they did not increase production. What a disgraceful reflection on the farmers! It is a reflection on them to make such a statement because by innuendo he said that if they obtained subsidies they would not do any extra work to increase production. The hon. member does not believe in subsidies, yet the hon. member for Marodian is asking for a subsidy for the pig industry. What a contrast! It seems very strange that on this occasion the Queensland Butter Board did not want a subsidy on butter. It wanted the whole costs of the production of butter to be borne by the consumers.

Mr. McIntyre: That is not right.

Mr. INGRAM: It is. The present Federal Tory Government dishonoured the agreement entered into by the late Ben Chifley with the butter producers. When the Chifley Labour Government were in power the butter-producers went on their hands and knees and begged for a subsidy for the industry. They cannot deny that statement. Because the Tory Government are in power, they do not believe in subsidies. We have a member of the Butter Board saying he does not believe in subsidies and the sooner they were cut out the better but the following appeared in the "Courier-Mail" of 12 June, 1943—

"The subsidy exceeds expectations, and it is accepted as an honest attempt to assist the dairying industry, the President of the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation (Mr. W. L. Osborne) said last night.

"It is, however, too belated to result in increased production of butter and cheese this year. Seeing that butter production results from 95 per cent. of family labour in share farming, the industry will be able to carry on under the Award.

"The chairman of the Australian Dairy Produce Board (Mr. T. Flood-Plunkett, M.L.A.) said last night, that the subsidy should encourage the industry. With a reasonable season, increased production should result, provided man-power was made available. The amount was practically what was asked for by the industry."

When a Labour Government were in power they crawled on their hands and knees for a subsidy, and now when a Tory Government are in power they do not want a subsidy; they want the whole cost thrown on the people of this State.

The hon. member for Fassifern talked about the good old days and quoted 1901. Apparently he does not know much about that period, otherwise he would not have referred to it. I have had experience of those days. I was working on a poultry farm for 14 hours a day for 5s. a week. You were lucky if you got a piece of pumpkin for your breakfast, with a piece of bread. You cannot tell me anything about the good old days. Those were the days under Tory rule when the workers had to work overtime without extra pay. I challenge contradiction of that statement. These are the days to which members of the Opposition want the tie conditions of the workers to revert to—the days when a squatter bought a 7-lb. tin of treacle for his drovers, and when it was getting low put a quantity of dirty dripping into it to fill it up again. I can quote the names of the men who did this.

Members of the Opposition are continually saying from the floor of this Chamber and from the public platform that this Government never gave any help to primary industries. Which Government gave help to primary industries? Was it not the Labour Government and not a Tory Government? What Tory Government ever gave any help to the primary industries? Absolutely none. I quote what Mr. J. C. Peterson, who was Home Secretary in the Moore Government from 1929 to 1932 had to say, which appeared in the Rockhampton "Bulletin" of 4 March, 1932. It reads as follows—

"I deeply regret that Mr. Gullett has seen fit to strike such a severe blow at the primary industries of Queensland . . . Yet Mr. Gullett had struck a staggering blow at the tobacco growers, demanding twice as much in excise as what the growers received.

"Other sections in the South wished to cripple the sugar industry, apparently oblivious of the fact that they, by an overwhelming vote, demanded a White Australia, and insisted that sugar should be grown by white labour.

"He sincerely trusted that every effort would be made by the Federal Country Party to prevent the sugar, cotton, tobacco, and other industries being slaughtered."

The Tory Federal Government have never done anything to help primary producers in this State. The only Government who have ever done anything for them have been the Queensland Labour Government.

Hon. members opposite have repeatedly accused this Government of giving only very little help to local authorities. This, again, is untrue, and they know it. Although there are 133 local authorities in the State and this

Government have helped them all, I propose quoting what has been done for only one, the Rockhampton City Council. During the financial year 1951-52 this Government have approved of £84,850 by way of subsidy. Millions of pounds have been paid to local authorities in subsidies by this Government since 1932, and on page 14 of the Financial Statement we find the following:—

"The advances made by the Treasury in the past year amounted to £2,109,305 for loans to local bodies and £1,275,001 was paid in subsidies, whilst approvals for raisings by the issue of debentures by semi-Governmental and other authorities totalled £8,610,919.

"Included in the approved programme for 1951-52 is £3,955,000 for regional electricity boards, £4,925,000 for the Brisbane City Council and £632,207 for harbour boards.

"The usual provision for subsidies on capital works carried out by semi-Governmental and other bodies has been made in the appropriation for the current year, the total of the approvals amounting to £3,008,449.

"Since 1 July, 1932, when the scheme was inaugurated as part of the re-employment policy, to the 30th June, 1951, subsidies approval totalled £16,161,375."

Nearly £17,000,000 has been granted to local authorities by way of subsidies but not one penny has been given to local authorities by Tory Governments at any time.

I think it was the hon. member for Cooroora who mentioned the distribution of tobacco the other day. He should know quite well that the distribution of tobacco is not controlled by the Government, but is controlled purely by private enterprise. The controlling body has a secret telephone number and one can never find it. In Brisbane, Rockhampton, Bundaberg, Maryborough and other places, it is almost impossible for members of the public to buy Australian brands of tobacco yet one can go to any small town on the Atherton Tableland and buy all the Australian tobacco one needs, not only in packets but in tins. This can be verified by any person who has been on the Atherton Tableland. But if one goes to towns not on the Tableland he cannot possibly get a packet of the brand of Australian tobacco he wants. On the Tableland, if you ask for a packet of Australian tobacco, the shopkeeper asks, "How many tins do you want?" That happened to me only three years ago. Why is it so? There is only one reason for it and it is to defeat the Mareeba Tobacco Growers' Association, to which this Government have granted thousands of pounds. I have tried hard to get tobacco for returned soldiers in my electorate but have been unable to do so. The sooner something is done about this matter the better for all concerned. But do not blame the Government; lay the blame on this private control.

Mr. Low interjected.

Mr. INGRAM: Why does not the hon. member get something done in the Federal sphere? Why not ask the Federal Government?

I wish to deal with a matter tonight that was brought up in this Chamber during the March session when the Minister for Transport put before the Committee the Callide Coalfield railway proposal. Members of the Opposition criticised the Government for taking that action and they cannot deny it. This railway proposal was for the benefit of the whole of the Central District and not for Rockhampton alone. During the debate the Leader of the Opposition said—

“The Battle of the Ports is being revived today, and the only excuse I can see for the proposal is that it is nothing more than a political sop to Rockhampton and surrounding electorates.”

There was no such thing as a political sop to Rockhampton. The Opposition virtually accused hon. members representing Central District electorates of bringing pressure to bear on the Government to take such action. This was a deliberate falsehood and not one of the three Central District members had anything to do with the building of the line.

A little further on in his speech the same hon. member said—

Mr. EWAN: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member justified in reading from “Hansard”? Do Standing Orders allow that?

Mr. INGRAM: I am referring to speeches made in the March session, and particularly to what Country Party members had to say. The hon. member for Mirani said—

“Today the Government ask for approval of the expenditure of £500,000 on a railway line 10 miles in length. That connecting link will bring the Callide coal to Rockhampton but is Rockhampton the suitable place at which to handle the coal? It is not.”

What does he know about it? Absolutely nothing.

Then we go to the hon. member for Cook, who said—

“I am not interested in either town, as I live further north. It does not matter two hoots to me whether the port is Rockhampton or Gladstone, but we do know that Gladstone is one of the best deep-water ports in Australia, that Rockhampton is a shallow river port, and that Port Alma is a poor one.”

He went on to say—

“I do not get up to talk about things that I have not thought about. I may think the wrong way, but do not speak on any subject without first studying the matter.”

I will show the hon. member that he does not know what he is thinking about. I will tell hon. members something about Port Alma.

Mr. Sparkes: What about Gladstone?

Mr. INGRAM: Never mind about Gladstone. The hon. member for Port Curtis spoke about Gladstone. Let me speak for Rockhampton, in the same way as the hon. member speaks for his electorate.

Port Alma was established in 1880, but was not connected by rail with Rockhampton till 1912. The “Courier-Mail” said that Port Alma was an artificial port but I challenge that. It is a natural port, easy of access, and well-sheltered, and requires no dredging. Port Alma has never been dredged. The trouble today is that we cannot dredge our river as deep as we should like to, because our dredge has been hired out to other Queensland ports.

The oldest survey of Port Alma dates back to 1911, and soundings taken recently show no appreciable alteration in depths compared with the original survey. The present minimum depth in the entrance channels is 26 feet, whilst the depths alongside the wharf are 28 and 29 feet at low water. That shows just how much the hon. member for Cook knows about it. In the swinging basin, the 3-fathom contour is approximately 900 feet from the wharf, and the 4-fathom contour 600 feet at low water. Those depths compare more than favourably with most ports on the Queensland coast. The largest vessel to enter the port was the “Largs Bay,” 14,342 gross tons; the deepest draft vessel was the “Waiwera,” 28 feet 1 inch, and the vessel of the greatest length was the “Suevic,” 574 feet. Two vessels can berth and be worked at the same time.

The only drawback to Port Alma at present is the lack of a road connection with Bajool. Serious consideration should be given to the building of a road from Bajool to Port Alma, a distance of only 16 miles. The railway line is a paying proposition, whilst the revenue from shipping has been sufficient to cover all maintenance costs.

The hon. member for Mirani said that coal could not be loaded at Rockhampton. That again is absolutely untrue. It is possible to load vessels of over 2,000 gross tons, carrying a cargo of approximately 2,000 tons, at the town wharves. We could stockpile 2,000 tons of coal at the Gavial Creek wharf. I mention these things to show that those hon. members opposite who have criticised Port Alma do not know what they are talking about. They have never been there by boat or by train. Whenever they go to their electorates or to any part in Queensland they travel by air.

I have here also a report by Mr. Dewey, of the Commonwealth Service, who made an investigation into Port Alma, and he confirms everything that I read from the report of the Department of Harbour and Marine. And that should be sufficient for anybody.

I shall not delay the Committee much longer; other hon. members are anxious to

speaking. However, I have not finished with the Opposition for this session and I shall have more to tell them before Parliament closes. I know that they are unhappy when I rise to speak because the truth hurts them. Everything that I said about them is absolutely true and cannot be denied.

An Opposition Member: You have never worked on a farm.

Mr. INGRAM: I have worked on a farm, I have earned by living on a farm. I have had to work for my living and it was not handed to me with a silver spoon as it was to the hon. member for Aubigny.

In conclusion I again congratulate the Acting Treasurer in bringing down such a fine Financial Statement.

Mr. HEADING (Marodian) (7.27 p.m.): I am pleased to have the opportunity of discussing the Financial Statement submitted by the Acting Treasurer but I do not propose to hand out any bouquets. The hon. gentleman did enough of that for himself.

A Government Member: You have been disciplined by your party.

Mr. HEADING: We leave the discipline to the members of the Government party. We are allowed to think for ourselves.

I am glad that the Treasurer was able to show a surplus rather than a deficit but it would have been better still had he been generous enough to say that it was thanks to the Commonwealth Government that this Government were able to show a surplus, that it followed on an increased allotment to Queensland by the Commonwealth Government of £2,000,000.

On the first page of the Budget the Acting Treasurer says—

“This is the twelfth surplus recorded for the past 13 years, which emphasises the judicious and businesslike manner in which the finances of the State have been handled.”

Then towards the end of the Budget he refers to all the nice things the Government have done and what they are going to do. He went on to say in conclusion—

“Nothing positive towards the arrest of inflation was done in the last twelve months by the Commonwealth Government which is charged with the responsibility of keeping our economy in a healthy condition. There is no need to dwell on the strain that inflation places on the budgets of Governments, local authorities, industry and the family.”

That is all right. Then he goes on to say—

“However, the Commonwealth Budget recently presented will affect to a considerable extent the revenues of the States. It bears a close resemblance to the deflationary pattern operating during the depression years and may unhappily have many of the same results.”

On the one hand, the Acting Treasurer contended that the Federal Government had done nothing about inflation, and on the other

hand, he predicts that the works forecast in the Budget will achieve greater development in the State. I do not know what he wants. If that is his attitude towards the whole business, it is not worth my while discussing it.

The Acting Treasurer has something to say on our primary industries. He mentioned maize, wool, wheat, sugar-cane, and meat by-products, all those products that would not buy an argument. The estimated value of the production of maize is £1,500,000, but the Acting Treasurer ignores altogether the dairying industry, which was worth £15,000,000 to Queensland last year. Surely an industry like that is worthy of some remark? Not only was this industry worth £15,000,000 last year, but its product was worth £14,000,000 the previous year. Was it not worth while saying something about an industry that was worth so much to the State?

I now want to refer to another great primary industry that I hear so much about from the hon. member for Mundingburra, and that is the pig industry. I am very interested in it and I am very pleased to talk about it.

Mr. Riordan: Because it is bristling with difficulties.

Mr. HEADING: It is one of the great industries of Queensland. Last year it was worth about £4,000,000 and the previous year it was worth a little more than that. Surely an industry that is worth so much and means so much to the economy of the State is worthy of mention in the story that the Acting Treasurer gave to us in the Budget? This is what I want to say about it: it is a valuable industry, an industry that can produce a great deal in a given time. I want the Committee to realise the importance of the pig industry. During the war, when the Americans were here, one of the meats they wanted, and wanted very urgently, was pigmeat. Even though some people may be critical of the product, the Americans were very pleased to get it. They were also very pleased with the quality of our pigmeats, ham and bacon. Nothing can exceed the pig in food production. A sow will give you two litters of an average of six a year, and some litters averaging eight. That is, you get twelve to sixteen baconers a year from one sow. The pig is the one animal that consumes food that is regarded as waste. A statement appeared in the Brisbane “Telegraph” the other night about the prices of ham and bacon in New South Wales, and I want to refer to it.

Mr. Aikens: Tell us why the prices of ham and bacon are so high.

Mr. HEADING: If the hon. member will possess his soul in patience, he will get the story on that point.

The “Telegraph” stated that the price of ham in Sydney for the forthcoming Christmas season would be £8 8s. for a 14-lb. ham.

Mr. Devries: No-one would ever buy it at that price.

Mr. HEADING: Of course not. I immediately got in touch with a firm in New South Wales that handles any excess of our supplies, and I found that the price for raw ham in Sydney today was 4s. 6d. a lb. Therefore, a 14-lb. raw ham costs £3 3s. It would be exorbitant to suggest that the ordinary trader would add another £5 5s. on what it cost him to retail it. It is my belief that somebody had a guess that there would be a black-market at Christmas-time and was simply trying to foster the idea.

That should not be saddled on the decent producers of Queensland who cure and sell bacon and ham. In Queensland today raw ham is valued at 3s. 11d. a pound wholesale, cooked ham 4s. 7½d., processed ham 6s. a pound—that is with the bone removed—bacon 3s. a pound, shoulder 3s. 1d., middle rashers 3s. 2½d., and rashers sliced and packed in cellophane 3s. 9d. I do not want this industry to be saddled with all the stories of high prices and black-markets. We endeavour to sell at the most reasonable price, while trying to encourage the pig-raiser to get back into the industry. We pay 2s. a pound to the farmer for the dressed pig.

During the war the price of pigs was controlled by the Federal Government and contracts were made between the Federal Government and the British Government and the price of pigs in the contract with the British Government was based on 1s. 6d. a pound. Hon. members can realise that nothing is going there, because we have to pay 2s. a pound to the farmer. The British contract is not worth anything to the producer in Australia.

Let us go back over the years and look at what happened. In 1938-39, 562,119 pigs were produced and the price was 5.52d. and in 1939-40, 684,495 pigs were produced and the price was 5.81d.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Graham): Order! I ask for decorum in the Chamber. The "Hansard" staff cannot possibly take the speech of the hon. member with the noise that is going on.

Mr. HEADING: I am quoting these figures because the other day I noticed that the New South Wales Government approached the Victorian Government to again institute price-control of pigmeats. That would be one of the greatest tragedies that the industry could suffer. For years when the price was fixed the industry was dying and it is dying today because we still have not obtained a price that would enable these people to carry on. We realise just as much as do hon. members on the Government side that there is a price past which the consumer cannot go but, as the years have passed, the production of pigs has dropped.

Mr. Riordan: No worker in Queensland today can afford to buy bacon.

Mr. HEADING: If that is so, it is the result of Labour's policy during the war years, and the figures I have prove it. In

1941, 707,570 pigs were killed in Queensland, and the price was 5.91d. Even though the price was barely 6d. then, we still produced 707,510 pigs because the surrounding costs did not kill the industry. In 1941-2, 639,944 pigs were killed and the price was 6.43 pence. In 1942-43 the number killed totalled 576,022 and the price was 9.16 pence. By 1947-48, the number killed dropped by almost half to 353,770. In 1948-49 there was a slight rise to 453,587, and the price was 12.32 pence. In 1949-50, 459,931 were killed and the price was 1s. 2.66d. and by 1950-51 they dropped again to 419,690 and the price 1s. 5.3d.

It will be noted from the figures I have quoted that as the years have gone by the production of pigs has declined and that decline took place because the price paid for the pigs never caught up with the cost of production. Labour and grain costs increased and the industry died a natural death. If the Government are considering reintroducing control I advise them to peruse the records they have and they will see for themselves just what control did previously to cripple the industry. I give the Government credit for the fact that about 12 or 18 months ago they decontrolled the price of pigs, but it has to be remembered that producers must be given time to get back to the industry.

Mention has been made of the fact that there is plenty of beef available but I remind hon. members that bacon and eggs make a very nice breakfast and another point is that if one desires steak for breakfast one must have more steak than bacon. People can afford to pay a higher price per pound for bacon than for beef because the bacon goes much further, and I wish it to be understood that I am not criticising the beef industry.

Hon. members know very well how they like to have ham on the table for Christmas. It is no good saying in the years to come that we could not get a ham for Christmas because the producers would not produce pork. You can encourage them to produce but I am telling the Government that you cannot make them do it. Pigmeat provides a food which is famed for nourishment and tastiness, one that has been known to mankind for hundreds of years and which has keeping qualities that make it specially useful where conditions are such that fresh meats are not available or will not keep. During the last war we provided hundreds and hundreds of tons of bacon and hams to the armed forces, not only to our own people but to the American and British forces. One of the great things about pigmeat is that it will carry and I know of cases in which pigmeat was carried on the backs of mules well up into the jungle country. There is no other meat that can be processed that will carry as well as pigmeats. One can therefore see the necessity of encouraging this industry to carry on, particularly if we should be engaged in war, and as things are today anything like that could happen at any time. Should war break out there will immediately be a cry for more bacon for the troops. The Americans are

particularly fond of bacon and it is said that they eat three and four times the quantity of bacon and ham that we do.

It is essential that the pig industry should be self-supporting. Our increase in population must be fed with the kind of food it is accustomed to. Many New Australians come from countries where pork and bacon are eaten in large quantities. Failure to produce the country's requirements of pigmeat would, because the export of our secondary industries is small, necessitate the exporting of some of our primary products to pay for the import of pigmeats. If imported pigmeat was available it would be infinitely more costly than the home-grown product. If we had to import pigs you could not possibly get them for the price we can produce them for in Australia. In fact, I doubt whether you could import pigs from any country in the world.

This country is particularly suited to pig-production because the climate is mild and expensive housing is not necessary in Australia and further, the incidence of disease is not as bad as in other countries. The pig industry helps the dairy farmer to spread his activities and earn added income, so that he will not be dependent on one source of income. This helps to retain rural population. The pig industry gives employment on farms, thereby keeping people in the rural areas, in bacon factories and meatworks, and also in industries that supply the needs of these works. There is large capital investment in the industry and a great deal of it is put up by primary producers. The co-operative movement handles most of the pigmeats of this country and that movement recognises its duty to the people of the State and it has not tried to exploit the consumers.

Mr. Riordan: They cheated the Taxation Commissioner.

Mr. HEADING: If the hon. member for Flinders cheats the Taxation Commissioner, that is his business.

We have a constant demand for pigmeats from other parts of the world. We could sell all that we could produce if we wanted to, and we could sell it to some countries in the world at a much higher price than we are getting in Australia. However, we do not do that; very little is exported today. A few hams are sent to the East Indies, but other than that our entire production is sold in this country. Whilst we are doing that, we are carrying out our obligations to the consumers of this country.

I have already said that the controls that were imposed during the war had the effect of almost destroying this very important industry. That being so, the industry should be given every consideration. As a matter of fact, it is high time that we did something to improve the condition of all primary industries in this State. Food is needed in nearly every part of the world, and many countries are looking to Australia to supply them with the food that they need. The Prime Minister of Ceylon told us today that

his country produces all its food on 25,000 acres of land. He pointed out that in the past the primary producers of Australia had greatly helped Ceylon and expressed the hope that they would continue to do so. We are doing everything we possibly can to produce the food that is needed.

I suggest that provision should have been made in this Budget for the appointment of a committee of, say, three men, who would watch the industries of this State, and particularly the primary industries. I say that advisedly, because sitting on this side of the Chamber, I realise that not many members on the other side have had much, if any, experience of primary production. One has only to sit on this side of the Chamber and look at the people on the other side to realise how true that is. I am not saying that in a disparaging way. All I am saying is that very few people on the other side have been through the mill of primary production. If they had, the primary producers would now be receiving better treatment from the Government than they are.

As I have said, I suggest that provision should be made in the Estimates for the appointment of a council of three men who would keep an eye on this State's production. This is a very important matter, and one that should not be ignored. We have only to look at what has happened in other parts of the world. If hon. members opposite would do that, they would take a more enlightened view of the conditions that are operating here. If hon. members opposite had fully realised the shock that they gave the primary producers of this State by bringing down their recent legislation, they would not have introduced it. In spite of all their legislation, the Government cannot force people to produce.

Mr. Moore: We did not set out to do that.

Mr. HEADING: I am not saying that the Bill included an instruction to farmers to produce.

Mr. Gair: The "Courier-Mail" said so.

Mr. HEADING: The Government cannot make the producers produce anything.

Mr. Gair: The Bill did not say that.

Mr. HEADING: I did not say it did. However, it did say to the producers, "After you have produced the goods, you will have to supply so much of them to the market, and the Government will fix the price."

Mr. Gair: They were very glad to supply their goods to the market when the marketing legislation was introduced in 1926. There was a very favourable market at that time.

Mr. HEADING: You have power under that Act to go onto a farm and insist on the owner's sending the produce to a specified market and in so doing you deprive the owner of all authority over his own goods.

Mr. Gair: The board had that power under the principal Act.

Mr. HEADING: Then why introduce a special Bill to do that?

Mr. Gair: We were only making the board do its job.

Mr. HEADING: If you want to encourage people to grow foodstuffs you cannot do it by giving yourselves the right to take it away at your own price after they have grown it. That will not encourage production. The Government are afraid of what is going to happen in the primary industries and they have decided to force the primary producer to send his goods to a specified market. The Premier of New South Wales, Mr. McGirr, said in a Sydney paper that if a dairyman would not produce the milk, he would take the farm away from him.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will not be in order in referring in the course of the debate on the Financial Statement to an earlier debate in this session.

Mr. NICKLIN: Mr. Farrell, I rise to a point of order. Did I understand you to say that you would not permit a debate on the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts Amendment Bill that recently went through the House?

The CHAIRMAN: I think I made myself very clear on two occasions. I ruled today that a concluded debate cannot be discussed in this debate. I refer the hon. gentleman to the Standing Orders. In view of the fact that I have so ruled, that the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts Amendment Bill cannot be discussed on this occasion, I propose to adhere to the ruling.

Mr. NICKLIN: I have to give notice—
"That your ruling be disagreed to."

I move accordingly because it is time that the rulings in connection with the business of this Chamber were clarified.

The ruling you gave is completely wrong. Do you mean to say that it is impossible for any hon. member to discuss legislation that is already the law of this land? It is a lot of darned nonsense.

Mr. WALSH: I rise to a point of order. I take it the Leader of the Opposition has given notice that he will move a motion to disagree to your ruling.

Mr. NICKLIN: I have.

Mr. Walsh: There is a proper course to be pursued in that connection.

Mr. NICKLIN: What is it? Who is the Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Marodian!

Mr. NICKLIN: Mr. Farrell, I am going to write my notice out and give it to you.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Gair: You cannot make your speech now; you have nearly an hour to do it in. (Opposition interjections.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! In order to clarify my ruling I will refer to what May has got to say on this matter. No-one can refer to anything that is said or done in a previous debate during the same session. That is a rule necessary to economise the time of the House. Nor may any hon. member read from a printed newspaper or notes of any speech made in Parliament during the current session. From the point of view that this debate was concluding during the present session in the House, I rule that the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts Amendment Bill cannot be discussed during this debate.

Mr. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Leader of the Opposition) (8.3 p.m.): Having fulfilled the conditions of the Standing Orders by giving notice to disagree to your ruling, I propose to proceed with my reasons for giving that notice. The ruling that you have given is that you refuse to allow reference to previous debates in the present session. If that had been the effect of your ruling it would have been in order but you have ruled that the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts Amendment Bill cannot be discussed. The hon. member for Marodian, whom you just told he cannot continue to discuss this matter, made no reference to any debate that took place in this Chamber. He was referring to the Marketing Act and its effect and in doing so he was completely in order. If that is to be the effect of your ruling it will stifle free speech in this House.

Mr. Walsh: Which Marketing Act, the amending Act that has just been passed?

Mr. NICKLIN: The amendment of the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts.

Mr. Sparkes: It is law now.

Mr. NICKLIN: May I refer to the fact, Mr. Farrell, that you on a number of occasions have stopped hon. members on this side from making reference to it, yet you have allowed hon. members on the Government benches to discuss it ad lib.

Mr. Walsh: That is a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. NICKLIN: It is a fact.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that remark.

Mr. NICKLIN: What do you want me to withdraw?

The CHAIRMAN: I have already said that I ask you to withdraw the remark that I am unfair in my ruling.

Mr. NICKLIN: I did not say you were unfair.

The CHAIRMAN: That I allowed hon. members on the Government benches to talk ad lib on the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts Amendment Bill while I pulled up members of the Opposition. That is not correct and I ask you to withdraw it.

Mr. NICKLIN: I am making a speech on the facts, which can be checked by checking "Hansard" tomorrow. The hon. member for Keppel referred to it and the hon. member for Windsor made reference to it also. The hon. member for Windsor referred to the Co-operative Societies Amendment Act and was allowed to do so. That is what I said. I ask hon. members opposite also to be very, very careful on the decision they give on this question of disagreement with the Chairman's ruling. It is completely wrong and it is going to have a very detrimental effect on debate in this Chamber. The Chairman of Committees is basing his ruling on May, page 426, where it says under the heading,

"Reference to Prior Debates"—
"Reference to debates of the current session is discouraged even if such reference is not irrelevant."

That is the basis of his ruling. May I draw attention to the fact that during his speech the hon. member for Marodian did not make one single reference to the debate that took place?

Government Members: Of course he did.

Mr. NICKLIN: He did not make any reference to the debate. He made reference to the Act, which he was entitled to do. Further on, at page 703, May deals with general restrictions on debate in Committee of Supply and lays down that in Committee of Supply debate may take place on the administrative action of a department, in other words the operations of any relevant legislation which this House has passed. From whatever standard you may judge the ruling, it is completely wrong. If we are to sit down and take rulings like that and set precedents for future debates we shall absolutely hamstring free debate and completely nullify the benefits of the deliberation of Parliamentary debates.

(Time expired.)

Hon. V. C. GAIR (South Brisbane—Acting Premier) (8.7 p.m.): Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition worked himself up into a great fury. I am sure, after the many years' experience he has had in this Parliament, he must know, as I do, that it is not permissible for a member to discuss a matter that has already been disposed of by the House in the current session. The matter we are dealing with now came before the House in the form of a Bill.

Mr. Nicklin: An Act of the House.

Mr. GAIR: Yes, an Act of the House. It is very clearly laid down and it is not difficult to comprehend and understand it. I will read May again for the benefit of hon. members. It says,

"Reference to debates of the current session is discouraged even if such reference is not irrelevant, as it tends to reopen matters already decided."

The matter under discussion has been discussed and debated here in the form of the Bill and disposed of by the House.

Mr. Sparkes: It is now law.

Mr. GAIR: The hon. member says, "And now law"; as though that would be a pertinent point in the discussion.

Mr. Dewar: Very relevant.

Mr. GAIR: It reflects the very poor standard of the hon. member who interjects.

Mr. Dewar: You may not understand it; it is relevant.

Mr. GAIR: I am talking to the butcher, not the block. This matter was debated. The question of the amendment of the marketing laws has been dealt with and disposed of by this Parliament. The Chairman had already ruled, when the hon. member for Southport was speaking, that he was not in order.

Mr. Ewan: You were not here.

Mr. GAIR: I may have been interviewing the hon. member's constituents or representatives of some local authority from his electorate, and if the hon. member is attempting to reflect on my absence I shall have to have regard in the future, to the necessity for remaining in Parliament when he wants an interview.

If we were to allow continued debate on matters that have already been disposed of we should never finish with the matters to be dealt with in a particular session. May is the authority in this matter and lays it down quite clearly what the procedure shall be, and I cannot understand the Leader of the Opposition's failing to see the merit in this Standing Order.

The Leader of the Opposition says that if we agree with the Chairman's ruling we are going to stifle debate. I should say there has been less stifling of debate in this Parliament since we have been the Government than took place during the three tragic years when hon. members opposite were the Government, as the records of Parliament will prove.

No doubt the Leader of the Opposition is imbued with a desire to help a member of his party who wishes to discuss this matter for the political advantage and kudos he might get from it. The fact remains that we have Standing Orders, and as members of this Parliament we have a common interest, a common regard, and we should have a common approach and common desire to preserve the Standing Orders for the common good of this Parliament and for the proper discipline and control of this Parliament.

Mr. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha) (8.13 p.m.): I support the Leader of the Opposition in his argument that the Chairman's ruling should be dissented to. When the Acting Premier quoted May as being a real authority on parliamentary debate—

Mr. Gair: You would contradict him because you are presumptuous enough to contradict the dictionary.

Mr. MORRIS: I do not propose to contradict such an outstanding authority as May; in fact, I intend to quote him in

support of the argument I am putting forward to prove that the Chairman's ruling is entirely wrong.

The Acting Premier quoted a paragraph from Chapter 18 dealing with the maintenance of order during debate and rulings governing the contents of speeches. Let me point out to the Committee that May does not restrict himself to any general ruling in that regard. He has also a paragraph that deals with the general restriction of debate when the House is in Committee of Supply. That is surely a much greater practical authority to us, coming from May as it does, than one which has a general application to general matters of debate. In this passage "General Restriction of Debate in Committee of Supply," which has particular application to this matter, May says that the administrative action of any department is open to debate. Surely every hon. member of this Chamber will agree and rightly realise that the only comment that the hon. member for Marodian made on this matter was on the effect of the administration of the department that is handling it, and as such there cannot possibly be any disagreement with May as I have quoted him.

This is not an unconsidered statement because Mr. Farrell you will recall that I was pulled up by you on this very point. I wanted to assure myself of the point at issue and therefore I studied May and discovered the basis of your ruling. Since then I have come across the passage in which May speaks particularly of debate in Committee of Supply, which we are in at present. Your ruling—and I reiterate this because it is the basis of the whole of the disagreement—is based on the general rules governing the conduct of speeches, whereas the statement I have read to the Chamber has direct application to the Committee of Supply. I therefore say that in all justice you cannot possibly prevent any member of this Chamber from discussing the general application of any legislation that has passed through the House. How obviously ridiculous it would be if in a debate on Supply we could not discuss the effect of any legislation that had passed through the House prior to the commencement of the debate! It would be fantastic, because it is to the legislation that passes through the House that we must direct our speeches, and our consideration of the Acts and the effect of the Government's work must be based on legislation that has previously passed through the House. As the Leader of the Opposition reminds me, it is what we are voting money for—the administrative acts of this Government.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) (8.18 p.m.): The Acting Premier introduced the argument that because there was considerable repression—and I have no doubt that there was considerable repression in the years of the Moore Government—his Government are justified in practising similar repression. It is the old argument of two wrongs make a right.

Let us come to the fundamentals of the position. The rules and orders as contained in this booklet, and this booklet alone, are the basis on which this Parliament shall function. Let us read the particular rule, Mr. Farrell, that you made reference to in giving what I consider to be a perfectly ludicrous ruling. It is the last Standing Order in the book and is numbered 333. It says—

"In all cases not specially provided for by these Standing Rules and Orders, or by Sessional or other Orders, resort shall be had to the Rules, Forms, and Usages of the Commons House of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland for the time being, which shall be followed and observed so far as the same can apply to the proceedings of the House."

In other words, where these Standing Orders that have been drawn up and approved of by this Chamber are not clear, then we shall have recourse to the Rules and Standing Orders of the House of Commons of Great Britain. Is that not clear? Yet we find that we have developed in this Chamber—and I have noticed the dangerous tendency since I have been here—the tendency to make a fetish of Sir Erskine May. I have seen hon. members running to the centre table and picking up a book, and if one reads the back of it as I have done one will see that it is Sir Erskine May on Parliamentary Practice. In other words, it is purely and simply the opinion of Sir Erskine May on the Practices and Usages of the House of Commons. It is not an official document. It is not the Rules and Orders of Procedure of the House of Commons referred to in our Standing Order No. 333.

A Government Member: He is a recognised authority.

Mr. AIKENS: I admit that he is a recognised authority, but nevertheless it is not an official document and it is not covered by our Standing Order No. 333.

Let me put this to the hon. member for Nundah, who is a member of the legal profession: I suppose that one of the greatest authorities on law is Blackstone, and I have no doubt that the hon. member for Nundah has read and re-read many times Blackstone on The Law of Pleading Procedure and Evidence, yet would anyone suggest that if the hon. member for Nundah was in a hole in court, instead of producing the proper legal authorities, he would have the temerity and the audacity to produce before a competent legal tribunal of this land Blackstone's Law of Pleading Procedure and Evidence and attempt to argue his case on that authority and that authority alone? He would be laughed out of court! Here we have what is purely and simply the considered opinion of an authority—I admit that—but an authority with no legal standing, yet we make an absolute fetish of him.

Let me state this case also: When I was a young man in the Railway Department we had what might be termed the Bible of the locomotive man, published by a man named

Bagley. Every young cleaner and fireman and driver made a study of Bagley. He was the authority and his book was the text book on all locomotive work. As a matter of fact, we based our replies to many of the examination questions on Bagley. However, I wonder what the Minister for Transport would say if a locomotive man who was charged with some breach of the railway rules and regulations was to produce Bagley as an authority in contradiction to the railway rules and regulations? Let us get away from the fetish of May.

(Time expired.)

Hon. E. J. WALSH (Bundaberg—Acting Treasurer) (8.22 p.m.): All the rulings and decisions that have been given by the House of Commons and enumerated in May and other authorities, clearly uphold the ruling that has been given by the Chairman.

Mr. Nicklin interjected.

Mr. WALSH: It is all very well to question that statement, but the facts are that earlier in this debate the member for Mt. Coot-tha was ruled out of order for exactly the same thing.

Mr. Morris: Incorrectly.

Mr. WALSH: If that is so, why was the opportunity not taken on that occasion to challenge the Chairman's ruling?

The plain facts are that we have a set of Standing Orders that have been laid down for the guidance of this Assembly, and where those Standing Orders are silent on certain matters the procedure that is followed in the House of Commons has been accepted as the practice in every Parliament in the British Commonwealth of Nations. If there is any doubt about a ruling of the Chairman, we need not follow May slavishly. I have an authority here entitled, "The Procedure of the House of Commons," by Redlich. On page 58 it says—

"All reference to previous debates in the House during the current session upon any question or Bill not under discussion is forbidden."

That is clear enough. It continues—

"The prohibition does not extend to preventing debates on earlier stages of a Bill being referred to. This rule is designed to prevent the revival of a debate which has once been brought to an end. Another regulation having the same praiseworthy object, is that a member is not allowed to speak against or reflect upon any previous determination of the House during the current session except on a motion for rescinding it."

An Opposition Member: What are you quoting from?

Mr. WALSH: Redlich on "The Procedure of the House of Commons." If we are to write into the Standing Orders all the things that may be covered under the heading of Parliamentary procedure, what a volume we should have and what difficulty we should

have in interpreting the Standing Orders! The fact remains that for years Parliaments have followed the procedure laid down in the House of Commons that where the Standing Orders are silent on certain questions of procedure "May" is accepted as the authority.

I may say that the Opposition have not got the right to interpret the Standing Orders and it would surely be a bad day for this Parliament if they had. I have some recollection that when the Labour Party was in Opposition when one of its members, Mr. Cooper, challenged the ruling of the then speaker, Mr. Taylor, and Mr. Taylor being fortified by counsel's opinion, that of Mr. Grove and Mr. McGill I think, referred his ruling to the Clerk of the Parliament in the British House of Commons and the point raised by the member of the Labour Party then in Opposition here, Mr. Cooper, was upheld.

Let us have a look at another authority, "Law and Practice of Legislative Assemblies" by L. S. Cushing. At page 666 he says—

"The first rule, to be mentioned under this head, is, that no member, in speaking, is to refer to anything said or done, in a previous debate, during the same session. One reason of this rule is, that it is a wholesome restraint upon members, to prevent them from renewing a debate which has already been brought to a close, and which might otherwise be interminable . . ."

It does not matter what authority you look at, that is the rule laid down and no-one knows that better than the Leader of the Opposition himself. He knows that it has been the practice for years not to permit of reference to previous debates in the current session. There is also a ruling that prevents an hon. member even from quoting from "Hansard" for the current session.

Mr. SPARKES (Aubigny) (8.27 p.m.): This matter did not arise from a reference to a discussion or a debate that had taken place in Parliament at all. The only reference the hon. member for Marodian made was to the fact that the Bill concerned in that debate had now become the law of the land and he was making reference to its effect on the people of the land. That is all. As a matter of fact, when he was called to order he was quoting from a copy of the "Sydney Morning Herald" which I had brought to him on Tuesday morning last. What he was quoting had nothing whatever to do with legislation recently passed through this Chamber. He was referring specifically to the statement by Mr. McGirr, the Premier of New South Wales, in "The Sydney Morning Herald," in which he had said that if the farmers would not produce butter on the farms he would take the farms from them and put on men who would. That is what the hon. member was quoting.

Mr. Walsh: The Chairman did not rule against that.

Mr. SPARKES: He did. The hon. member for Marodian had made reference to the effect of the new law on the people in this State. When he was called to order he was reading from an extract taken from "The Sydney Morning Herald." That is the point. I gave the same information to the hon. member for Roma and he quoted it in this Chamber today. He quoted exactly what the hon. member for Marodian was sat down for. It was a news item taken from "The Sydney Morning Herald" and had nothing whatever to do with any Act passed by this Parliament this session. It was read simply to show what another Labour Premier was doing in another State.

Mr. Walsh: You are distorting the position.

Mr. SPARKES: I am prepared to declare that on my oath and I will leave it to the hon. member for Marodian.

Mr. Walsh: The Chairman did not rule against that.

Mr. SPARKES: He did.

Mr. Walsh: Nothing of the sort. (Interjections.)

Mr. SPARKES: As a matter of fact, when the Chairman gave his ruling I said, "He is not quoting from the debate; he is quoting from "The Sydney Morning Herald" which I had handed to him."

Mr. Moore: He was not.

Mr. SPARKES: He was, for I handed it to him.

Mr. Moore: You were not listening.

Mr. SPARKES: I am prepared to sit down and let the hon. member for Marodian get up and say whether I am right or not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will now proceed to put the question. (Opposition dissent.)

Mr. Walsh: You do not know your own Standing Orders. Half an hour has elapsed.

An Opposition Member: The gag!

Mr. Walsh: No. the Standing Orders limits the debate to half an hour.

Question—That the Chairman's ruling be disagreed to (Mr. Nicklin's motion)—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 26.

Mr. Aikens	Mr. Morris
.. Allpass	.. Müller
.. Bjeke-Petersen	.. Munro
.. Chalk	.. Nicklin
.. Coburn	Dr. Noble
.. Dewar	Mr. Pizzey
.. Ewan	.. Plunkett
.. Gaven	.. Sparkes
.. Heading	.. Taylor, H. B.
.. Jones, V. E.	.. Wordsworth
.. Kerr	
.. Low	<i>Tellers:</i>
.. Macdonald	.. Nicholson
.. McIntyre	.. Roberts, L. H. S.

NOES, 33.

Mr. Byrne	Mr. Marsden
.. Clark	.. Moore
.. Devries	.. Moores
Dr. Dittmer	.. Power
Mr. Donald	.. Rasey
.. Dufficy	.. Riordan
.. Duggan	.. Roberts, F. E.
.. Foley	.. Smith
.. Gair	.. Taylor, J. R.
.. Gardner	.. Turner
.. Graham	.. Walsh
.. Gunn	.. Whyte
.. Hilton	.. Wood
.. Ingram	
.. Jones, A.	<i>Tellers:</i>
.. Keyatta	.. Brown
.. Larcombe	.. Burrows
.. Lloyd	

PAIR.

AYE.	NO.
Mr. Watson	Mr. Hanlon

Resolved in the negative.

SUPPLY.

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. HEADING (Marodian) (8.37 p.m.): I should like to proceed with the quotation I was making from "The Sydney Morning Herald" when I was called to order. I am sorry hon. members have had any inconvenience from something I was quoting from a New South Wales paper. I was referring to the old Marketing Act, not the new legislation. I would not do anything like that. The hon. member for Aubigny brought this paper to me. I am sure hon. members opposite would be pleased to know what is happening in the other States. In case hon. members have not read "The Sydney Morning Herald" I will read it for the benefit of the Committee. I quote from the issue of 16 October, 1951, as follows:—

"The Premier Mr. McGirr confirmed yesterday that he had told a primary producer's representative that the State Government would resume farms if the owners did not get them back in production. He said he had told the representative of the Lismore district of the Australian Primary Producers' Union, Mr. A. Nardi, that the farms would then be handed over to soldiers or others who would produce butter."

I know how shocked hon. members on the Government side will be to learn that the Labour Government in New South Wales would even think of doing anything like that to those primary producers in New South Wales. When I read that in this newspaper I could not help reading on, and this is what I saw—

"Striking union bans meat from the country.

"Trade union officials took steps yesterday to prevent interstate or country-killed meat reaching strike-bound Sydney. They asked Queensland members of the A.M.I.E.U. not to send meat to Sydney."

I wondered what Mr. McGirr was going to do about that; (Government interjections). He said that if the farmer there refused to

go on producing on his farm, the Government would take his farm from him (Government interjections)—he would lose his farm because they said he struck—but when the members of the Butchers' Union in Sydney decided that the men, women, and children of Sydney were not to get any meat, Mr. McGirr did nothing whatever about it. (Renewed interjections.) That is one of the reasons why the primary producers of Australia are beginning to wonder whether it is worth while carrying on under the class legislation that is being enacted in New South Wales.

Mr. Devries: I wonder if the Press was truthful about Mr. McGirr?

Mr. HEADING: I have not noticed anybody refuting the statement.

When I was so rudely interrupted in my speech on pigs I was diverted into discussing the dairying industry and I propose reverting now to the pig industry. I point out to hon. members that the Co-operative Association is doing everything possible to induce producers to return to the industry and we are making an honest attempt to keep prices down as low as we possibly can, commensurate with that inducement.

As all hon. members know, bacon factories work under an award that provides for a 40-hour week to be worked in five days. This means that no work is done on Saturday or Sunday and the wage provided in the award is £10 a week. It is also provided that the factory worker shall receive two weeks' paid holiday a year, one week's paid sick leave each year and 10 statutory paid holidays, as well as smokos and unemployment benefits. The total time paid for but not worked on holidays, sick leave and smokos amounts to seven weeks in each year. This means that the workers are paid for 52 but work for only 45 weeks. A man earning £10 a week receives £70 each year for time not worked, and his actual cost to industry is not £10 but £11 10s. a week for the time actually worked, which adds materially to the cost of everything the farmer has to buy.

Mr. Devries: But the court bases those conditions on your returns. Do you say the Industrial Court is wrong in its judgment?

Mr. HEADING: I made no reference whatever to the Industrial Court. Hon. members opposite are touchy about this matter. I am not criticising the Industrial Court; I am saying that instead of paying £10 a week to these people the actual time worked costs us £11 10s. a week.

I want to put this contrast because I am sure hon. members opposite do not realise the actual position. When a farmer is able to take a holiday he is not paid, but instead must pay somebody to look after his farm and do his work whilst he is away from home. If a farmer becomes sick he must again pay to have his work done or else see all his production stand still until he is well enough to attend to it himself. The farmer also pays taxes to help pay for unemployment relief, but he cannot claim any benefits.

Another added cost to the farmer is the greatly increased cost of transport, both on his own produce from the farm to the market in the cities, and on his purchases from the cities back to the farm. This means he is paying both ways. Since 1 July, 1950, railway freights have risen by 40 per cent., and this added cost has been saddled on the farmer. Do not forget, Mr. Farrell, that higher transport charges, such as railway freights, do not affect the urban worker much.

Mr. Devries: He passes it on to the consumer, and what is wrong with that?

Mr. HEADING: Hon. members opposite are squealing so much about the cost. The cost of production of pigmeat has been examined carefully by competent Government officers in Queensland and New South Wales, together with leading members of the industry. These men arrived jointly at a basis of cost at June, 1949.

Mr. Power: We do not fix prices of pigmeats now.

Mr. HEADING: One never knows what hon. members opposite might do.

These costs were published. The cost in June, 1949 was 15 pence but in September, 1951, it was 26.3 pence. This figure shows the actual cost, but the farmer must receive more than just a return of his outlay. Farmers are only being paid 2s. dressed weight for pigs today. Those are the cost-of-production figures, and no question of profit is taken into consideration. It must not be forgotten that at the end of this month there will be a wage increase of 10s. a week, which will affect further the costs to the primary producer.

Let us look at the livestock per head of population in Australia, as quoted in the Commonwealth Year Book for 1951. We find that in 1860 there were 0.31 pigs to every person in Australia, but the 1949 figure, which is the last I can get, shows that the figure is 0.15.

The situation in the industry is desperate, and drastic measures must be taken now to place the industry back on its feet. The industry must be rebuilt from the farmers' end, without undue consideration of the consumers' viewpoint on prices. I say that very definitely. This industry can be saved if it gets kindly consideration. It must also be remembered that the price of wheat to the animal-producer has gone up from 8s. 2d. a bushel to 16s. 1d. a bushel, and most of that wheat will have to be brought from South Australia. You can say that wheat will cost 18s. or 19s. a bushel landed on the farm in Queensland. Back in 1941 we were paying 3s. 6½d. at the station and we received 9d. a pound for the dressed weight. The price of grain is now five times what it was in that year. We were getting 9d. a pound for pork at that time, and if it is fair that we should charge five times as much now, we should be getting 3s. 9d. a pound.

Mr. Brown: Pigs do not eat only grain.

Mr. HEADING: That is quite true. They eat grass and other feed.

If we are not to pay the farmer that price for his pigmeat, the only way to give him some relief is to subsidise the feed that is brought here from South Australia. I put that case up because it is obvious to me that this industry must be saved in some way or other. If the Government are indiscreet enough to fix a price at a figure that is not payable to the primary producer, the industry cannot be rehabilitated in any other way.

Mr. Power: What about growing a bit of your own grain?

Mr. HEADING: Even if we do, what is the difference if it costs us £2 to grow a bag of wheat? We shall have to get that £2 back somehow. As a matter of fact, we shall want a bit more than £2 because it costs us something for labour to feed the pigs. Many people use the argument that the Secretary for Mines and Immigration has just advanced but a bag of wheat costs something to grow.

Mr. Power: It does not cost £2.

Mr. HEADING: How would the hon. gentleman know?

Mr. Power: I know a lot more than you think I do.

Mr. HEADING: Many people have planted acres and acres of wheat and in some cases they will harvest none at all, while in others they will harvest only a bag to the acre. What experience has the Secretary for Mines and Immigration to justify his talking about the cost of growing a bag of wheat this year on the Downs for instance?

Mr. Power: They grow wheat in other places besides the Downs.

Mr. HEADING: So many loose statements are made on this matter that I am sure we cannot get anything that is of any value from the Secretary for Mines and Immigration.

I should like now to get away from the pig industry and to return to the dairying industry. Many people, particularly those on the other side of the Committee, accuse the dairying industry of inefficiency, and I should like to quote a few figures to show what it has done over the years. In 1939 there were approximately 120,000 people in Australia engaged in the dairying industry. The increase in population between 1939 and 1950 was roughly 20 per cent., and there are only approximately 80,000 men in the dairying industry today, which is a reduction of 40,000 since 1939. I should like hon. members to remember those figures, because they show that this industry, like the pig industry, is drifting. The 80,000 people who are in the dairying industry today are producing 5 per cent. more milk than did the 120,000 in 1939. The authority for those figures is the "Live Stock Bulletin" of 1 September, 1951. The people who criticise the dairying industry do so very often without sufficient knowledge of what they are talking about.

We have already come up against the problem of a shortage of butter in this country, and it will very probably happen again. I have a newspaper here from New South Wales which talks about "the great butter mystery." The producers in New South Wales cannot produce enough butter to meet the demands of that State. They have to go to Queensland and Victoria to supplement their supplies. New South Wales has to come to Queensland for bacon and hams, if we can provide them, and if that State cannot get them here it tries in Victoria. That is the position in New South Wales. Are we to get into the same position in this State? I am pointing out that a time will probably come when we shall have to look elsewhere for food for the people of this State. We are also charged with the duty of providing food for people overseas. If they cannot get it from this country, goodness knows where they will get it; they might even come here and get it themselves.

I heard hon. members opposite speak glibly about organised marketing, and most of them are astray in what they say. When the scheme was first introduced it was for the purpose of trying to build up the primary industries, and the boards in those days were constituted by the appointment of primary producers in addition to one Government representative. What has happened today? A number of people who speak about organised marketing do not know what it actually is. What we have today is Government-controlled marketing and the boards have no say in the prices to be charged. They are fixed by the Prices Minister.

Mr. Power: They are not fixed by the Minister at all; they are fixed by the Commissioner of Prices.

Mr. HEADING: I suggest that the Minister has quite a deal to do with it.

Mr. Power: No.

Mr. HEADING: I am sure that the Secretary for Mines and Immigration frequently directs his under secretary on what should be done in regard to mining matters in Queensland. If he does not, then why is there any need for a Secretary for Mines and Immigration? You cannot tell me that the Attorney-General has nothing to do with the fixing of prices and, particularly, had nothing to do with them recently.

Mr. Power: You know that is not true.

Mr. HEADING: I am not in the habit of making statements that I know to be untrue.

Mr. Devries: You know that it is not correct. That is a grave reflection on the Minister.

Mr. HEADING: I do not know any such thing. He directs the Commissioner of Prices on some of the work he does.

Mr. Power: The Commissioner of Prices bases his price on the cost of production plus a margin of profit.

Mr. HEADING: We have got away from organised marketing and now it is marketing between Governments and that is not in the best interests of the industry. Unless we do something about it, unless we can get closer together to discuss these problems the difficulty will increase. The time has come when co-operative marketing is a long way better than the organised marketing that is gradually being pushed into the primary industries of this State. It has come so quietly and secretly that before we realise it the industry is taken out of our hands.

I remember very well that in the days of the war, when Labour was in charge in the Federal Government, we never knew what price we were going to get for our butter in England until the contract was made. We must get back to finding a solution of the difficulty surrounding the food problem so that we can help the producers to carry on profitably.

I want to refer to the hon. member for Kedron's statement made this morning that the land policy was wrong and—

“There has always been more taken out of our land than has been put back into it.

“The anomalous position existed today where wonderful advances had been made by science in curing diseases and prolonging the expectation of life, but at the same time land, the very basis of production, was being denuded and destroyed.

“The alternative was the imposition of controls and conditions of land ownership.”

It would be just as sensible for me to say that men working on the wharves were not doing their job, or that the meat-workers were not doing their job or that hon. members sitting on the Government benches were not doing their job, for with one fell swoop the hon. member for Kedron collected all the primary producers together and declared that they were taking more out of the land than they were putting back into it. On most of our agricultural farms you will find some hilly country where erosion is in evidence. I am not going to say that no erosion exists on our farms. There has been and is still some, but some has been corrected, for many primary producers look after their land very jealously.

Mr. Power: That was admitted by the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock.

Mr. HEADING: I am not referring to the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock; I am referring to the hon. member for Kedron. He would not know what the conditions on the land were for if he did know he would, when speaking in this Chamber, speak on matters he knew something about. He condemned the whole of the primary producers and they are not deserving of it.

I have endeavoured to make a speech that will be of some benefit to the primary producing industries. Some hon. members opposite have endeavoured to stop me from making my point. The Acting Premier said that the Leader of the Opposition did something in

order that I could get some kudos out of the speech I was making. There was no need for that statement and there was no truth in it. When I was called to order, I was quite in order because I was quoting from something that was not connected in any way with the debate on the Bill you mentioned.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR (Balonne) (9.4 p.m.): I want to join with other hon. members in complimenting the Acting Treasurer on bringing down his first Financial Statement but I want to couple with him the Acting Premier who was for many months in charge of the Treasury. Our praise is due to both those hon. gentlemen. We had no doubt that when the Budget was presented that it would be a very fair one and that it would meet with the approval of the majority of the people.

I have listened to the contributions made by Opposition members and in my opinion the best efforts were made by the hon. members for Coorparoo and Toowoong. I believe they did so because they thoroughly understand finance. They are educated along those lines and they are familiar with the subject on which they are speaking. Each of them complimented the Acting Treasurer on the Budget. There is no need to take notice of the other critics because they are really not competent to criticise the Budget. For instance, if we wanted to know something about sugar we would not go to the hon. member for Coorparoo; similarly, if we wanted to know about beef we know to whom we would go. The hon. members I have mentioned praised the Government and the Acting Treasurer for the Budget.

I agree with some of the remarks made by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. He stated that they were receiving 2s. a lb. for pigs and in Sydney 11s. a lb. was paid for ham. I agree with him that something is wrong and it is essential that something should be done to remedy the position. It appears to me that it is the middleman who is “copping” the excessive profit. The pig-breeders have an organisation that is sufficiently powerful to do something to remedy the present state of affairs. From time to time we pass legislation that is helpful to the people as a whole, but members of the Opposition endeavour to pull it to pieces and make out that it is detrimental to the people. I have often sat and wondered what the condition of these people would be if the position was as bad as they try to make out, and whether they would be in the position they are in today. I have no objection to any man's making progress; I have no objection to anybody's making his way in the world; but I have strong objections to the actions of people who have had a fair deal from the Labour Government and who have made huge fortunes under Labour regimes and who then decry Labour. There are members in this Assembly who have admitted coming to Queensland virtually carrying their swags, and some of them are now very wealthy men. What is wrong with Queensland when these men and many others who are not in Parliament can come here and

accumulate wealth under a Labour Government? I have put forward that argument before and I have never heard it knocked over yet. I think these people would show better principle if they did not adopt the role of "knockers" and down everything that Labour Governments have done. The other day, when a member on this side resumed his seat after speaking, an Opposition member remarked that it was a hymn of hate. We have never had better examples of hymns of hate than some of the speeches delivered by members opposite. I admit that some hon. members opposite do offer constructive criticism but there are some who lay themselves out to give vent to as much hate as they possibly can against the Labour Party and many of the men have done exceedingly well during the time Labour have been in power.

We hear hon. members opposite saying that the production of this State and of the Commonwealth is not what it should be. There are many ways in which they can help if they are sincere, without attacking a Government who have stood the test of time and retained the confidence of the people for so long. The Federal Government have committed many sins, and one great cause of the lack of production is to be found in Section 36 of their taxation law. I have discussed this section with some hon. members on both sides, but many know nothing about it and it will not hurt if I explain its effect.

Mr. Ewan: They are fixing that now.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: Twelve months ago I was told you were fixing it.

Mr. Ewan: You will know all about it in about three days.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: The other day I received a letter from the Federal Treasurer stating that the Taxation Board of Review had not discussed it yet. If the hon. member for Roma can tell me what the Federal Government intend to do, it will relieve many people of a great deal of anxiety.

Let me explain now the effect of the section about which I complain. If a partnership business was left by will to a certain number of people and they decided some years afterwards to dissolve the partnership and divide the assets, something that they rightly owned, because it had been paid for, the taxation payable upon the dissolution and division would be extremely heavy. I know of one case in which the estate was worth £360,000. When the parties desired to divide it equally it was pointed out that the division would attract taxation amounting to £103,000. I have taken the matter up with the Federal Treasurer. I have made two trips to Canberra and interviewed him twice. He has sympathised with me, he has said he believes it is wrong, and has promised to make an effort to fix it up. I have written to the Federal Treasurer and asked for a decision, but the only reply I could get was that the Taxation Board of Review has not given a

decision. However, I am glad to have had the assurance of the hon. member for Roma that in three days time it will be fixed up. If it is fixed up, as the Federal Treasurer told me he thought it should be, I can assure you, Mr. Farrell, that everyone will be happy and I can also assure you that when I leave this House tonight I will get on the telephone and tell the people concerned that I have had an assurance from the hon. member for Roma that it will be fixed up within three days.

Mr. Ewan: To whom will you tell that?

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: The people with whom I am concerned.

I was pleased this afternoon to listen to the speech made by the hon. member for Southport who made, I thought, a very good speech and whilst it might not please some of his party I think what he said showed that he had given his subject consideration and thought. It was well presented.

Mr. Rasey: And fair-minded too.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: The only thing I am afraid of, seeing that he spoke his mind is that he might run into trouble, as another member of the Country Party did when he expressed his opinion and was expelled from the party. Charlie Russell was expelled because he dared—

Mr. Ewan: It is not true.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: He said he was expelled, it was in the paper too, and I am only quoting what Charlie Russell said. He said he was expelled from the Country Party and he made a statement in the paper that he was expelled and I am prepared to believe Charlie Russell because he is the man concerned.

Mr. Low: You criticised him in this Chamber.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: I never criticised him, because I think he put forward some good suggestions. However, he says he was expelled and he said he was given back 9s., the balance he was entitled to.

Mr. McIntyre: Did you not read the contradiction?

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: I only saw what the president of the Country Party at Surat said. He said he was not but I saw again in the paper that Charlie Russell said he was expelled. I am not a member of the Country Party and so I do not know. However, I can only hope that the same fate does not befall the hon. member for Southport because of the excellent speech he made. He was fearless and one of the things that I was pleased about was that he said in reply to an interjection that water was worth any price—even if it was £4 an acre-foot it was worth it. I agree with him.

I have said that the salvation of the inland areas of this State is water, irrigation, and fodder conservation. I am pleased to see

the Government going ahead with the programme outlined quite a few years ago. That programme is not progressing as fast as we on this side of the Committee—and even some hon. members in Opposition—would like it to, but we must realise that material necessary for building weirs and water-conservation projects is just as difficult to get as material for other building works. However, at the present time we are getting on with a very good irrigation system. I do not know whether I am fortunate, but in my electorate—and I have mentioned this fact on other occasions—three or four weirs are either under construction or have been completed.

Mr. McIntyre: Is that the electorate you represent now, or the one you ran away from?

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: It is the one I represent now, and I did not run away from the other one, if it is any news to the hon. member. I had to take the hon. member for Roma to task for saying the same thing, and I think he was really a little sorry afterwards that he had said it. However, I will now tell the hon. member for Cunningham why I left the Roma district. Unfortunately, I have a boy who was suffering from asthma and a specialist ordered me to take him away from the West. The hon. member in such circumstances probably would have left his boy out in the West and would not have cared what happened to him. I did what I was advised to do and brought him away.

Mr. McIntyre: You are still in the West.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: I did not run away from Roma, as the hon. member has suggested.

As I have said, in my electorate quite a number of weirs are either in the course of construction or have been completed, and at the present time the Department of Public Lands is making arrangements to have the lands along the river banks surveyed for citrus fruit and lucerne-growing, which will be of assistance to the people living in those areas. I repeat that that is the only salvation for the inland areas. I believe, too, that the graziers and the other people on the land could do a lot more to help themselves. I have mentioned here on several occasions the splendid work that Mr. K. B. Cameron has done and is still doing on a water conservation job on Bullamon Plains.

Mr. Ewan: In spite of the opposition he received from this Government.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: He received no opposition from this Government.

Mr. Ewan: You reported him when he built his first weir.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: I did not. As a matter of fact, I did not know that the weir was being built and neither did the department.

Mr. Ewan interjected.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: At no time was anybody sent down there to destroy it. On the contrary, officers of the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply have been sent down to help Mr. Cameron. If the hon. member would like to meet Mr. Cameron in my presence, I am sure Mr. Cameron will tell him that he has received every help from the Government. If I had time to go down to my room now, I could produce a letter from K. B. Cameron to the effect that he has had nothing but help from this Government. He built the weir without a permit, but when he learned that a permit was required he did the right thing. Up to the present, he has spent approximately £43,000 on that job. He proposes to spend another £10,000 on three sluice-gates to enable the water to flow down the Moonie River. No man in Queensland is happier about the help he has had from the Department of Public Lands and the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply than Mr. K. B. Cameron. Other graziers could do something to help themselves by storing water, although perhaps not on the same scale as he has done. I am not a grazier but I have had a good deal of experience in the West. I was not as fortunate as the hon. member for Aubigny in being able to go on the land.

Mr. Sparkes: You had a pretty good racehorse.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: The hon. member has some very good bulls. He has a very good stud, probably one of the best in the West. I am satisfied that many graziers could help themselves and at no great cost.

Living conditions in the West are not good. Many of the amenities available to city-dwellers are not available to the people in the West.

Mr. Ewan: Do you think the Government should build the road from St. George to Surat?

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: I shall deal with that in a moment and tell the hon. member why it is not built. Housing in the West is not good either but it is no fault of the Housing Commission. For a number of years it called tenders for the building of houses and offered every inducement to builders to become interested in building homes in the West but without much success. However, I am pleased to say that a building programme is going on in Roma.

Mr. Ewan: Private enterprise.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: The man building out there was here yesterday on a deputation to the Housing Commission and he thinks he may be able to build for the Housing Commission. It looks very likely that we shall be able to get a man to build for the Housing Commission at Mitchell also. Already one has begun the building of some homes in Mungalalla and I understand that a start is to be made very shortly at Surat and St. George. I was told today that land has

been cleared and six homes are about to be built in Thallon. That shows that the Housing Commission realises its responsibilities and that it intends to build homes for people in the West. I travel the road between Surat and St. George more than anyone in this Chamber and I know how bad it is. I know that over the years a big sum of money has been set aside by way of loan and subsidy to both the Balonne and Waroo Shire Councils to put it in trafficable order but nothing has been done. On every occasion the work has been side-stepped; therefore, if there is any blame to be attached to anyone for the bad road between those two towns it cannot be attached to the Government. It is purely a matter for the local authorities concerned and it is one they will not tackle.

We heard something today about the main road right through to Charleville, thence to Longreach, and on to Darwin. I am pleased that we have been able to persuade the powers that be not to continue the road past Dunkeld Ridge on the Condamine Highway.

Mr. Ewan: I got that letter 18 months ago.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: The hon. member did not get a letter; what is the use of his coming in now and telling lies?

Mr. Ewan interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Roma has had an opportunity of delivering his speech and I hope he will now give the hon. member for Balonne an opportunity to make his without interruption.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: I do not want to have a quarrel with the hon. member for Roma over this matter, because it is too trivial. He could not have got a letter 18 months ago. A few months ago a deputation waited on the Acting Premier about this road. We put our case to him and he informed us that it was an excellent one. The Acting Premier sent both the hon. member for Warrego and me a letter informing us that the road would not be continued past Dunkeld Ridge. What is the good of the hon. member for Roma's coming in now and saying what he did?

Mr. Ewan: I will show you the letter.

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt referred to a matter that I intended to raise. I add my support to his remarks about hotels and the breweries. I believe that there should be some control over hotels owned by breweries. This afternoon a lady interviewed me and told me that her mother, who owned a hotel in the West, had her beer quota cut from 90 gallons to 60 gallons and that the hotel on the corner owned by the brewery had its quota raised from 220 to 250 gallons. That is not an isolated instance. As I go round, I meet a lot of friends who are in the hotel business and they tell me stories that would amaze you. I stopped at a hotel the other evening and the proprietor showed me his rent account. He

paid £20 a week rent and on 7 March he was informed by the brewery that his rent from then onwards would be £40 a week.

Mr. Nicklin: What does the price-fixer propose?

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: Unfortunately rents of hotels are not controlled. I think they should be. I have a little bit of sympathy for the hotelkeeper who overcharges for beer today, because he is more or less compelled to, and it is the breweries who are compelling him to do it because they are taking from freehold hotels and giving to their own hotels; if they cannot do that, they raise the rent of their own hotels and make it impossible for the hotelkeeper to carry on under the old prices. A friend of mine recently gave £18,600 for an hotel. At that time he was getting 180 gallons of beer a week and the first week they cut him down to 120. I was able to get it up to 140, after being told that they owned the beer and that they would do what they liked with it. Today it is back to 110. You can imagine the state he is in, after giving nearly £19,000 for the hotel and spending £2,000 or £3,000 on it and then getting a cut like that. Unfortunately there is nothing anyone can do about it.

Mr. Low: What do you propose to do about it?

Mr. J. R. TAYLOR: There may be ways and means of controlling these breweries, but I suppose that will be discussed in the proper place at a later date.

We have heard the cry of the Commo. Labour Party. I think it has been thrashed out here on a number of occasions, and I cannot see that there is any evidence that the Labour Party is allied with the Communist Party. We stand on a platform and tell the people that we do not want the support of the Communist Party. We have had members of the Opposition endeavouring to convince the House that we do by using an argument put forward by a Communist. Members opposite should hang their heads in shame. I can vouch for any member of the Government party when I say that they will never try and strengthen their argument with something that a Commo. put forward. We go out on the platforms and tell the people that we do not want anything to do with them. During the last Federal election, on more than one occasion members on this side of the Committee stood on platforms and said if there were any Commos. in the audience they could give their votes to the Country Party, the Liberal Party, or the Menzies-Fadden Government—that we did not want to go into power on their votes. I repeat tonight, on behalf of every member of the Labour Party, that we do not want the support of the Communist Party. If our being in power depends on our having the support of the Communists, we prefer to be in Opposition.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 9.42 p.m.