

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 28 AUGUST 1946

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 28 AUGUST, 1946.

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

QUESTIONS.

RELIEF SUBSIDY, SUGAR INDUSTRY.

Mr. BRAND (Isis) asked the Premier—

“In view of the serious financial losses suffered by sugar-producers through drought and frost, will he give favourable consideration to a case for a relief subsidy, if presented by the sugar organisations, similar to that provided for other primary industries detrimentally affected by the prevailing drought conditions?”

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca) replied—

“The Government will give consideration to any sound proposal that may be put forward by the sugar organisations.”

BUSINESS OF PREMIERS' CONFERENCE.

Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba) asked the Premier—

“In view of the inadequacy of the Press reports regarding the Premiers' Conference, will he kindly make a statement to the House on the business transacted, and particularly as to full or partial agreements reached to give to the Commonwealth Parliament by State legislation powers which it does not possess under its constitution or possesses only for a limited period of time under defence provisions?”

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca) replied—

“The deliberations of the recent Premiers' Conference were open to the Press, with the exception of one item on which the Conference sat in Committee. A verbatim report was taken of the discussions by the Commonwealth ‘Hansard’ staff and will be published by the Commonwealth in the near future. I shall arrange for copies of the official report to be available for members' perusal in the Parliamentary Library.”

APPLICATIONS FOR HOUSES, STATE HOUSING COMMISSION.

Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

“Will he kindly supply the following information in regard to the operations of the State Housing Commission for 1945-46, viz.:—(a) The total number of applications for houses (i.) by service and ex-service personnel, (ii.) by others, and (b) the number of approved applications, respectively?”

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

“Applications for rental houses: (a) (i.) By servicemen and ex-servicemen, 1,904 (ii.) by others, 1,327; total, 3,231. (b) (i.) By servicemen and ex-servicemen, 193; (ii.) by others, 200; total, 393.

Applications for home purchase: (a) (i.) By servicemen and ex-servicemen, 407; (ii.) by others, 263; total, 670. (b) (i.) By servicemen and ex-servicemen, 368; (ii.) by others, 258; total, 626."

SUPPLIES OF MATERIAL, STATE HOUSING COMMISSION.

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"What is the total quantity of roofing material (a) now in possession of and (b) held by others, by direction, for the use of the State Housing Commission?"

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

"(a) and (b) Nil."

DROUGHT RELIEF, MILK PRODUCERS.

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

"In reference to the claim for a drought-relief subsidy made by the Queensland Milk-Producers' Association, will he make representations to the Minister concerned regarding the exceptional severity of the present drought and the extremely high prices and poor quality of available fodder, with a recommendation that an immediate decision be given and that an adequate subsidy be made retrospective to the date of application?"

Hon. H. H. COLLINS (Cook) replied—

"Yes."

PEANUTS FOR OIL.

Mr. MACDONALD (Stanley), for **Mr. EDWARDS** (Nanango), asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"In view of the detrimental effect upon this State and upon the growers and processors concerned, including many ex-servicemen, of the Commonwealth order that all peanuts in Queensland must be diverted to the manufacture of oil, will he receive a deputation representative of those affected by the order and submit their views to the Commonwealth Government for reconsideration of this matter?"

Hon. H. H. COLLINS (Cook) replied—

"Yes."

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY.

Mr. WANSTALL (Toowong) asked the Attorney-General—

"In view of comments recently made by learned judges to the effect that the principles of the Married Women's Property Acts 'are not in keeping with the modern outlook as to the status of a married woman,' will he give consideration to the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend those Acts so as to entitle a wife to hold as her own property the savings from her housekeeping allowance?"

Hon. D. A. GLEDSON (Ipswich) replied—

"Yes."

ADMINISTRATION OF RURAL FIRES ACT.

Mr. WANSTALL (Toowong) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. How many prosecutions have been instituted during the past five years for breaches of the Rural Fires Act of 1927, and when was the last of such prosecutions instituted?"

"2. Is this Act being actively administered and policed?"

"3. In view of the large number of destructive fires which have occurred during recent months in rural fire districts resulting in serious losses of grass by dairy farmers and graziers, will he order an inquiry under section 20 of the Act into a selected number of the worst cases?"

Hon. A. JONES (Charters Towers) replied—

"1. Twenty-four; 5 October, 1945.

"2. Over the last five years approximately 900 reports of fires have reached the Rural Fires Board. Most of these have come from forest officers reporting outbreaks on or near the areas under their control, but a number have also come from fire wardens, police officers, and others. A large number of inquiries and investigations have been made, in which the assistance of the police has been freely forthcoming. Many warnings have been issued, and letters of appreciation sent to persons who have assisted in extinguishing fires. As the hon. member is aware, the Government proposes to bring down a Rural Fires Bill this session which will have the effect of strengthening the administration dealing with bush fires.

"3. Where reports indicate they are desirable, police or other inquiries have been, and will be, instituted."

SUPPLIES OF MOLASSES FOR STOCK.

Mr. JESSON (Kennedy) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"In view of the serious drought which is prevailing in Northern Queensland in the cane areas and the action of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company in cutting down the ration of molasses which is used as a subsidiary food for live stock, dairy cows, and working horses, will he take the matter up with the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, urging them to supply the farmers as they have previously done without any restrictions?"

Hon. H. H. COLLINS (Cook) replied—

"Representations have been made to a number of sugar-milling companies with the object of obtaining increased supplies of molasses for stock feeding, and considerable quantities are now being sold for that purpose. Following representations to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, the general manager has replied as follows:— 'It is regretted that we are unable to make additional molasses available for dairy farmers in the Ingham district, notwithstanding the very severe drought which is

being experienced in Queensland at the present time. You are, no doubt, aware that the sugar crops have suffered very severely, together with all other primary production, during the disastrous drought. Under these circumstances the amount of molasses available in Queensland has fallen considerably and we regret to advise that the tonnage of molasses available for our distilleries will fall far short of their requirements, and, in view of the urgent industrial demand for molasses, we feel that you will appreciate that we are unable to offer additional assistance to the dairy farmers in the Ingham district, as suggested by you.'''

CONDITION OF SECONDARY INDUSTRIES.

Mr. MORRIS (Enoggera) asked the Secretary for Labour and Employment—

“Will he provide information on the condition of the State’s secondary industries for the years 1935-36, 1938-39, and 1944-45 in these particulars:—(a) Total wages paid; (b) number of employees; (c) value of plant; and (d) value of land and buildings?”

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

“(a) Total wages paid—
 1935-36 £ 8,394,900
 1938-39 10,887,229
 1944-45 17,979,827

(b) Number of employees—

	Males.	Females.	Total.
1935-36 ..	34,557	8,637	43,194
1938-39 ..	41,577	10,075	51,652
1944-45 ..	49,472	12,546	62,018

Note.—These figures represent the average numbers of employees over the whole year and exclude working proprietors.

(c) Value of plant and machinery—
 1935-36 £ 17,736,543
 1938-39 18,095,415
 1944-45 18,134,011

(d) Value of land and buildings—
 1935-36 £ 10,514,513
 1938-39 12,299,089
 1944-45 13,689,055

An extensive survey made through the Director of Employment early in 1946 showed that, in the factories covered by the survey, the number of employees increased by over 5,000 during the year ended 31 January, 1946. A survey made

through the director in 1945 showed that Queensland manufacturers were so confident of the future that they projected a capital expenditure on expansion of approximately £4,000,000.”

ENOGERA LEVEL CROSSINGS.

Mr. MORRIS (Enoggera) asked the Minister for Transport—

“1. In the plan outlined by him last week to minimise danger at various city level crossings, is it the intention to install at Enoggera crossings all the safety devices specified in the statement?

“2. If so, will these installations be completed within this financial year?”

Hon. E. J. WALSH (Mirani) replied—

“1 and 2. No; but a special stop sign will be provided at this and other similar level crossings.”

BURDEKIN RIVER TRUST.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

“1. What are the functions and duties of the Burdekin River Trust?

“2. What funds have been allocated to the trust, and what period does such allocation cover?”

Hon. H. H. COLLINS (Cook) replied—

“1. The functions and duties of the Burdekin River Trust are as set out in the Burdekin River Trust Act of 1940. The trust is constituted as a local body under and within the meaning of the Local Bodies Loans Guarantee Acts, 1923 to 1936, and a constructing authority within the meaning of the Public Works Land Resumption Acts, 1906 to 1933, for the purpose of repairing as far as may be damage occasioned to the banks of any river within the Burdekin River benefited area, as defined by Order in Council of 5 February, 1941, by flood or cyclone, and the prevention as far as may be of the future occurrence of such damage. It has power to borrow and to levy precepts upon the local authorities comprised in the benefited area for the purpose of constructing and maintaining works and resumption of land as approved by the Minister, and for administration. It may prohibit an owner or occupier of any land within the trust’s benefited area from taking any action which may cause or contribute to damage of the river banks.

“2. The following funds have been made available:—

Date of Executive Approval.	Purpose.	Loan.	Subsidy.	Government Grant.
5-9-40	Rehabilitation and preventive works	£	£ 20,000
(Total expenditure from grant to date, £17,809 3s. 9d.)				
30-5-46	Repairs and extensions, reafforestation, new works and resumptions	27,500 (30 year term)	50 per cent. of interest and redemption	12,500

DELAYS TO PRODUCTION, COLLINSVILLE
STATE MINE.

Mr. PATERSON (Bowen) asked the Secretary for Mines—

“Since 1 January this year, on how many occasions was coal production adversely affected at the Collinsville State mine owing to a shortage of (a) railway wagons; and (b) coal skips?”

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

“(a) Twenty-six; (b) five.”

PRIVILEGE.

DISALLOWANCE OF MOTION.

Mr. HILEY (Logan): I rise on a question of privilege. I move—

“That the action of Mr. Speaker in refusing to accept the motion of dissent from his ruling as notified by the hon. member for Windsor on 27 August, 1946, is in contravention of the provisions of Standing Order No. 117, and as such, it constitutes a breach of privilege of members of this House.”

In submitting that motion, I propose very shortly to traverse the facts—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I want to say to hon. members that the hon. member for Logan extended me the courtesy—and it is appreciated—of making a copy of this motion available this morning. I have had time to consider it, and I am ruling it out of order because my ruling yesterday was based on a question of order, and a question of order cannot be a question of privilege.

Mr. Aikens: It is about time you cut out their cheap propaganda, anyway.

Mr. HILEY: I rise to a point of order on privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have given a ruling.

Mr. HILEY: I rise on privilege, and draw your attention to page 264 of May.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I want to say to the hon. member for Logan that I have had sufficient time to consider this motion. I have given a ruling and rejected it and there can be no further discussion. If hon. members desire to exercise their rights, they can this morning submit a motion of dissent from my ruling.

Mr. Pie: This is terrible!

Mr. Aikens: It is something Menzies did not tell you over the week-end.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—FIFTH ALLOTTED
DAY.

Debate resumed from 27 August (see p. 205) on Mr. Wood's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. HEALY (Warwick) (11.18 a.m.): I join with the other hon. members who have taken part in this debate in extending my

congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply, both of whom I think it is generally conceded acquitted themselves with great credit indeed. Both the hon. member for East Toowoomba and the hon. member for Bremer will I am sure prove worthy members of this House, and will continue to represent their respective electorates for many years. There is no doubt that the handsome majority secured in the Bremer electorate—approximately a 2,500-majority—will make our Opposition friends, both the Country Party and Q.P.P., again write off the Bremer electorate as a hopeless seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is too much noise in the Chamber.

Mr. HEALY: It is significant that the Country Party has already thrown in the sponge in the electorate of East Toowoomba and has bequeathed to the Q.P.P. the impossible task of recapturing that seat. (Opposition interjections.)

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

Mr. HEALY: I enjoyed the remark of one hon. member who interjects, about not throwing in the sponge in the Warwick seat. We shall see when the next elections are held what great prophets our friends opposite are.

The Lieutenant-Governor's opening Speech to this House and the State outlined Labour's progressive policy for the further development of Queensland not only for the current financial year but also for the succeeding years, and I have no doubt that the policy will be endorsed by the people at the forthcoming poll.

The Government are to be commended for their decision to set up a Tourist Development Board for the purpose of exploiting and developing Queensland's tourist trade. The possibilities of Queensland in this connection, particularly in relation to the Barrier Reef, are immense and cannot be too strongly stressed. The tourist trade, properly developed in this State, would be worth many millions of pounds to Queensland, as the tourist trade is valuable to Canada, Switzerland, and other countries. In January last I had the privilege of making a trip along the Queensland coast and to the Celebes, and I would say that there is no more beautiful sight in any country in the world than the Hinchinbrook Channel and the marine beauties inside the Great Barrier Reef. As I passed through Hinchinbrook Channel the thought came to me that I, along with most other hon. members, have frequently sat in picture theatres and viewed with great pleasure the travelogues produced in technicolour by Fitzpatrick. So I suggest very earnestly to the Tourist Development Board that the services of Mr. Fitzpatrick and his camera might be obtained, with the object of photographing and narrating the beauties of the Great Barrier Reef, so that films of them may be exhibited in every country. I believe that there is no more beautiful scenery to be found in any part of the world.

Following so quickly as it does on the termination of the global war, the present-day global turbulence gives us all cause for serious thought, and brings home to us very forcibly the challenge to our hard-won privilege as Australians that is being launched by those in our midst who would do anything to bring about their ideals of a communistic State. Signs are not wanting in Australia that this country is included in the Russian communistic dream of world soviets. Like the softening-up preceding a military assault on an objective, this country is under a barrage of communistic propaganda at the present time, which is weakening our pride in our democratic institutions and exalting everything Russian. We have people in our midst whose allegiance is not to Australia or the British Empire but to Moscow. These are the same people who, in the early years of the war, when Russia was not on our side, referred to the Australian soldiers as six-bob-a-day murderers. They kept on demanding a second front, at a time when the British Empire was desperately clinging to the only front it had, and to-day they give credit for victory more to Russia than to the British Empire or to the U.S.A. Yet in the early stages of the war, before Russia's entry into the struggle, these people denounced the war as an imperialistic attempt to dominate the world, whereas upon Russia's entry into the war this bad war became a good war over-night. Why this colossal change of front on the part of these people? Because Russia was now one of the United Nations and the war now became a war against Fascism to save, not the democracies of the world but Russia. The Communists in this country were merely waiting for the end of the war in order to put into effect their post-war plan to seize power. Last Christmas, as we in this Assembly know and the people of Australia know too well, there was a false move on the part of the Communist Party of Australia. It held up industry in New South Wales to such an extent that Sydney was blacked out at Christmas time and the life of her people was made extremely difficult indeed by a premature softening-up campaign directed against the Australian economy. That was Australia's first big warning of the dangers of the Communists in this country. But since then we have had other warnings. The meat strike and black-out in Queensland was one; the black-out in Adelaide was another; and the coal hold-up in Melbourne was still another. Believe me, we shall have more of these softening-up measures unless we take remedial or preventive action. Unfortunately, there are other wise good Australians who regard these people as nonentities and who scoff at the idea of their rising power in this country but we have the evidence of a paper-hanger who forced himself as boss on the German people, and a cobbler's son is absolute ruler of Russia. In the knowledge that it is only in the soil of misery that the seeds of Communism can germinate, these traitors make no excuse for plunging a nation into chaos, causing all the unrest and hardship possible, thus trying to make people an easy prey to the pernicious com-

munistic doctrine that the end justifies the means and any means is justified provided it leads to the goal they desire—revolution and communistic dictatorship.

No high-sounding words can give the lie to the actual experiences of those people whose lands have now been brought under communistic control. Let us take a look at the world today. Recent events in Canada, Europe, Egypt, China, Mexico, Indonesia and even in Australia itself make it perfectly clear that the Communist Party wherever it exists is still a powerful and fanatical agency in the cause of treason, for it recognises no loyalty, no patriotism and no allegiance except to the foreign ideology whose willing instrument and tool it has become. In every quarter of the globe today there exist treason, unrest, violence and disorder, which have been traced to the Communist agents in those countries who slavishly obey orders to serve the Soviet foreign and domestic policies by disrupting the national economy of this country and every other country, thus preventing the work of reconstruction of any nation that is likely to be a bar to the power of Communist imperialism. The Communists boast that Russia under Stalin has rid herself of Fifth Columnists and Quislings; but they carefully avoid mentioning, however, that she has filled every country in the world with agents prepared in the service of Communism to shrink from no act however treasonable. Should the existing tension arising out of the Yugoslav incidents, or any future incident, lead to war with Russia, we should have in Australia a greater number of Fifth Columnists working for Russia than were ever placed behind the bars during the recent war.

The latest proof of the truth of these contentions comes in the report of the Canadian Royal Commission on Soviet espionage in that country, detailing the Soviet system of parallel spy rings operated by agents located in the Russian Embassy and working through Canadians.

These, as the report says, "are Communist sympathisers willing to betray their country."

One statement in that report that will be particularly disquieting to observers of the Australian scene is this:—

"Political information obtained by the ring came from agents in the Canadian External Affairs Department, the Cypher Division and the British High Commissioner's Office in Ottawa. Evidence showed that the Communist Party is trying to get control, through the election of secret members, to the directing committees of as many types of functional organisations as possible, including trade unions, professional associations, youth movements and civil liberty unions. Its objective is to accustom young Canadians to the atmosphere of conspiracy, double life and double standards."

It must be apparent to anyone who studies the political affairs of this country that the machinations of the Communist Party of

Australia are no different from the machinations of the Communist Party in Canada.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HEALY: Who are the "professional revolutionaries" in this country? They are the members of the Communist Party, those people who bob up from time to time as organising secretaries, as organisers of many fronts; so-called Labour leaders without any knowledge of leadership; unemployed relics of the depression, professional trouble-mongers and disruptionists who are trying to make this State into a Communist cell.

Mr. Pie: Is Mr. Healy one of them?

Mr. HEALY: I just want to reply to that interjection. It is extraordinary how some people in this State associate me with the secretary of the Trades and Labour Council of Brisbane. As you all know, that man's name is not Healy, as has been admitted by himself. If there is any doubt—and there has been even in my own electorate—I want here and now to clear it up for all time.

Mr. Maher: You ought to change your name to McCracken.

Mr. HEALY: I hope I shall never have reason to change my name from the good old Irish name I have.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HEALY: There is no doubt the Communists have concentrated their strength in an endeavour to capture the trades unions of Australia. This is admitted by leading Communist Sharkey. In his book entitled, "The Trades Unions," on page 9 we find the following:—

"The trades unions are the most important mass organisation of the working class, and therefore have a special importance for the revolutionaries. 'Without the trades unions the revolution is impossible,' Lenin has written."

The primary objective of the Communist Party is to keep the industrial system in a state of turmoil. In this way they prepare the way for the revolution that will enable them to seize power. But the Communists have a secondary aim. They deliberately foment strikes that will promote the foreign policy of Soviet Russia. They are not concerned with the welfare of Australian unionists but with their own selfish aims and ambitions.

Fenner Brockway, a noted British Socialist leader, sums up a long experience of Communists and their activities in the following words, at page 343 of his book entitled "Inside the Left":—

"Communist parties do not owe their first loyalty to the working-class movement as a whole, either in the country where they operate or internationally, but to their own organisation, to the Communist International, and to Russia. They do not regard

their organisation as an instrument to be used for the working-class; they regard the working-class as an instrument to be used for their organisation. And though among 'Communists' there is often selfless devotion, their party has no place for ethical considerations of fraternity, honour, truthfulness outside their own associates. Any section of workers which is critical of Russia in any respect becomes an enemy; no more quarter must be shown to it than is shown to an enemy by national patriots in war. Accordingly 'Communists' will adopt any means against it; they will intrigue, sabotage, lie, assassinate, denounce old comrades to the Capitalists' authorities, and if they have the power extort false confessions, imprison, terrorise, execute. They will stop at nothing to achieve their purpose, even if their victims are fellow members of the working class."

Mr. Sparkes: You will not get the Communist vote.

Mr. HEALY: I do not want it. The trade-union movement, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is one of the glories of democratic Australia. It has, of course, grown to be a powerful movement, and rightly so because without the trade-union movement in this country the workers would be reduced to a state of serfdom. The foundations of that glorious trade-union movement were laid by those grand old Labour stalwarts of the early days, many of whom have since passed on to the Great Beyond. They were men imbued with love of country and of fellow men, and the union movement has carried on since those early days in its great struggle to uphold the rights and dignity of the working men and women of this country. Despite all the vapourings of the Communists it is a fact that Communism does not emancipate humanity from anything. It does not break the chains of oppression that bind the world but only creates fetters designed to bind men more securely. It strikes a death blow at all human freedom. It is a system of revolution and dictatorship—and a dictatorship, as was admitted by Joseph Stalin, unrestricted by law and based upon force. As Australians with an inherent love of our country we should say to the Communists, "We don't want anything to do with your dictatorship in this land of the Southern Cross." We do not want to see in the streets of Brisbane or the other capital cities the firing squads and the basher gangs that are the inevitable accompaniment of the communist ideals. We do not want to see in Australia the things that have taken place in the history of Russia, Europe, Mexico and other countries. We should all be clear on what the Communist Party wants to impose on this country, and that is just what we do not want as Australians. Should the Communist Party in this country ever gain power it would mark the end of all freedom of political opinion and expression. No other party would be tolerated except the Communist Party. That is how it is in Russia and that is how it would be in Australia if it ever gained power.

The only freedom of choice that the Communist people possess in their own country, in parliamentary elections, is the choice between Communist candidates A, B, and C. They have no choice whatever between a Communist candidate or a non-Communist candidate. Is it any wonder that the General Council of the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress of Great Britain declared—

“If the British working class toy with the idea of dictatorship, Fascist or Communist, they will go down to a servitude such as they have never suffered.”

We know what to expect from Communism and surely, as Australians with an inherent love of this country, we will not await the hour of such persecution with fatalistic resignation. We must meet the menace here and now by anticipating the “Red Dawn” by relentlessly exposing the Communists and their methods.

Mr. Maher: What would you do to deal with them?

Mr. HEALY: Mr. Speaker, I would say that Australian citizenship gives us great privileges in this country but with those privileges go obligations and if there is a set of people in the community who are prepared to accept these privileges and not accept the obligations, they are not deserving of Australian citizenship.

In the workers' struggle for their rights there are other and better means of securing justice than by violence and bloodshed, which is the policy of the Communists. Down the years enormous strides have been made by constitutional means in the attainment of social reforms for the working men and women of this country. Those reforms have been won not by violence but by sane unionism, legislation and education.

During the course of this debate hon. members opposite have indulged in a good deal of criticism of the Government for their alleged activity in the recent meat strike. It must be remembered that that dispute eventually became as much a political issue as it was industrial. There is no doubt in my mind that the Communists in this State “horned into” that dispute with a view of capturing control of the trade-union movement in Queensland and thus being in a position to destroy the Labour Government of this State, to destroy the greatest bulwark we have in Australia against the machinations of the Communist Party.

Whatever hon. members opposite may say, no matter how much political cocaine they may attempt to disseminate it is to the everlasting credit of the Premier of this State and the Government that that dispute ended in a triumph for Labour's policy of conciliation and arbitration. There was another very pleasing result. The recent meat strike has brought about an awakening on the part of many thousands of industrial unionists in this State to the white-anting tactics of the Communist Party. Some of the credit for bringing about that awakening is surely due to rational industrial leaders like Dixon and

Kearney who had the courage to face 2,500 unemployed at the Brisbane Stadium and point out to them and expose the treachery of the Communist Party in this State. The example set by those men should be followed by all genuine unionists in Queensland who wish to preserve the things worth while in this country. They should take a lively interest in the affairs of their union and see that all men who are known Communists are not permitted to occupy official positions in their trade unions.

Actually, there is very little difference between the Communist and the capitalist so far as their attitude towards the trade union is concerned. The object of both is to destroy trade unionism; the only difference is that the Communist operates from within the union. The capitalist, resentful of the power of trade unions in this country, seeks to discredit the Labour movement and endeavours to provoke, at times appropriate to him, a general strike, and then by clever propaganda seeks to sap the confidence of the average Australian and average unionist in the trade-union movement. In that way he hopes to eliminate and smash industrial unionism finally and completely. Let me emphasise that both Communists and capitalists are enemies of the Australian Labour movement and both must be fought with the same vigour. The future of the trade-union movement depends ultimately on the ability of union leaders to wage a decisive fight against their enemies both within and without the movement, and on their ability to pursue a sound policy during the next few years.

In a general survey of the industrial unrest throughout Australia, whether it be capitalist- or Communist-inspired or caused by any other means, we must face up to the reality that we are living in a period of great social changes. The old order has gone and our job in this and the other Parliaments of Australia is to evolve a new order to take its place. Undoubtedly the workers themselves are under a great mental strain. They have not forgotten the depression of the early 30's when they were compelled to see their wives and children go hungry and poorly clad. Throughout those years the workers were haunted by the fear of unemployment which became eventually a fear complex, but the war has changed all that. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the workers are determined that the end of the war is not going to mean for them a return to the old capitalist economy. Nothing can be gained if we ignore that fact. We cannot deny the worker the right to strike, otherwise we should have in this country a form of slave economy. The strike, however, must be for a just cause and waged only as the last resort.

In Australia we have adopted the system of industrial conciliation and arbitration, which should be employed to meet all the just demands by unionists. It is well-known that the avowed aim of the Communist Party is to smash our system of arbitration. That is admitted, as I shall show by the following

extract from page 23 of this booklet, "The Trade Unions":—

"The Communists regard the State-controlled Arbitration system as a pernicious, anti-working-class institution, whose objective is to keep the workers shackled to the capitalistic state, i.e., eternally wage slaves."

Whilst I admit that our present system has revealed some weaknesses and imperfections—brought about through changes in world conditions—I think it can be claimed that the system of conciliation and arbitration in this country is one of the best achievements of social legislation in any part of the world. The need today is for the provision of a just wage for every worker in industry, a wage that will support the worker himself, his wife and family in reasonable comfort and provide for the higher education of his children, for normal periods of sickness and unemployment, and enable him to acquire, within a reasonable time, a piece of land on which to build and own his own home. The recent clamour for an increase in the basic wage, coupled with a reduction of working hours, brings before us the urgent need for a thorough review of the system of computing the C index figures upon which the Commonwealth basic wage is based. That system has been in operation for many years, with little or no variations in fundamentals. The unjustness of the methods of computing the basic wage is one of the greatest factors contributing to the period of industrial unrest we are experiencing now.

Finally, I wish to make reference to what I believe is a ramp in this country. I refer to tobacco supplies. It is a burning question with most Australians. At first we had Government control of tobacco. Government regulations were discontinued, and then a control system was introduced by manufacturers. Whether that control is necessary at present I am not prepared to say, but I do know that the control committee rations out supplies to retailers throughout Queensland. There is nothing wrong so far, but my complaint is that there are some retailers in this State who are getting their legitimate supplies from the control committee and sending that tobacco to other States and other towns within this State. Why that happens I do not know, but I think it should engage the attention of the Commissioner of Taxation, who might find a reason for it. I know consignments of tobacco are going to southern States and being sold at a few pence a pound above the normal price.

I believe that in this State we have a system of registering tobacco-sellers. I do not know what obligations rest on such sellers in conforming with the Act, but I suggest that the Minister in charge might institute, with regard to tobacco-retailers, a method similar to that in operation with regard to breweries.

When a person buys a dozen bottles of beer from a brewery he has to sign for them. Therefore, why not draft a regulation to provide that when a man buys tobacco from a retailer of tobacco he must sign for it so

that the signed documents may be included in a return furnished to the registrar who issues tobacco-sellers' licences.

I want to say how happy I am to have had the privilege again of speaking on the Address in Reply in this Parliament. There was a time in the history of this State when it looked as if it might be possible that no hon. member would ever again be able to speak on the Address in Reply. However, we were saved from such a calamity and I want to say now, belated though my remarks may be, how much we owe to the fighting men and women of this country who were responsible for delivering us from the spectacle of Japanese occupation in this country. The people of Australia should be ever and always thankful to them for their splendid services.

Mr. PIE (Windsor) (11.52 a.m.): I want sincerely to endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Warwick concerning the attitude of the Labour Government towards the Communist Party in this State. I want to assure him that we endorse them 100 per cent. and agree that we shall never have peace in industry or peace in Australia until we put this communistic element where it belongs. I want to assure him that my party and the Country Party, too, will do everything they can, in conjunction with decent Labour people, to get rid of this sinister element, the Communist Party that has developed in our midst.

The mover of the Address in Reply made a very valuable contribution to debate. I only hope that he will maintain that high standard and that he will continue to read and study and so contribute more important thoughts on important matters. I am sure that the hon. member will agree with me that in Australia a fair day's work for a fair day's pay must be given by everyone, and I hope that it will be always clear in his conscience that he must give to the people of the State a fair day's work for a fair day's pay even in Parliament. The hon. member for Aubigny reminds me, of course, that although we think a great deal of the new hon. member for East Toowoomba he is only a temporary hon. member in this House.

Now I come to the hon. member for Bremer who seconded the Address in Reply. As we all know, he is in this House on the vote of the Communist Party. (Government dissent.) There is no doubt about that. I have here a statement published by the Ipswich paper, "Queensland Times," during the Bremer by-election campaign. It was quoted also by the hon. member for West Moreton and the statement therein was contradicted yesterday in no uncertain manner by the hon. member for Kelvin Grove. The paper says quite emphatically that Mr. Donald said he was tremendously pleased with the Communist Party decision to support the Labour Government candidate in the fight against the common enemy. That has never been contradicted and I followed that statement through and through, actually having got every newspaper cutting during the Bremer by-election campaign. So it is quite certain that the hon. member for

Bremer went in on the result of what I should call an unholy alliance—the support of the Labour Party and the Communist Party.

Here is a further statement from the "Queensland Times," a most interesting one, too, from a man who was supporting the hon. member for Bremer in his election campaign. It says—

"The A.L.P. is a party representing capitalism,"—

the very ones the hon. member condemns this morning—

"and in the main the slogans of the A.L.P. have been slogans of capitalism,"

said Mr. Crisp, a supporter of the hon. member for Bremer who put that hon. member into this House.

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. PIE: The Premier has come in. He could not keep out; he cannot keep out of anything. He said—

"I hope,"—

talking about Communists—

"it foreshadows a change of heart generally."

Did the hon. gentleman say that?

Mr. Hanlon: Yes.

Mr. PIE: The hon. member for Bremer holds his seat because of the support of the Communist Party. Yet we get a speech like that of the hon. member for Warwick! That speech will go all over the countryside of Queensland and show very definitely how this so-called Labour Party condemns the Communists, and yet it took their support in the Bremer by-election for its own needs. That speech, as I said, will go all over Queensland—to every part of Queensland—to show what a true Labour man thinks, yet this very party to which he belongs put a Communist or a near-Communist into this House.

I had contemplated dealing in my Address in Reply speech with some of the more important problems that today face Queensland. The 40-hour week and its effect on production, housing, taxation, international affairs, Queensland's industrial future, social legislation, and full employment. These are just a few of the many crucial subjects that could each form the basis of an address to this House, but I feel that as leader of the Queensland People's Party I should deal more specifically with the matters contained in what I term the 55-minute political address delivered by the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of this session. Let me say at the outset that I listened to this remarkable address on the opening day of Parliament with a degree of amazement, not unmixed with amusement, and with righteous indignation because I believe I was not alone in those feelings—I saw even members on the Government side looking ashamed. I listened, I say, with amazement—amazement that any Government should so abuse their power and privilege as to require the representative of the King to present to Parliament a speech that was patently a crude and blatant attempt to dress the Labour Party's political window for next year's State election—you cannot

deny it—and amusement that any Government should be so bereft of imagination and devoid of pride as to permit matters of pure administration to be written into a Governor's Speech in so exaggerated a form that they become highlighted as matters of major Government policy. The indignation that I had at the abuse of privilege, the ruthless exploiting of tradition, and the lack of dignity in such an opening of our first peace-time Parliament can be imagined.

I wonder what our late popular Governor, Sir Leslie Wilson, who faithfully and loyally served this State and the King for 14 years, would have felt at seeing the opening of a British Parliament reduced to such a level and used so blatantly for electioneering purposes. We all miss Sir Leslie. I believe the Premier does. Queensland owes him a great debt. Many of us wish he were back with us. Perhaps he will be back sooner than we expect.

I found the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech a most curious medley, a recapitulation of work performed, a host of promises for the future—impossible of being carried out under present conditions—and an outline of legislation. As far as the promises are concerned, practically the whole gaudy box of tricks outlined has previously figured in the stock-in-trade of the Labour Party and successive Labour Administrations in this State for nearly 30 years.

Indeed, I would say, this Labour Government will go down to posterity as the greatest band of political promisers this State has ever known. Of course, members of the Government think that all they have to do to win elections is to promise the people something. But I think the Government are in for a rude shock at the next election. The people have become sick to death of this constant reiteration of empty promises, this constant display of all the well-worn and shop-soiled stock pieces this Government trot out at every election: more and better railways; more and better secondary industries; more and better assistance for the rural community; more and better hospitals; more and better education. In short, more and better of everything, except politicians and statesmen. For that is the one commodity that the party represented by the Queensland Government cannot produce; and that failure will be their downfall.

I have often been told that Labour politicians know all the tricks of the political game and since politics in the main is their only profession, they learn to become cunning and ruthless, even within their own caucus and among their own friends, at tactics and manoeuvring. But I find it difficult to believe in this cleverness in political tactics or manoeuvring when I witness this Government attempting to trick the people of Queensland again with the same threadbare stories, the same shop-worn policy that they have tried to sell so assiduously to the electors, term after term. But the people today are looking for leadership. They do not want broken promises; they want realism and action.

In discussing this matter of the Lieutenant-Governor's address, I should like to say right here and now, quite bluntly but without any suggestion of personal feeling—

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. PIE: I wouldn't come in on this—that in my opinion the sooner a Governor is appointed to this State who will be free from any taint of political influence, and cannot be connected with a life-time of political service to one party the better it will be for Queensland.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did I understand the hon. member to say that the Lieutenant-Governor was politically tainted?

Mr. PIE: No. I will repeat what I said. I will make it a practice to be certain what I do say.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PIE: It has been suggested by the Press and not denied by the Government, that General Sir John Laverack will be in line for the Queensland Governorship. I feel I speak for all members of this side of the House—certainly for the members of my own Party—when I say that his appointment would be heartily welcomed. He is a splendid Queensland and a great Australian, a distinguished soldier with a magnificent record of service to his King and country in two wars, and I know from personal and intimate conversation with him in Washington last year, when he was Australia's military representative to the U.S.A., that he has no parochial outlook, but is closely in touch with world affairs, and has a broad vision and a logical mind.

He is not the man to suffer the indignity of being made a party-political mouthpiece, unless my estimate of his character is all wrong.

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. PIE: I am saying that General Sir John Laverack was one. Perhaps I speak for myself, however, when I say that I should still like to see some person of outstanding qualification and with a record of service to the Empire brought from the Old Country to be our Royal representative. There appears to be a feeling, deliberately fostered among certain sections of the community—I do not charge all the Government—that the Governorships of States, in common with the appointments of judges and overseas representatives to important diplomatic posts, should be political plums, and awarded to those whose only qualification is that they have given faithful political service to one section of the community.

It will be a sad and tragic day for this State when that idea gains full credence and vital appointments such as the Governorship of this State are made purely on that basis. But it is possible, for already we have the Hon. Frank Forde teed up for Governor-Generalship of Australia when he is beaten, as we say he will be, in Capricornia by a man who in the last war fought in the ranks and in this became commanding officer of a

Capricornia battalion and entertained Mr. Forde when he visited the troops and who now desires to still serve his country again but in the political sphere.

Then we have the Hon. John Beasley and the Hon. Norman Makin, really Labour men, running for jobs of £2,500 a year plus £4,000 a year expenses free of taxation, running for cover before the next election through the medium of international ambassadorial appointments. (Government interjections.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PIE: Appointments undoubtedly made not upon the test of ability—ability to serve this country, but upon the test of reward for services rendered to a political Labour Party.

Then we have the threat of the Hon. E. J. Ward and the Hon. Mr. Calwell on the judiciary, indicating in no uncertain terms that unless the High Court judges play ball with the Government they should be replaced by political stooges and yes-men.

Mr. Mann: Your party appointed Latham.

Mr. PIE: There you are—he is better than Latham. The integrity of our High Court is the last barrier we possess protecting us from the will of any Government who are ruthless in the administration of their laws. We must reward these judges, these men of the judiciary of the High Court, with salaries to make them above all thoughts of party politics.

We must always remember—and this is important—that primarily the Governorship of any State is to us who are loyal Australians, a symbol of our King Emperor, a tangible link with the tradition of Empire; reminding us at all times that we, the people of this State of Queensland, constitute a part of that happy family group which we are proud to call the British Empire—the British Commonwealth of Nations.

We Australians—and we must not forget it—are basically British. We should be proud to acknowledge that fact. Although I am a second-generation Australian I can tell you that among my most cherished memories are the few weeks I spent during the war in Great Britain: that unforgettable moment in the House of Commons on V-E Day when Winston Churchill came from No. 10 Downing Street and the House rose as one man and cheered him; again outside Buckingham Palace that night when thousands upon thousands of people assembled awaiting the King, the Queen and the Princesses to come out on to the floodlit balcony, the cheering—again I was proud to be British. The majority of the people in this House are proud to be British. I was proud to know I had it in me—some sense of British tradition.

I was proud to know that I shared the rich heritage of British traditions of freedom and fair-dealing bred into the peoples of all classes, people who would never accept any form of totalitarian rule under any circum-

stances. A Socialistic Government in Britain learnt that to their cost when they tried to put some in.

I know it is fashionable for many people to follow the practice of some hon. members opposite of sneering at the British Empire, of talking slightly of our ancient tradition and our great history of achievement. To those who sit opposite in this House, to the small minority of people in Queensland and Australia who follow that ideological line of thought that generally ends up in empty adulation of all things in Russia and Russian, I say, let them go back to Russia, back to the country that has the lowest standard of living among the white races of the world. I saw those Russians wandering along the roads. They had been refugees or slave labour during the war in Germany, and they are like animals. They have no mental outlook in comparison with the worst Australian type, yet these so-called Communists want to build us up to Russia's level. Let them go back to Russia. They have enough work to do there for the rest of their lives and for their children's lives also. Let them work for them, fight for them if they must, but do it in Russia, not in this great free democratic country of ours, and never suggest that the iron dictatorship of the Soviet offers anything to match the proud record of Great Britain and the British Empire.

I would say to this House that whatever faults Britain possesses—and she does possess them—whatever sins she has committed in the past—and she has committed them—the fact still shines as the brightest of beacons in the darkest of nights, that she has brought to the four corners of the world conceptions of decency, of fair-dealing, of tolerance, of courage in adversity and of individual liberty that have never been approached by any nation or empire in the history of the whole of this world.

Britain has given you and me, Mr. Speaker, and every hon. member in this House, as well as all loyal Australians, a birthright that she has given as well to a huge part of the globe where people have British blood running in them, not the least of these being among the people of the U.S.A. That birthright is embodied in the passionate belief in the supremacy of the individual as opposed to the supremacy of the State, which has given us all the fundamental belief that expresses the very essence of Christian civilisation.

So I say to this House that our first loyalty is always to the British Empire. We must thank God that we were born British, and if there are ways and means whereby we can strengthen the ties that bind us to the traditions and heritage of the Mother Country, then let us seek to encourage, develop and use every sense within our power to strengthen those ties, ties that will forever remain the life-blood and abiding strength of the British Commonwealth of Nations. I emphasise again that my reference to a connection through a British Governor is purely

a personal view, and that apart from my desire to retain the direct tie with Britain, I have nothing against the appointment of a distinguished soldier, a man of proved ability, a man of proved culture and intelligence, a man of commercial and—I stress—moral probity.

I only hope that the Premier will at an early date be good enough to favour this House with some indication of the Government's mind on this matter—the appointment of the Governor of this State.

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. PIE: The recommendation comes from the Government because the Premier told me that in answer to a question I asked in this House. I feel that the present situation is most unsatisfactory, even to the Government itself, and cannot but operate to the detriment of the State. I repeat that anything I have said on this subject is not of a personal nature but springs purely from a conviction arising from my own beliefs as to what is in the best interest of this great State of Queensland. I am sure all thinking people in this House must concede that no man, irrespective of party, who has built his life in, on, and out of politics could be regarded as a satisfactory choice as an active Lieutenant-Governor of the State of Queensland.

I want to get back to the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor. I have already indicated that in my opinion it was a curious hotch-potch, a repetition of unimportant work performed, an exotic array of fine promises for the future, combined with an outline of sane legislation in parts that has been advocated by this side of the House for many years. Most of it is long overdue. I take it as a tribute to the party I have the honour to lead that the majority of the sensible reforms and improvements outlined so blithely in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech are the very reforms and improvements that members on this side of the House have advocated, both in this Parliament and from the public platform.

Mr. Power: Rubbish!

Mr. PIE: When I first came to this House as an Independent, with, I admit, considerable admiration for the capacities and leadership of the then Premier, Mr. Forgan Smith—and I say that since his departure the other side of the House has developed into a rabble that he would not have tolerated for a moment—I could see from the practice adopted that it was the duty of the Opposition to oppose everything and propose nothing, since the Government were determined to ignore any suggestions made from this side. But it is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that by constructive debate and concrete proposals this side of the House has forced the Government into belated action on many of the things we have advocated.

We must not, however, overlook the important point that after 30 years in office with the exception of a short period, that hon. members opposite never fought, this Govern-

ment are still only promising such important things as should have been done years ago. I refer to the development of North Queensland—let hon. members go up there and see for themselves, because it is still undeveloped—the Burdekin Bridge, the opening up of our vast coal resources—an analysis of the Blair Athol balance-sheets over a period of years will show what they have been trying to develop the coal there—a realistic approach to the problem of migration, the modernising of our long-suffering rail services plus the electrification of suburban lines, which is long overdue and which has been put into operation in other States, the processing and canning of tropical fruits in North Queensland and not in Brisbane, the creation of a department to specialise in the development of secondary industries, thorough research into our natural and agricultural resources round which industry can be built and immigrant population absorbed, a complete plan for irrigation and water and fodder conservation, and the revitalisation of forestry, particularly soft woods. This State is “going to the pack” from the point of view of reforestation. We should also encourage the cultivation of the soya bean.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. PIE: I suggest to the hon. member that he should ask the hon. member for Maryborough what Hynes and Wilson Hart, sawmillers, of Maryborough, think of reforestation in this State. I was up there the other day and went over their plant. I heard what they had to say. We must also bring up to date our legislation relating to co-operative enterprise. I am glad to know that the Government are proposing to bring in a Bill relating to the sharing of profits in industry. That must come sooner or later. I do it and I know the advantage of it but it will be difficult to get down to a proper basis by the passing of appropriate legislation setting out just what shall be done in connection with the sharing of profits in industry. But if we were to do that we should soon get rid of the tremendous industrial unrest that exists throughout Australia today. I earnestly hope that the Government will go ahead and give effect to the suggestions that I have made and that we on this side have made over a period of years.

Every hon. member opposite now feels that his political existence is threatened—they are suffering with the jitters over there. The Government go to the country next year and that accounts for their frantic endeavours a few months before the election to persuade the people that they have a practical interest in all these things, that they have the State's, not their own, welfare at heart. They want to sell the idea that the job lot of political plans and promises contained in their Lieutenant-Governor's Speech—most of which have been issues for many years—are now, just before an election, certain to be carried out shortly after their return. But pin the Government down—if you can, and you will be lucky if you can—ask them to tell you logically and honestly how and when these things will be done and they will undoubtedly reply—“In the sweet by and by.”

Some of the matters contained in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, indeed most of them of any constructive value, have their foundation in the policy of my party. There is something in the policy of the Queensland People's Party that should go into the policy of the Labour Party if it is thoroughly Labour and that is free education for all, from the kindergarten right through to the University. The Government would not put that in. I have people in the poorer parts of my electorate who have brilliant children but they cannot get through to the University and I have had to fight and fight to try to have their fees paid so that they can go right through with their education. A case was brought under my notice the other day of a lad with outstanding ability. I said to him, “I will not see you stuck even if I have to pay the fees myself. When you get through you can pay them back to me.” I have been working with the University Committee and they have now agreed to let that lad go through. Everybody in the State, every true Australian, is entitled to free education from the kindergarten to the University if he cannot afford to pay the fees. That is my opinion and I am not now expressing the opinion of my party. However, I shall never be happy until all children are given the opportunity to complete their education from the kindergarten to the University.

My time is now drawing to a close and there is one thing on which I desire to comment before I conclude my speech. The Government's proposal as set out in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech for the canning of tropical fruits is really laughable and they will have to answer some very awkward questions when they go to the different electorates in the North, where I have been in the past few weeks. We all know that the Government brought up from the South a Mr. Williams to inquire into the practicability of canning of tropical fruits and I sincerely hope that the industry will be established in the North and not in Brisbane. Incidentally, Mr. Williams is to be congratulated on achieving the distinction of being the only person specifically mentioned in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech.

I regard Mr. Williams as a man of outstanding ability in the canning of colder-climate fruits, but possessed of inadequate practical knowledge of the canning of tropical fruits and the problems that I know are associated with such canning. I say that very definitely, I feel we should have brought a man from Honolulu or America.

Mr. Hanlon: Germany.

Mr. PIE: No, I will send you back there if you want to. I have learned as a result of my recent trip North that every major coast centre he visited on his tour, sponsored by the Government, now expects to become the pivot of thriving fruit-canning industries, and all are under the impression that such co-operative canneries are to be established by this benevolent Government. I sometimes wonder whether hon. members opposite, representing northern electorates from Maryborough to Atherton, ever read

their local newspaper reports. I followed Mr. Williams, and I can assure hon. members that there are going to be some headaches for someone when, say, Ayr gets a cannery and Townsville does not, and when Rockhampton puts in a claim and perhaps preference has been given to Mackay. I can only assume from the vast local publicity given in every major town in the North to these tropical fruit-cannery projects, that the Government have somewhere purchased job lots of tropical-fruit canneries and are promising them with open-handed abandon to all the people up North. I happen to know something about tropical-fruit canning and fruit-juice extracting, as I was associated with it when I was abroad. When the Government cease experimenting with this subject and stop using tropical-fruit canning for political purposes in the North, I will put a tropical fruit cannery up north. That is a challenge. (Government interjections.)

The hon. member for Mundingburra, who when I was in the North was only recovering from a most mysterious illness, was in my audience at Townsville. He has come and abused me in this House and yet although he was in my audience at Townsville he was not game to ask me a question on my address. A man who comes and uses this coward's castle as he does with his reputation in the North has no right to come and abuse me in this House the way he does. He was recovering from a very severe illness which comes to him very many, many times in his life, an illness that we in this House would all be very ashamed of. It is useless for the hon. member for Mundingburra to come into this House and abuse other people if he does not expect to get some abuse back himself. I never won a fight running away from my opponent and I will stand up to anyone bringing abuse into this Assembly.

We will bring industry to the North if we have the opportunity. Until the Government get away from the idea of experimenting in a tropical-fruit cannery we shall never get down to realities. We must get away from the little red book "Socialism at Work" that was issued by the Labour Government when the late Hon. T. J. Ryan was Premier. As I go through that book and underline some of its passages I see what the cry of socialism brought to Queensland.

One of these days when I get the opportunity I will analyse this book and write a book and say how socialism did not work in Queensland. Every one of them has a record of failure—the State stations, the State sawmills, the State forestry, even the butcher shops and fish shops and your rehabilitation of Servicemen. They are all contained there. That book is locked up in my safe because I am afraid I shall lose it, and it is too valuable to be lost. We are getting a few copies run off—although we might have to pay over-riding commission—and they will be distributed throughout the length and breadth of Queensland, to show what "Socialism at Work" really meant. In that book this Government condemn themselves and their future actions. It cost the State many millions of pounds, and you and I as tax-

payers are still paying for the experiment of a Government within the British Empire practising "Socialism at Work." I do not believe in socialism. I believe the man of ability, the man willing to work, the man who takes risks is the only man who can lead this country in the world that lies ahead. We have to have men who will take that risk, who will gamble their future to give employment to other people. I say that the record of socialism contained in that book will not give jobs to anyone in the world that lies ahead.

At 12.32 p.m.,

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

Mr. JESSON (Kennedy): At the outset I offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. Before I make a few observations on my ideas of the future I should like to reply to some of the egotistical and bombastic statements made by the hon. member for Windsor. I have never listened to such a bombastic and egotistical speech in all my life. He does not know the subject he is talking about at all; I will elaborate on that as I go along. For 40 minutes this morning he rendered one of the greatest disservices to Queensland that any member could render to this State. He is the greatest "knocker" of Queensland Queensland ever had; yet we remember this gentleman came to Queensland some years ago with very little and went to the Labour Government cap in hand and got a guarantee with the bank to start a business, and he has now worked it up to a large business.

An Opposition Member: Does that not do him credit?

Mr. JESSON: Definitely—I am not saying that against him—but why condemn the Government when he gets on his feet? Why be such a "knocker" of Queensland? Why drive private enterprise away or stop it from coming in when he has made such a great thing out of it himself? Why does he not do the honest thing and get hundreds of thousands of pamphlets printed and sent out to the millions in England—and Germany if he wants to—stating "Look at me. Look what I did. I am a self-made man under the protection of a Labour Government in Queensland." But no, he is knocking them down in every possible way. I have been to Melbourne and Sydney a few times since he has been a member of this House and people have told me he is the greatest "knocker" who ever went down there; he is always running the Government down. When the question about secondary industries was asked this morning hon. members opposite thought they would get some reply that they could use politically, but what did they get? Information to the effect that it is increasing by leaps and bounds. The hon. member for Windsor is starting a three-quarters of a million factory himself.

Mr. Pie: Half a million.

Mr. JESSON: Half a million.

Mr. Pie: Have you got some shares?

Mr. JESSON: No, by God. I will tell everybody to keep his money out. I will ask the Government to investigate the thing before it is allowed to go through. Money is plentiful today; but remember this: these countries have to be watched very closely and carefully. The hon member is floating a £500,000 company in Brisbane and he has his ordinary activities in the textile trade. I will warn any investor who wants to put in any money.

Mr. Pie: What about your business, C. G. Jesson & Co?

Mr. JESSON: My business is all right. I am not a land shark like you, charging £4 or £5—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to address the Chair.

Mr. JESSON: If they want it they will get it. I am very sorry I have to indulge in these matters, but this gentleman is not going to get away with this. Speaking about canning, he said that Williams went up to all these places in North Queensland and promised canneries.

Mr. Pie: He did not say that.

Mr. JESSON: You read it out of a paper. You do not know what you say.

Mr. Pie: They all expected to get it.

Mr. JESSON: In all sincerity, I would suggest that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, get the proof and see that the proof is not altered to show that he did not say that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JESSON: The hon. member waved the papers around in his pompous and bombastic manner and said, "Here are the headlines! what has the hon. member got to say about a cannery in Townsville?" A gentleman at the present time in North Queensland is contemplating starting a cannery on a co-operative basis with the farmers living around him, but the hon. member says that nobody knows anything about tropical fruits. It shows his knowledge is confined to the Brisbane line, as it was during the war. He is a "Brisbane line" politician. Some years ago the Mona company was started in Townsville. His friend, with whom he is mates now, Artie Fadden, ran it, and it was run as a land-selling stunt. Although the man produced papaws and from the seeds of the papaws produced pepsin and made tropical fruit drinks that went to England and America in 1926 and 1927 they told the farmers who bought this land—I am referring to the Abergowrie development scheme—that they would be guaranteed £20 to £30 a ton for their papaws to be sent to Townsville. Immediately they sold all this land, what happened? The company went into liquidation and left all these fellows who had put their hard-earned money into this undertaking holding the bag. That is the class of individual associated with the people on the opposite side of these benches. They speak of nobody's knowing anything, but that man who processed these papaws and sent them over-

seas to America knows more about it today than he did then.

Mr. Aikens: They worked the same racket in tobacco lands.

Mr. JESSON: Yes, in Woodstock. Fadden was the individual. This little group is called the Aquarium—where sharks are displayed.

Mr. Sparkes: Little Boy Blue.

Mr. JESSON: I know a lot about you too. I made a note of an interjection of the hon. member for Aubigny saying, "Hear, hear!" when the hon. member for Windsor spoke about the co-operative system and the sharing of profits as being the only solution for Australia. I will take a wager now that he would not even share one of his bulls with one of his destitute neighbours.

Mr. Sparkes: I would not share a bull with you.

Mr. JESSON: No. I have no desire to be offensive, but if the hon. member for Aubigny persists in doing so I will give him a barrel that he will not like.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JESSON: What of the hon. member's boss speech at the Trades Hall some time ago, and at the Ipswich workshops? Why did he not attack the Communists, all these disrupters and others at the Trades Hall when he made his speech there?

Mr. Pie: I did.

Mr. JESSON: Nothing of the sort. The hon. member just kidded to them. He was just nice to them and promised them shares in his business. He made the same speech about sharing profits with the workers in the business. He had not the courage to talk to the militant section of the community up there. I will give the hon. member for Windsor this much in—that I have no more time for the Communist Party than he has, but I will say that any man who puts up a fight for the worker, irrespective of who he is, is branded as a Communist or something else by hon. members opposite. The fact remains that the hon. member for Windsor was not game to attack them at the Trades Hall. He made the same speech up there and at Ipswich. A couple of men working in the workshops came back to me and said, "By jove, that fellow Pie is not a bad fellow; he is going to give us the world." I said, "Wait till he gets there and see what he will give you then."

Mr. Pie: I will get there, don't worry.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind hon. members on my left that they must allow the hon. member for Kennedy to make his speech without interruption.

Mr. JESSON: The hon. member for Windsor proved adept in pulling out one of my business cards. I am not ashamed of my business. I reared six children on my business before I came into this House of Parliament. It has been an honest business and I can go back any day I like and start up there. I am doing business with people

in Brisbane today, with whom Bruce Pie cannot obtain dealings. I do not believe in attacking a man, but this egotist—one hon. member on this side has said of him that the next thing we shall hear will be that he is in the films with Clark Gable or somebody else—is looking for it. Hon. members will notice the position in which I am standing today. I am standing here because the hon. member for Windsor would probably race across and attack me if I stood in my usual place, just as he tried to do last year. During an argument here earlier in the week the hon. member for Windsor looked across at me with all the venom and hatred that one man could possibly show to another and he said, "I will fix you." I want that to be noted, because if my dead body is found down the creek or on some vacant allotment it can be put down to the gangster methods of the hon. member for Windsor.

I am not ashamed of anything I have done in this world. The other day, by way of a question to the Attorney-General, this lily-white from Windsor had the audacity to make a nasty suggestion here. He asked the Attorney-General whether a commission agent who was a member of Parliament could charge fees for doing work that could have been done as a member of Parliament. That was a dirty, low, vile insinuation.

Mr. Aikens: That is the sort of thing you could expect from him.

Mr. JESSON: I am the only man on this side of the Chamber who is a commission agent. He has two on his own side. I cannot vouch for them, but I can vouch for myself.

Mr. Decker: Who are they?

Mr. JESSON: The hon. member for Sandgate is a commission agent.

Mr. Decker: No, I am not.

Mr. JESSON: You have it in your wife's name and you have it that way in case there are any blues. I say that there are two commission agents on the other side, or there were. The hon. member for Sandgate was one. He may have it in his wife's name but he gets profit out of it. The suggestion conveyed in the question asked of the Attorney-General is one of the vilest insinuations that could ever possibly be made, and then this lily-white, who goes to the public talking about his high moral character, asks another question in this House. He asks for a report on the price of macaroni, how this firm in North Queensland can get a higher price—

Mr. Pie: 80 per cent. higher.

Mr. JESSON: It is not higher at all. He asked that question, but he did not ask Mr. Speaker or anybody else about himself. He is selling in opposition to this man.

Mr. Pie: No, I am not.

Mr. JESSON: The hon. member was. He also wanted to buy into this man's business.

Mr. Pie: I did not.

Mr. JESSON: This man was going to open a factory in Brisbane.

Mr. PIE: I rise to a point of order. I did not want to buy into the Danesi macaroni factory, but the hon. member for Kennedy came to me and asked me if I would have a look at it and see if it was any good.

Mr. JESSON: I quite agree, it is the result of his dirty filthy information. He came to me and asked me about the thing and said it was a good show to be in.

Mr. Pie: Is it?

Mr. JESSON: You got out of it when you found out. In fairness to this man, I want to say that he has pioneered an industry in North Queensland and has had letters of appreciation written to him from the American authorities for what he has done for them in supplying a very necessary item of food. They took his stuff away to the Islands. (Opposition interjections.) Hon. members are talking through the back of their necks. The American Army authorities bought hundreds of pounds of this stuff from him and so did the Australian Army. I wish I could produce the accounts I had here in this House and I want to tell hon. members something. I had all those accounts in an envelope, together with another envelope full of papers about the Communist Party in a drawer in my room in this House and during the last three weeks they were stolen. I reported the matter to caucus last week. No, I am not making any assertion as to who stole them, whether any member of any party in this House or by someone outside the House. Those documents showed the whole of the accounts of the American Army. There were letters of thanks from the R.A.A.F.—this stuff was sent down to Sydney and down to Melbourne—and they were stolen from my drawer. I can give a written guarantee—I am flying to Townsville tomorrow—that copies will be produced when we are discussing the Financial Statement.

Mr. Sparkes: Did you report the theft to Mr. Speaker?

Mr. JESSON: I did not go as our friend the hon. member for Windsor did and get his photograph in the paper.

Mr. Pie: Is it annoying you?

Mr. JESSON: I can pay to have it in if I want to. This man started his factory and he was the only man who was able to produce this class of food up in the tropical area because it goes mouldy very quickly. This was because of his enterprise, research and his own machinery and notwithstanding even 50 inches of rain he could go on making this necessary staple food. He has done that. Now, what I want to tell hon. members is that a certain price-fixing officer by the name of Kenny, who used to be a member of this House—

A Government Member: A Tory.

Mr. JESSON: I do not like to make accusations but this thing is dirty and very sticky. As I was saying, this man Kenny

came along to this fellow. He was getting 6½d. a lb. for his product and it was being sold down south for 1s. 6d. a pound. The hon. member for Windsor did not say anything about that. He could not compete with him; he had to go out of business. Despite the fact that a cheap article is made in Sydney and Melbourne it is not near the quality of the stuff turned out up north. This man uses semolina flour and the others use flour whites. Their stuff is being sold at 3½d. and 4d., whereas this fellow is getting 6d. and his stuff is being sold in Brisbane at a reasonable price. McWhirters and T. C. Beirnes and other big firms sell thousands of cases of this man's product because it is a superior quality article. I want to come to my point. His price was reduced from 6½d. to 6d. He cannot get storage for his product and it is being put in cases in garages, on verandahs and all over the place. None of those conditions was taken into consideration and they reduced the price to 6d. He then came and protested to me and to the hon. member for Herbert. He saw a firm of solicitors and resubmitted his price for consideration. After an investigation at Canberra and by people sent from Brisbane it was decided that 6½d. was a fair and equitable price. And so he got his price back, but in the meantime, during the two or three months that the negotiations were proceeding, he lost a great deal of money. I am proud of the part that I took in the matter, and it is in direct contrast with the dirty, filthy insinuations by the hon. member for Windsor who tried to damage my character. I know that my statements today will be perhaps twisted by the Press or someone else, but I am "in the clear." The hon. member tried to injure me politically, and not only politically, but in my business concern. It is only a small one, but it gives employment to returned soldiers, and I am getting no money out of it. If a returned soldier is in the factory of the hon. member, the hon. member is getting 20s. in the £1 out of him, otherwise he would not be there.

I have here a list of the orders that this man has received from places as far away as Singapore and Hong Kong. He has had orders from these places and elsewhere since the war ended, he has had orders even from the American military authorities at Manila, and from Tokyo too. He cannot send his stuff from Innisfail to Brisbane by boat and back to these places because of the difficulties of transport. Month after month the greatest obstacles in the world were placed in his way but at least he is getting somewhere. On 3 April last he sent me this letter—

"Dear Mr. Jesson,

If you decide to go to Melbourne about the permit to me for my new factory at Brisbane, I will pay your expenses.

Yours faithfully,
L. Danesi."

I did not have to go to Melbourne, because I was in close collaboration with my colleague in the Federal Parliament, Mr. George Mar-

tens, and Mr. Neil Smith, secretary of the Bureau of Secondary Industries in Queensland. Mr. Neil Smith is an estimable gentleman, one who has done more for Queensland than the hon. member for Windsor will ever do.

Here is another letter that I got from Mr. Danesi—

"I beg to inform you that I have been granted the occupational lease of an army building, near Nudgee station, for the purpose of establishing a macaroni factory. Such grant was due to your endeavours and those of Messrs. G. W. Martens and N. Smith.

"In view of this, I wish to thank you very much for your assistance."

That was on 2 August last, long before those dirty inspired questions by the hon. member for Windsor were levelled at me. So far as taking commission off Danesi, then acting strictly within the limits prescribed, I can only say that it is a filthy lie.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to be more moderate in his choice of language.

MR. JESSON: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but when your are attacked by a person of this description, by the leader of the Pie publicity department, you are hard put to it to reply adequately and keep within the language permitted in Parliament. These accusations are thrown across the Chamber at me because last year I had the audacity to challenge the hon. member when he was suggesting the bringing-out of young Germans, nine and ten years of age. In the next breath he deplored the fact that the housing shortage in this country was so acute that some of our own young native-born people were living under deplorable conditions. He cannot have it both ways. The housing problem is serious all over the world. Wherever you like to go people are living in bags, tents, and under trees. Thank God, it is not that bad in this country, and the position here is improving every day. I remember the previous speech by the hon. member for Windsor which was something like his glorified flag-flapping speech today when he never said one word about Australia or the Australians, but spoke solely about the Germans. There is one thing about the hon. member, and that is that he is an internationalist.

All these things lead up to one point, namely, the hatred they have of hon. members on this side. They think they can say anything in order to blacken a man's character. They cannot blacken my character, as I have lived in North Queensland for nearly 40 years and I have worked among the people there. The hon. member talked about Mr. Kelly. He thought that it was something marvellous to insinuate that a brawl had taken place between Mr. Kelly and me, when in reality all that Mr. Kelly did was to oppose me in the plebiscite. This is a democratic country and Mr. Kelly is entitled to oppose me if he so desires. We will not do what his party did to Senator Foll. Senator Foll

was thought so highly of by the Government of the day that they sent him to Singapore to report on the situation there. When he returned to Australia he reported that everything was all right there, and yet a few months afterwards the Japs walked into it. We know what they thought of Senator Foll, as they cut his head off in the recent Senate plebiscite. We remember, too, how they treated Mr. Dart, the representative of Wynnum in the last Parliament. He was audacious enough to pass an insulting remark to the hon. member for Windsor, calling him Mud Pie—

Mr. Pie: Fong Pie.

Mr. JESSON: Well, Fong Pie, and as a result they cut his head off at the following election. But he has no chance of cutting my head off at the next election.

I should like to bring up one matter while it is fresh in my mind. It has to do with the question I asked of the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock this morning as to representations being made to the sugar mills in the Ingham district to release a certain amount of molasses to feed stock affected by drought. The letter read by the Minister from the C.S.R. Company is not true.

Mr. Pie: It is not true ?

Mr. JESSON: Some of the statements in it are not true. The company blames the drought for not making supplies of molasses available to drought-stricken stock. I made representations on the subject some months ago. The C.S.R. Company asserts that the molasses at the mills in the Ingham district is required for industrial purposes. That is not right. I saw the Minister months ago before that part of the North was affected by the drought. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The C.S.R. Company has its own tramway to Lucinda Point. It takes its molasses to that port and loads it into tanks on its ships, thus saving much trouble in transport. It pays the company to send molasses to Sydney to be refined.

Mr. Pie: Has transport nothing to do with it?

Mr. JESSON: Yes. The company's sheds are full of sugar and it suits it to send the molasses south.

Mr. Pie: I mean transport on our own railways, such as applies at Mackay.

Mr. JESSON: I do not know anything about Mackay. I am the member for Kennedy. The hon. member is the member for Queensland, or he thinks he is. He can put a case for the other side but I am putting up a case for my electorate. There is no problem there associated with transport on the railways. The C.S.R. Company owns the tramway system and it ships all molasses into its own vessels. I have never heard any representative of the sugar industry on the other side asking for an inquiry into the by-products of the sugar industry. The farmer is paid only for the sugar products of sugar-cane. All the profits from rum and chemicals extracted from molasses go to the C.S.R. Company. It is idle for hon. members oppo-

site to contend against the assertion that molasses is taken to Sydney to be refined because of the profits that are returned from that operation. Before the sugar industry asks for increased subsidy from the Government it should examine the profits the C.S.R. Company and other manufacturers obtained from the by-products of sugar and those little things taken out of it.

At 2.15 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. JESSON: At the luncheon adjournment I was referring to the action of the company in refusing molasses to the cane-farmers and dairymen; and by the Minister's reply it looks as though nothing could be done about it. I trust they will try to do something to release this commodity because it is very important on cane farms where they feed working stock and milking cows. The dairymen mix it up with chop-chop and chaff and it may be termed one of the staple diets of horses. However it is their molasses; they can either sell it or keep it. I trust they will review the position again.

There is one matter I should like to mention in connection with the speech delivered by the hon. member for Windsor which was one long condemnation of this Government. He said the Labour Government did nothing for the sugar industry. As a matter of fact, it was a Labour Government who put the northern area on the map. North Queensland was a denuded place and instead of the battle of Milne Bay it might have been the battle of North Queensland only for the Labour Government's building of the North Coast railway, which opened up huge tracts of country, by the Sugar Agreement, and the action of the Labour Governments who renewed the agreement and made arrangements in England for preference. It was a Labour Government who, despite great opposition, built the Tully mill; and what an asset that mill has been to the wealth of the nation!

I now wish to touch on the matter of racing in support of my colleague the member for Baroona. Personally, I am not in agreement with him about the Government control. That is my personal opinion about the Government's taking over control of racing. It is not often I agree with the "Courier-Mail" or the "Sunday Mail." As we all know, they are the mouthpieces of our opponents.

Mr. Sparkes: The Premier said racing is in a satisfactory state.

Mr. JESSON: Just be patient; don't be so impetuous. I was going to say that I agree to a great extent with the creation of an independent tribunal suggested in the leading article in the "Sunday Mail." In regard to appeals from decisions of the racing officials I do not think it is right for the game, or morally, for the people who own race horses to sit in judgment on other people who have race horses, too. I think that is totally wrong; there should be an independent tribunal presided over by a judge of the Supreme Court, and assisted by others

who have no interest in racing at all. I will give a demonstration of how things can be misconstrued by the general public. At a recent meeting a few months ago there were two horses called Guiding Light and Wild Buck. They had a bit of interference on the straight, and the race was taken from Guiding Light and given to Wild Buck. Round the racecourse you could hear people saying they knew well the protest would be upheld because Dr. Crosse was on the committee and owned that horse.

Mr. PIE: I rise to a point of order. Dr. Crosse does not own either Guiding Light or Wild Buck.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JESSON: I do not care who owns them, but the fact remains that a committeeman owned a horse called Wild Buck.

Mr. Pie: It's not Dr. Crosse; it's Dr. Power.

Mr. JESSON: I will correct that: it is Dr. Power.

Mr. Pie: Who owns Guiding Light?

Mr. JESSON: I do not know.

Mr. Pie: A committeeman too.

Mr. JESSON: Well, the same remark applies. If the hon. member's party held a picnic race meeting and his horse was running it would be picked out because he is the leader of the party. I am not saying anything against the integrity of either of these gentlemen, but the circumstances lead to much talk among the public. I like racing myself. I like to put a pound or two on a racehorse if I have it to spare. I follow up form. Racing is one of the only two pleasures I have and I am of the opinion that much can be done to clean up this cause for talk among the public. I can walk about a racecourse and remark that I fancy such and such a horse and somebody will say, "Don't you touch that, George, it is dead today," or, if a certain jockey is riding it, "It is all right." These insinuations are made on the racecourse. There have been allegations that certain stewards were very partial to certain jockeys. Only the other day when the subject of "nod" betting was brought to notice the Queensland Turf Club made an order that every person had to be given a betting ticket whether it was a credit or cash client of the bookmaker. The Press published that Mr. Lynch had said that it would be a great thing to enable a check to be made on bookmakers to find out where they placed their bets on different occasions. The bookmakers did not reply to that, for the simple reason that when their licences came up for renewal they would probably have been refused by the licensing authorities. I do not intend to say anything about the "stand-over" business. I have read in the Press and heard of things that happened behind closed doors of the Queensland Turf Club and that man does not talk to the people as he should.

Mr. Sparkes: Did you ever hear of a place called Kedron Park?

Mr. JESSON: I am not dealing with Kedron Park any more than I am dealing with Captain Cook. I am dealing with the present and the future. As has been suggested by the turf writer or the editor or whoever the writer was of the editorial in last "Sunday Mail," there should be an independent tribunal. I heartily agree with the sentiments expressed.

In the short time at my disposal I will now touch on the tourist trade of North Queensland. It was stated this morning that this Government had done nothing. It is forgotten that we have been six years at war. Moreover, many other factors come into it. It would cost hundreds of thousands of pounds, perhaps millions of pounds, to put the tourist resorts on a proper footing and attract people. I would suggest to the Government that they hasten slowly in the encouragement of tourists to this country until we can provide proper facilities. We have the housing problem at present with us. When the proper facilities are provided we can always attract tourists by advertising and propaganda. It is no use our bringing tourists here in six or twelve months, with the tourist resorts so primitive. Before anything can be done in that direction I suggest the provision of up-to-date licensed hotels, proper sanitation, and adequate water supply. All these facilities should be made before the Government even think of encouraging tourists. We should wait for a year or so until we are on our proper course, when the minds of the people are settled. We should wait until we are over the aftermath of the greatest and bloodiest conflict of all times. We should hasten slowly about tourist resorts and other matters.

Much has been said by Menzies and various speakers on behalf of the infused party—the Liberal, Country, and Q.P.P. I know what they are infused with but it would be unparliamentary to say it. If the 20-per-cent. taxation reduction mentioned by Menzies in the course of his policy speech for the next Federal election comes about somebody will have to suffer under the present set-up, and under the present circumstances it may be the farmers who will have their subsidies removed by the other party if they are returned to power. Goodness gracious me, the farmers are in a better position today than ever in their lives owing to the assistance and subsidies given to them by the Commonwealth and State Governments.

One has only to examine the bank deposits or review the position in various industries to prove that that is so. The banks are bulging with their money today. Take the sugar industry. I know that the Hinchinbrook Shire Council has never been in a better financial position. Its arrears of rates have never been as low as they are, despite the fact that costs have increased while the price of sugar has been stationary. The reason why they have so much money in the banks is that it is impossible to buy flash motor-cars or radios, or go for long trips. Hon. members opposite and the people whom they support took a great deal of money from the farmers

in the days gone by by selling them shares in angora rabbit farms, and probably textile mills and other things. There are no flash motor-cars to be bought today and for this reason the people are not able to spend their money.

(Time expired.)

Mr. WALKER (Cooroora) (2.27 p.m.): I felt that I should speak to the Address in Reply on this occasion because up to date we have heard many statements that are not in accordance with facts. Over the years one gains a certain knowledge and experience which is helpful to one in debate. I know that charges have been made here without any foundation whatsoever. I know they are groundless and although by making them certain parties might gain political capital it must be remembered that these things react to the detriment of our country.

Again, many things that really need not be discussed here have been mentioned. For instance, the hon. member for Kennedy has referred to the Q.T.C. racecourse. I have had a complimentary ticket from the Q.T.C. for the last 40 years and if I had a complaint such as that voiced by the hon. member for Kennedy I should immediately send back my ticket, thank the Q.T.C. for favours received over the last 40 years, and then never visit that racecourse again. If any hon. member wishes to do anything about racing let him start on the starting-price betting that is so troublesome today. Hon. members know that that system of betting is unfair, that it is detrimental to public interest. Why, not only do we find women but also children betting in certain places today.

Mr. Jesson: That is not right.

Mr. WALKER: I walked into a place last Saturday—

Mr. Jesson: In your electorate?

Mr. WALKER: I do not propose to say where it was. Last Saturday I walked into a store and found this place by accident. There were women and youths there and starting-price betting was being indulged in.

A great deal has been said for and against the Government. One thing that is detrimental to past Labour Governments is their venture into State enterprises many years ago. They cost the country £3,000,000 and we are still paying interest on that sum, but not one word is said about that by hon. members opposite even though some of them must know how that great loss occurred. Why, they are advocating a similar policy today.

Again, the strike issue is surely serious, yet hon. members on the Government side persist in referring to the tram strike of years ago, persist in referring to a black Friday. You would have thought somebody was hurt.

Mr. Turner: Some were hurt.

Mr. WALKER: I walked down George Street during that tramway strike—I came down to this House, as was my duty—and never did I see a man hit with a baton

throughout the whole of the strike. Why all this talk about Black Friday? We have had other strikes since then, but they have not been mentioned by the present Government because a Labour Government were in power at the time. Let us look at the strike that took place during the time the late T. J. Ryan was Premier when policemen were sent up north and a man was wounded—I say rightly so, if he deserved it. Why give a policeman a baton to protect himself if you do not want him to use it? Why, they are armed today, but not a word is said about that. We have to abide by the law of the country as it stands, and there is no country with better laws than we have, and there is no country that has a greater freedom than we possess. This is a good country, but why abuse one party for things that never occurred and omit to mention the things that did occur when the party opposite is in power? Let us look at the strikes of recent date, when almost the whole of Queensland workers were prevented from carrying out their legitimate work. Surely one cannot get a bigger conviction against any Government. When I first became a member of this Parliament strikes were almost unknown.

We certainly had the tramway strike and one or two other little troubles; but today, if anything should put the present Government out of power, it is the series of strikes we have been experiencing. The present Government have been in control of Queensland for about 30 years, and instead of there being one or two little strikes and misunderstandings that the Industrial Court could have rectified, we have had the spectacle of strikes for weeks and weeks and hundreds and hundreds of men being thrown out of employment. Those facts condemn the policy of the Labour Government; they show the down-right weaknesses of that Government and prove that they have not the grit necessary to deal with situations as they arise. I could have used a better word, but I will refrain from doing so.

It is a shocking state of affairs to allow these strikes to happen; something has to be done. I know full well that so far as many workers are concerned there are causes for grievances. I know that genuine causes for grievance exist in the Ipswich railway workshops for instance. Those grievances should be remedied; they should not be allowed to continue until they burst into strikes when everyone becomes bad-tempered and the law is broken. The coal-miners, too, have their legitimate grievances. There is the grievance in connection with dust, and I say right here that the dust menace should have been overcome years and years ago. I do not think it fair for a man to go down a mine knowing that dust-prevention methods have not been adopted. I am referring now, particularly to coal-mining, in which we have lost hundreds and hundreds of men. Speak to the hon. member for Fitzroy and the hon. member for Gympie, and they will tell you of the conditions of the men working below of a few years ago. They will tell you that after 10 years these men pass into another world. We all know that

years ago many of our men were enticed to the mines of South Africa on account of high wages, but they were glad to come back to this country and died here in Queensland. If grievances exist, why not have them remedied? Why should they be continued? It is a shame and a reproach to the whole of the Queensland Legislature if we allow men to go down our mines and breathe dust mixed with powder or smoke to the extent that it is detrimental to their health. It is a shame that these things should be allowed.

These pin-pricks are allowed to continue and ultimately develop into a source of serious complaint, bringing in its train discontent and unhappiness everywhere. The Minister for Transport knows very well that the Government have a long record of strikes extending over their 30 odd years in office. Year after year their record of strikes is broken by still more strikes, which clearly shows that their administration is at fault.

Mr. Walsh: This is the first time that you have mentioned it in the House and you were in government for three years.

Mr. WALKER: For the simple reason that I had many other important matters to deal with too but I am happy to know that even the Minister for Transport accepted my advice on many occasions. I hope and trust that these strike difficulties will be overcome. If the Government are willing to do that they may have some hopes of being returned at the next elections, but they will not be returned unless they do.

The meat strike had its rather amusing side and this is of interest to the Minister for Transport. When the strike occurred the Government sat down for a while, I suppose believing that it should be allowed to run its course for a while, but during this period of inactivity on the part of the Government the Government actually broke the law themselves. They allowed butchers' wagons and motor vehicles to run along the highways carrying meat from various country butcher shops to the metropolis, which was in direct contravention of the State Transport Act. Here were the meatworkers helping one side perhaps 50 per cent. and helping the other side, shall I say, 49 per cent.

A great number of meat workers from Brisbane not only went on strike but also went out to the country and helped to supply meat to the city of Brisbane by slaughtering stock at country slaughter-yards, killing upwards of 50 beasts a day, when the killing in normal times was perhaps only one or two head.

As I said before, not one word of condemnation has been uttered concerning the action of the Labour Government in sending the police to Townsville during a serious strike there some years ago, and on that occasion one man was wounded. Let it be remembered that the police are not a lot of brutes, they do not go about batoning people here, there and everywhere. They simply carry out their duty. Even if there was a strike they would not use their batons unless they were attacked.

Mr. Bruce: They were not too nice in '91.

Mr. WALKER: They always have been nice; they have always played the game. It is said that they were armed but all policemen doing night duty carry arms. It is necessary that I should check the wild assertions made by hon. members opposite, otherwise their erroneous statements may pass for the truth. Again I say that I should like to have seen much more reform in the abatement of the dust nuisance in mines than has taken place so far, especially in view of our increased knowledge of the subject gained from all parts of the world. I listened very attentively to the speeches by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply and especially do I remember the remark of the hon. member for Bremer that he did not want to go back to the bad old days. He spoke about the dreadful Moore Government but I suggest to him that his Government should begin their political career on sound lines and first they should give credit where credit is due.

Let me now enlighten hon. members opposite on several matters that concern the Moore Government. There was a reason why the Moore Government became so bad in the minds of hon. members opposite; it was on account of the babies left behind by the previous Government that they had to carry. Just before the Moore Government were elected in 1929 a return was published by the then Secretary for Labour and Industry, Mr. Gledson, which showed that at 30 September, 1928, 46,512 persons were totally unemployed and 69,664 partially unemployed, or 116,176 in all. About one half of the working population was then wholly or partially unemployed. What sort of a baby was that for the succeeding Government to handle?

At that time the Commonwealth Government called a conference of State Premiers because of the economic position of Australia. That conference comprised four Labour Premiers and three non-Labour Premiers. That conference agreed that in the interests of Australia costs must be reduced to save the country from the effects of the depression that existed. Hon. members opposite today endeavour to shoulder any depression that may exist onto the Commonwealth Government. That was one of the troubles that the Moore Government were called on to face. No Government could have done more than we did at the time to help everyone concerned. Prices were low, particularly as regards our exportable products.

Mr. O'Shea: That is why your Government decided to help New South Wales with a loan.

Mr. WALKER: The hon. member knows only one subject.

At that time we made certain concessions to help the man on the land in his fight against the drought. The prices of his products had fallen considerably and we off-set that to some extent by reducing rail freights and fares. Among other matters agreed on under the Premiers' plan of that day was a reduction in salaries. That took place. We had to agree to that. The decision of that

conference was that salaries in every State of the Commonwealth be reduced by 5s. a week. One would think, on hearing hon. members opposite, that there was no precedent for that decision, but we all know that in 1922 the Labour Government of the day in this State reduced salaries. We do not hear hon. members opposite refer to that in any way. I know that several hon. members sitting behind the Government of the day voted against it, but I do not blurt that out at every opportunity, because I recognise it is a matter for hon. members' constituents. In addition to a reduction in rail fares and freights made at that time to assist the man on the land to recover from the effects of the depression and drought, rents also were reduced to help those people who were playing the game. All the economies I have mentioned were effected to save the economic position of Australia. It was proved ultimately that this plan did save Australia. On the other hand, when the Moore Government were defeated in 1932, what did the then Labour Government do to restore wages and conditions that existed prior to the Moore Government's coming into power?

Mr. Devries interjected.

Mr. WALKER: I did not catch the hon. member's interjection, but I would remind him that his Government did nothing whatsoever to restore wages.

Mr. Devries: We did.

Mr. WALKER: Not until 4½ years after they were elected. If what I say is not a fact, then I am prepared to give £10 to any fund in Brisbane. It is no use hon. members opposite trying to get away with it. It was 4½ years before they increased the basic wage, which shows conclusively that they could not do so until the State got over the depression. They should not malign politically a man like Arthur Moore, or any member of his Cabinet who went through a time like that. Many acts of the Moore Government, such as assistance to the wool, wheat and cotton industries, the starting of industries and the establishment of the Brisbane abattoirs, in addition to a reduction in rail fares and freights, are not mentioned by hon. members opposite. We must not forget, too, that the Moore Government had to clean up all Labour's State enterprises. We hear nothing from hon. members opposite of the accumulated losses, amounting to £3,000,000, made by those State enterprises.

Mr. Power: You gave them away.

Mr. Luckins: That was cheaper than carrying them on.

Mr. Power: You gave it away.

Mr. WALKER: I am not sure what the hon. member says but it was not given away. If he is going to give anything away I would advise him to confer with Mr. Lynch, of the Q.T.C.

In order to show how it was absolutely necessary to economise I quote the remarks made by the Minister for the Army, Mr. Forde, who was Minister for Trade and

Customs, and who is going to give a subsidy for the delivering of bread here and in Rockhampton in his own electorate; and he will let the country people get it the best way they can. They will get it and without squealing. The time is overdue for the wiping out of zoning; when that is done you will get good bread and good service.

Mr. Power: Zoning has been wiped out.

Mr. WALKER: It is zoned out our way; the hon. member may have a bakery of his own.

As to the Premier's Plan, Mr. Forde on 18 July, 1931, said—

"Critics overlook that the deficits of Australian Governments will total £70,000,000 next year at the present rate of expenditure.

"Federal public servants' salaries are to be reduced, but better the substantial return for labour under the Plan than no salaries and wages if default had come. Better reduce pensions along the lines urged by the soldiers themselves, than pay nothing or something far less than what is proposed under the Plan."

Don't forget that Mr. Forde said this and that the Commonwealth reduced pensions.

He also said—

"Better preserve to the old age and invalid pensioners at least 17s. 6d. a week, than leave them with 10s. or 12s. a week.

"Common sense dictates the acceptance of the Plan and the protection of the worker and the pensioner from the worse things that would befall them were the Plan rejected."

That is quite sound. The hon. gentleman admitted they had not the money. At that time you could not borrow money. It was not procurable anywhere; and all hon. members know that.

It has been claimed by Government members that the Moore Government lent certain sums to other States.

Mr. Jesson: £5,000,000.

Mr. WALKER: No, not £5,000,000; from memory about £500,000. Let me tell the hon. member for Kennedy that our predecessors also lent money to other States and we had to recover part of it. Why do hon. members not say that they both did wrong instead of saying the Moore Government only did wrong.

A return tabled in Parliament on 13 September, 1922, showed that between January, 1921, and June, 1922, 1120 Government employees were dismissed. That was under a Labour regime; and the figures are taken from Government records. Yet hon. members all support the four strikers, because they were dismissed. What is the difference? Here they knocked off about 1120, and 4247 were subjected to pooling of work. What is the difference? Why do hon. members not remember this when they talk about the four men who were dismissed for some cause at Murarrie? If you took away the right to

dismiss an objectionable person, you would remove all the incentive for the good man to do better.

The hon. member for Brisbane also made certain statements in regard to members of the Industrial Court, statements that I am not altogether in sympathy with and which I think were unfair.

Strange to say, the hon. member made one or two statements that were absolutely sound; that was rather inconsistent of him but nevertheless true. I would remind him, if he needs reminding, that acute unemployment without an intermittent relief-work scheme existed for some years prior to the Moore Government and for many years after the change of Government in 1932. I remind him also that in the 14 years Labour was in office prior to 1929 no provision whatever was made for the unemployed except ration relief.

The hon. member for Brisbane, after criticising the present Industrial Court, stated that there should be more conciliation. We all agree with that. There should be a greater number of little talks between both sides under a properly registered and conducted court, presided over by somebody of responsibility nominated by the Government. A great deal would come out of these talks. It is idle to speak of agreements in the Industrial Court, one side to keep to the agreement and the other side not. It is a question of numbers.

As a matter of fact, it was Kidston in the early days who was the first man to introduce anything in the nature of arbitration. At that time it was called a peace board. The idea was never thought of by the Labour Party, but if that idea had been carried out it would have been a benefit today. Unfortunately the Act has been amended so many times that now neither the worker nor the employer knows where he stands. There have been 23 years of amendments and we do not know where we are today. The position is getting worse, we are getting into a bigger fog. The Industrial Peace Act of 1912 provided for industrial boards consisting of an equal number of elected representatives of employers and employees, and an independent chairman nominated by those representatives. It provided too for the appointment of a judge to act as a court of appeal and also to act in cases of dispute.

The hon. member for Brisbane made the suggestion that the judge should deal with matters of law only in case of a strike or any industrial matter. That would never do. It is impossible to get one man who would be an authority on all subjects. The system of conciliation boards of the days of the Kidston Government was preferable. Both sides to the dispute nominated their representatives. If it was a meat strike, naturally the butchers would be on the one side and the employers on the other. They could talk from the practical viewpoint. The hon. member said, "Let conciliation commissioners be appointed in grouped sections of industry." He then said, "After

the conciliation commissioners had dealt with the matter and given a decision, I suggest that it then be O.K'd by the court." He also said, "There should be a separate conciliation commissioner for each group, such commissioners to be men with experience in the various industries in which they would be called on to conciliate." In case the hon. member for Brisbane is not aware of the fact, I invite his attention to the fact that what he is now advocating is exactly what was contained in the Act of 1929 passed by the Moore Government and left out of the Act that the Labour Government passed in 1932. The hon. member is advocating what the Moore Government did and he is sitting behind a Government who left something out of that Act.

The relevant provisions of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1929 are:—

"Section 27.—Conciliation boards shall be constituted by the court . . . for any one or more of the callings to which this Act applies or to a group or group of different callings.

"The court shall appoint a conciliation commissioner to be chairman for any board so constituted."

I repeat that the 1929 Act contained all the provisions that the hon. member for Brisbane suggested were needed to improve the present Act. I urge that some investigation be made into the whole system obtaining today with a view to evolving something that will overcome the strikes taking place in our midst.

Much has been said about buildings. About 12 or 18 months ago the Secretary for Public Works issued attractive Press cuttings concerning the cost of houses and stating what they were going to do for the soldiers. Present-day costs are far in excess of those mentioned at that time. It was said then that the houses were to be equipped with electricity, refrigerators and many other comforts. We see none of these things provided today. All these things were taken seriously by the people at the time and now they see no actual result of these promises. We were told that a home was going to cost under £1,000.

Mr. Bruce: No.

Mr. WALKER: Of course we were. Homes are costing far more than that today. I ask the Minister what the ordinary worker's home is costing today.

Mr. Bruce: The homes are costing under £1,000, but the building of streets and roads under the ordinances of the Brisbane City Council, and the purchase of land is bringing the cost to over £1,000.

Mr. WALKER: Take the good old very early days in Gympie. The hon. member for Fitzroy and the hon. member for Gympie will bear me out when I say that in those days good, comfortable houses such as those in which we were reared cost only £250. The cost of timber has increased tremendously since then, but it seems strange that the

industry should not have derived some benefit from the scientific methods now applied to the cutting of timber and from the alleged economies being effected in sawmills. The price of timber today is out of all reason. Again, the Sub-Department of Forestry could do much to help. We find that the royalties charged have increased tremendously. In Tewantin it costs 2s. 8d. a 100 superficial feet for ordinary first-class log timber on which the royalty was only 6d. in the early days and in the Brisbane area the royalty on pine is 18s. a 100 super feet in the log. The Government could do much to reduce the cost of homes by reducing the royalty on timber to be used in the erection of homes.

We all know what happened after the last war. Soldiers built homes through a certain building society that was using both Commonwealth and State money, and the prices charged were so high, the interest burden so great that many of them have not paid for them even yet. Now the position will be even worse. It is time that something was done to improve the position. It is time that we found some way of giving the worker an opportunity of building a home for which he can hope to pay within a reasonable period. One direction in which a big improvement can be effected is the price of timber. Why, timber to be used for home-building today is being paid for at the price one would expect to pay for good cabinet timber.

Most hon. members may not remember the days of the pit-saw, but I can assure them that by using a pit-saw, one man being above and one below, we could produce 100 feet of timber in those days at a much cheaper rate than that being charged by the sawmillers today. This surely is a clear indication that something is wrong. All our buildings in the old days were built from timber provided by the pit-sawyer, and we got excellent timber. Surely something should be done in that regard.

Land settlement is almost at a standstill; we have virtually no land settlement going on but statements appear in the Press referring to the settlement of our soldiers on the land and what the Government are going to do. Why, land settlement is virtually dead. We have a knowledge of the country and there is no closer-settlement land to take up excepting by the repurchase of estates or the acquisition of our western land. A little could be done in that direction but it is ridiculous to talk about land-settlement schemes.

Much has also been said about irrigation and at every show one attends one finds representatives of the Crown devoting about 95 per cent. of their speeches to the question of irrigation. Before the Government go into irrigation schemes it would be well advised to think ahead. Much of our land does not lend itself to gravitation irrigation.

Mr. Devries: The flooding process.

Mr. WALKER: Gravitation is the same thing. Over in South Africa much has been done by the gravitation system. On the Stanley River there I saw a wonderful piece of work but the two banks of the river

came so close together as to provide an ideal site for a dam on rock formation. The banks were so high that the water could be distributed by gravitation—without pumping. On the Nile, too, a wonderful scheme is in operation by which the water gravitates over the lower-lying land. We do not want irrigation schemes along the Mary River. The water is there and the land is there and in our worst droughts the holes are full but it has simply got to be pumped and that makes a great deal of this irrigation too expensive. Why, if you irrigated all the lands in the Mary Valley, what would you grow? You could not grow fodder, because it would prove too expensive, and if it was not too expensive the produce would supply half a dozen Brisbanes. I urge the Government to be particularly careful. As a layman and one who does not know the West but has heard reports of the western areas and of the long distances cattle have to go for water I think that the Government should concentrate their efforts out there if there is any money to spend. I know almost nothing of North Queensland, but I do know that if it does produce a lot of perishables you cannot find a market for them.

The Fish and Oyster Acts require amendment. We have had reserves created for sportsmen, and because of the unusual fishing season we have had these reserves have been filled with bream. It is not unusual for a man to catch a caseful of bream weighing up to 2½ lb. Abuse has crept into the privilege given to sportsmen and we find that there are some who are using crab pots and there is no law to prevent them from so doing. Is it the Government's intention to keep these reserves for anglers or are they going to allow them to be exploited by the man with 40 or 50 pots who is catching bream by this means and sending them to the markets although he is breaking no law? I should like the Government to give serious consideration to that question.

The Secretary for Agriculture and Stock spoke of what his Government had done since 1932 to keep the buffalo fly in check, but I can go back another three years to the time that I was Secretary for Agriculture and Stock. I was able to prove conclusively that the buffalo fly could fly over long stretches of water, and that it actually did fly from the mainland to Mornington Island, a distance of 17 miles. If I had had my way on that occasion, I should have had the cattle removed further north-west, where the fly would automatically leave the beasts and so give us a little more time for experiment work. If that had been done we could have achieved a fair deal.

I thank hon. members for listening to me patiently on this, the last occasion that I shall speak on the Address in Reply. I thank them all very sincerely.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. INGRAM (Keppel) (3.7 p.m.): In the first place I wish to extend my sincere congratulations to the Lieutenant-Governor on his elevation to such an important position. I am sure that he will carry out his duties

with credit to himself and to the State in general. I trust that he will enjoy the very best health to enable him to carry out his duties, and that he will live long in that position.

I also wish to extend my hearty congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply on their very excellent speeches. I am satisfied that the electors of East Toowoomba and Bremer made very wise choices in their representatives, and I am sure too that those hon. members will carry out their duties in the best interests of their electors. I express the fervent hope that they will be permitted to represent those electorates in this Parliament for very many years to come.

I have listened to this debate with a fair amount of interest, and not without some amusement. I was particularly amused at the rash statements of hon. members opposite, especially hon. members of the Country Party, concerning the meat dispute, all of which were made for the purpose of political propaganda. In the course of his speech the Leader of the Opposition said that many thousands of people in this State seem to think that the Premier and the Government had no interest in the strike whatever and made no attempt to bring about a settlement. What a foolish and ridiculous statement! At all times the Premier was ready, day and night, to meet representatives from both sides of the dispute, while the interests represented by hon. members opposite were content to enjoy themselves in Sydney or to go electioneering for the Federal Tory Party in other parts of the State. The Premier and his Government faced the issue until a settlement was reached. I have been requested by the electors of Keppel—and especially the farmers, bear in mind—to extend to the Premier, Hon. E. M. Hanlon, their sincere congratulations on his actions and on bringing the strike to a successful conclusion. Notwithstanding all the criticism that has been levelled against the Government by the Opposition not one suggestion have they made for avoiding a recurrence of a similar situation in the future. It is my honest opinion—bear in mind what I say, my opinion—that the Tory Party was extremely disappointed that the strike should have finished as soon as it did. Its members earnestly hoped that it would extend to the eve of the Federal election campaign and that the grand old Labour Party would be defeated. Had hon. members opposite been in power when that dispute occurred they would have employed the same old tactics that were used in 1891 and 1912. In 1891, under Tory rule, innocent men were chained, belted, bashed, shot and gaoled. Not that I remember 1891, for that is the year in which I was born, but I am proud to know that my father was one of the strikers who were belted by the agents of the Tory Government in power at the time.

Why, even the ex-leader of the Queensland People's Party the hon. member for Hamilton was sworn in as a special constable in

1912 to help the Government of the day to baton men, women and children off the streets or Brisbane.

Mr. Brand: Who was batoned?

Mr. INGRAM: Men, women and children during the Brisbane tramways strike. Yet the two Tory parties opposed to Labour get up and tell the people that they are behind the workers! Did you ever hear such ridiculous nonsense? To hear them talk one would think they were the saviours of the working class, but their interest in the toiler is nil. Their statements are mere propaganda designed to defeat the Government at the next election, but in thinking that they "have another think coming to them." I want to tell the Opposition right here and now that the people of Queensland will never forget the 1929-32 regime of the Moore-Barnes Government. That party came into power by its great election promises of "£2,000,000 and 10,000 jobs," "Give the boy and girl a chance." When that party was returned did it give the boy and girl a chance? No, definitely no. Instead of setting aside £2,000,000 for 10,000 jobs it sacked thousands of workers, slashed wages, ring-barked the Arbitration Court and even took 1s. a week off the poor widows and orphans. They also made the swagman travel 58 miles instead of 25 in order to receive 4s. worth of rations a week. They did not give the single man one day's work a week, but gave him 10s. once every three months to buy shoes and clothing. Did you ever hear of such treatment of our young men? That was because they were sheltered under their parents' roof. A single man had to go out into the country at that time before he could get relief. Those are facts that cannot be denied. I happened to be one of those men who were on relief work at the time. I had a son who was unable to get relief work because he was living with me. I refused to let him go into the country notwithstanding that he, like myself, was virtually starving. I saw single men and swagmen put into gaol at that period for jumping the train to travel from one centre to another to look for work. After they had completed their terms of imprisonment they were sent out onto the track again by the then Tory Government, a policeman following them along the street until they reached the boundary of the town to make sure that they were on the road again. They went even further than that, as I will illustrate. When I was engaged on relief work a swagman approached and asked me for a smoke. A policeman was 200 yards behind him running him out of the town. That policeman came to me and said, "Did that man ask you for anything?" I said, "No." He replied, "Just as well, otherwise I should have had him under the Vagrancy Act." That was the treatment meted out to our swagmen on the track looking for work cotton-picking or farm work. It was not until 1932 that wages were increased and single men received one day's relief work a week, and other drastic measures were thrown overboard. Yet we have the parties in Opposition telling us they are the friend of the worker! That, as I said previously, is mere political propaganda.

Let me take you a little further. In 1929 when the Moore-Barnes Government came onto the Treasury benches, they found £5,000,000 in the Treasury that had been left there by the McCormack Government. What did they do with it? I will tell the House as I go along. Recently I heard the hon. member for Isis criticise the Government for letting contracts out of this State for railway locomotives and depriving local engineering establishments of that work. He said that the Government should support manufacturing industries that are willing to provide work for the workers of Queensland.

Mr. Brand: Don't you agree?

Mr. INGRAM: Yes, but wait till I am finished with you. Did the hon. member ever protest against the action of the Moore-Barnes Government, which he supported in 1929-32, when they gave New South Wales and South Australia £2,000,000 of the £5,000,000 they held, which was used to build the underground railways in connection with the Harbour Bridge in Sydney for the benefit of the workers in New South Wales while the workers here were starving and in poverty?

What about the criticism by the Opposition of the Labour Government's decision to have the Tully mill crushing machinery manufactured at Maryborough? I admit the contract price is more than the machinery could have been bought for overseas, but they have provided considerable employment for our people and kept the money in this country. I am pointing out these things to show to the House the inconsistency of the Opposition. While on the one hand they criticise the Government for going outside with tenders for locomotives, on the other hand they oppose the Government's decision to have sugar-mill machinery constructed in this State. Did you ever hear such two-faced talk in your life? It is all very well for the Opposition to get up and criticise the Government, but let them look back on their own records and they will hang their heads in shame.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. INGRAM: We have heard a great deal of criticism of the Government from the Opposition about preference to the returned men. I want to ask the Opposition how many private employers have honoured their obligations to the ex-servicemen and women of this State. In this regard I refer to the C.Q.M.E. Company, Lake's Creek. These are the industries that the Opposition support—meat barons, great shipping combines, and financial institutions. They talk about the preference clause, but the C.Q.M.E. Company is not giving preference to the returned soldiers. Returned men discharged from the army went back to their jobs at the Lake's Creek meatworks where they were working prior to enlistment or call-up; and they have been unemployed since the strike. Some men have had from four to five years' service and they have been following up the C.Q.M.E. office picks every day, but this company still does not recognise the majority of these returned soldiers in Rockhampton. If a returned soldier has a touch of malaria he

is not wanted by the company. If necessary I can give the names of these returned soldiers to the House.

We have the great Tory party with a great hue and cry about preference, yet their own supporters are not observing that preference clause. The Central Queensland Meat Export Company has not even been treating the unions in a proper manner since the commencement of the works. Pin-pricking is going on by the works managers themselves to make the men discontented. They have treated free labourers far better than they treated members of the A.M.I.E.U. They made accommodation available in the dehydration plant at the Lake's Creek meatworks, and several of the free labourers are sleeping in that dehydration plant room. That should not be allowed. I will show members of this House how the Lake's Creek company is treating free labourers and giving them greater concessions that it gives to A.M.I.E. Union members. If a union member were to come from any other part of the State and go to work for the company it will not say, "I will find you accommodation in this town; I will let you live in the dehydration plant."

As an instance of what the company has done for free labourers, this is a notice by the Central Queensland Meat Export Co.—

"Notice.

"It is appreciated by the management that the sleeping accommodation on the works is inadequate and therefore could only be used as a temporary measure. To assist those who wish to obtain outside accommodation the management is endeavouring to supply a service for you by contacting various guest houses weekly to ascertain the accommodation position.

"The present position is as follows—

1. Strathearron—1 room with 2 beds. cost 25s. weekly per person, without meals.

Address—169 Denison Street, Rockhampton.

2. Hotel Central—1 room with 2 beds. Cost £2 10s. weekly per person, with meals.

Address—114 William Street, Rockhampton.

3. Newmarket Hotel—2 rooms each with 2 beds. Cost 17s. 6d. per man per bed. Without meals.

Address—140 East Street, Rockhampton.

4. Oxford Hotel—Vacancy for 14 men on July 25th. Cost 10s. per day. Board and meals.

Address—16 East Street, Rockhampton.

"All inquiries can be made at the personnel office."

This is what is being done to encourage free labour and to do away with unionists.

Mr. Pie: Do they not have to belong to any union? Have you not a new union there?

Mr. INGRAM: No, we have not, and you know that. In order to show how sincere private enterprise is—and these are the people that the Opposition support and protect—I quote the following illustration. On 26 July, 1946, the company's works manager informed the secretary of the A.M.I.E.U. that he wanted men to work overtime at the week-end for the purpose of having a meat boat loaded at Port Alma. The union agreed on condition that the company selected members of the union who were still unemployed and followed up the union office every day for a pick in case more men were required at the works. The works manager, Mr. Hinchliffe, refused to do this. The union told him that none of the union members who were already working at the works would work overtime to put out meat to load the boat unless the unemployed unionists were selected; and let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that among these unemployed unionists are dozens of returned soldiers. I challenge contradiction on that.

Mr. Hinchliffe then got in touch with the industrial magistrate at Rockhampton, Mr. Power, who called a compulsory conference at 4 p.m. on the same date. After hearing both sides, he recommended to the company that it select competent labour from the unemployed unionists of the A.M.I.E.U. This recommendation of the industrial magistrate was refused by the works manager, Mr. Hinchliffe. The magistrate then telephoned the works manager to come to another conference but he refused to attend any further conference because he said it would be of no use to him. The result is that the men who are assisting to load the boat with meat, who receive £7 5s. 3d. a week for their usual week's work, are receiving because of working this extra time £12 6s. 10d. a week, and the unionists whom Mr. Hinchliffe refused to take are still unemployed, together with the returned soldiers. Had these men been picked for this work they would have received £5 1s. 7d., but the free labourers reaped the benefit.

That is what the meatworks company is doing today. I am merely pointing out these things so that members can see what class of employer we have in our midst. Who are the brigands and ruffians referred to by the hon. member for West Moreton? He said the employees were. It is employers of this description who are the brigands and ruffians—not the workers—and whom this Tory party protects all the time.

Now for a word or two on the Leader of the Q.P.P., but I would mention they are all one—the Q.P.P., the Liberal Party, and the Country Party. There is not a bit of difference.

Mr. Pie: That is good. We hope you tell them that at the next election.

Mr. INGRAM: It will do the hon. member no good. On 13 August it appeared in the "Telegraph" that the hon. member for Windsor had said that the Commonwealth Government should refund the shilling-a-week rise in the basic wage, because it had been swallowed up by taxation. There was

no protest from the Leader of the Q.P.P. or any of his members—of course they were not members of Parliament at the time—when the Moore Government smashed wages, gave £2,000,000 to another State for the unemployed, and took 1s. a week from the little orphans. Did they enter any protest then?

Why do they protest today? They do so merely in order to try to make out to the people that they are the great saviours of the worker.

Mr. Pie: You will be stealing the thunder of the hon. member for Baroona soon concerning the Moore Government.

Mr. INGRAM: I am not worrying about the hon. member for Baroona. If the Queensland People's Party should ever succeed in being returned to power in this State—and I am certain they will never be—what will be the position of those who were born and bred in Queensland? We heard their main spokesman, Alderman Russell Roberts, advocating the importation of 100,000 Japanese into Australia, 5,000 of them to be kept in Brisbane.

Mr. Pie: He is not our main spokesman.

Mr. INGRAM: He was at the time he made the statement. He advocated the bringing of 100,000 Japanese to Australia, 5,000 to be kept in Brisbane. Why were they to be introduced? It was merely to make more unemployment for our Australian bred and born. They cannot deny that statement, and, furthermore, I heard no word of protest from the Queensland People's Party, nor did I see that they had contributed to the protests appearing in the Press at that time.

Mr. Pie: You must be deaf.

Mr. INGRAM: They made no objection to it.

Mr. Pie: We do now.

Mr. INGRAM: To hear hon. members opposite speaking in this Chamber one would think that they had a great knowledge of both coal and metalliferous mining. To my mind they know nothing whatever about the mining industry. I do not pretend to know anything about coal-mining but I do know that the Secretary for Mines and the Queensland Labour Government are doing everything for the benefit of the coal-miners and to speed up production. I have had 14 years' experience in metalliferous mining at Many Peaks and Mount Morgan and I have done hard work. I have not been content to walk about the streets as the hon. member for Windsor has. When I worked in those days, conditions in the mines were intolerable. Of course, this was before the advent of a Labour Government. There was no such thing as water laid on in the stopes to lay the dust and the heat was so severe that the work had to be carried out on the system of 10 minutes in and 10 minutes out.

Mr. Pie: What Government were in power at the time when you were working under those conditions?

Mr. INGRAM: The Denham Government, the same party that sits on the Opposition side today. Such conditions as those under

which I worked do not exist today. In those days I saw young men only 26 years of age die from that dreaded disease, miners' phthisis, which was brought about by the rotten conditions under which men had to work. The Tory Government would not attempt to do anything to relieve the position and the mining companies were just as callous. They thought more of horses than they did of the men because they could get men for nothing whereas they had to pay exorbitant prices for horses to work underground.

The Tory Government of the day did not attempt to bring down legislation to provide for the wife and family of a miner who was stricken with this dread disease. It took a Labour Government to provide these benefits for those who worked underground. It was not until a Labour Government came into power that all these conditions were altered and the mines made worth working in as they are today.

Mr. Pie: Do you say the mines are worth working in today?

Mr. INGRAM: I have worked under Tory Governments since 1906. During those days conditions were absolutely disgraceful. When I was a lad of 15 I worked 12 hours a day and received only 5s. a week. Does that apply today? No, under Labour Government it does not apply.

Mr. Pie: How much do they get?

Mr. INGRAM: I have worked in railway cuttings, in ballast pits, and on the lengths for 9d. an hour, and in those days you had to buy your own tent and tools to get a job. Does that state of affairs apply today?

Mr. Pie: What do you get today? £850 a year?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Windsor will have to obey my call to order. The hon. member for Keppel is entitled to make his speech without any assistance from any hon. member.

Mr. INGRAM: I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor made a remark and I wish to say that I give him the same protection when he is speaking.

Mr. INGRAM: I want hon. members of this House to understand that I am a keen supporter of conciliation and arbitration. It is the policy of this Government, and on it I was elected a member of this Assembly. I should not be a party to the strike weapon unless it was used in a constitutional manner. If it were not for the Industrial Court in this State our workers would be in a dreadful position, and we have a Labour Government to thank for establishing such a tribunal.

On 8 August the Leader of the Opposition said that the Government made an announcement about a hospital programme, but never did anything. The statement is absolutely untrue, and I am about to quote facts and

figures to prove it. When a Labour Government took over in 1915 there were 3,138 hospital beds, but today that figure has increased to 7,414. In 1915 the number of patients in hospitals was 35,684, but today it is 127,030, or an increase of 91,346 extra patients to be catered for. Again, in 1915 the maintenance cost of hospitals amounted to £211,670, but at the end of the financial year 1943-44 it had increased to £1,518,559, or an increase of £1,306,889. For the 10-year period 1933-34 to 1943-44 the number of out-patients increased from 198,766 to 265,832.

I am coming to the point I wish to make, and that is the assistance given to hospital boards. The assistance to hospital boards in Queensland for the year 1944-45 amounted to £675,716 and the contribution for the same year to voluntary hospitals amounted to £27,612; the contribution to ambulance brigades amounted to £52,797, the total being £756,125. In 1945-46 the Government found the whole of the hospital maintenance costs as well as capital expenditure in works of all descriptions. In maintenance the contribution by the State Government was £1,409,318, the contribution by the Commonwealth Government was £642,602, and in the building programme the cost borne by the State Government was £354,738. Those figures prove how the Queensland Labour Government have catered for the sick and suffering.

Mr. Gledson: More in one year than the Tory Government spent altogether.

Mr. INGRAM: In those days the care of the sick and the injured was left to charity, to depend upon individual generosity which was proved to be unreliable. The Labour Government have a policy of catering for the sick and suffering with Government subsidy, not relying upon private persons to give this or that or pay for this or that.

I have heard a good deal from hon. members opposite in lauding Mr. Menzies. They spoke of his wonderful speech the other night and of the great man he is. Some hon. members opposite were even on his public platform and some are going to the country to help him sweep the polls, but they have no hope of doing that. What has been said about this great Leader of the Opposition in the Federal sphere? Here is what the Press says:—

“Bungling and Incompetence of Menzies Government.

“Jobs he shirked when in office.

“Tory Press change of front.

“Today the Tory Press is lauding Menzies and advising the people to place their trust in his leadership, but a few years ago it denounced him and his Government for their incompetence and inability to take positive action both in pre-war times and during the war, when our very existence was at stake.”

The “Sydney Morning Herald” of 17 August, 1943, summed up Menzies in the following words:—

“Anyone who attempted to place complete and absolute confidence in Mr. Menzies was likely to become bewildered.”

The following also appeared in the "Sydney Morning Herald" of 21 August, 1940:—

"The mass of electors would feel more confidence in Mr. Menzies as Leader if they were convinced—and they by no means are convinced—that he means to place national needs before Party exigencies."

Lest the public might think that the criticism that has been levelled at the Tory Parties is merely the remarks of political opponents, it is well to quote a few statements in which the Tory Press severely criticised the Government's inability to meet the situation that then confronted Australia. The "Daily Telegraph" of 23 May, 1940, said:—

"Don't let us deceive ourselves. There has been bungling, inefficiency, temporising and confusion. It is now on the (Menzies) Government's own head to get us out of the mess."

The "Sydney Morning Herald" of 26 July, 1940, said:—

"The (Menzies) Government has become stale. It contains too many dissentient factions and its personnel is sadly lacking in administrative ability."

The "Sydney Morning Herald" of 29 July, 1940, said:—

"Through political timidity the (Menzies) Government drifted on inactive for month after month."

The "Daily Telegraph" of 30 July, 1940, said:—

"No-one can be satisfied with the present (Menzies) Government. The people are united, but the leaders are not."

The "Daily Telegraph" of 27 August, 1941, said:—

"He (Mr. Curtin) says he has given the (Menzies) Government loyal support. So he has. But despite that the Government has failed."

The "Daily Telegraph" of 20 April, 1942, said:—

"Since Labour took office Australia has got a lot of important jobs done—jobs the last two (Menzies and Fadden) Cabinets talked of but shirked."

This is the leader that hon. members opposite urge that the people should put back into power, but he did nothing for the people when his Government were in power.

In conclusion, I want to say that I am proud to belong to the Australian Labour Party and to be a member of a Labour Government party. I belong to a party that is game to face an election anywhere under the same old name of the Labour Party. No need is there for us to change the name of our party at every election. We can rely on Labour's doing the job and Labour will do the job.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Moore, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 3.41 p.m.