

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 17 AUGUST 1950

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 17 AUGUST, 1950.

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

QUESTIONS.**PRICES OF WEEK-END FISH, BRISBANE.**

Mr. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

“1. As fish depots are closed over the week ends, will he reconsider the regulation or rule that fish kept in depot refrigerators over such period, and sent to Brisbane on Mondays is paid for at contract prices, whereas if taken from the fishermen's own refrigerators it is nailed at owner's risk?”

“2. What is the reason for such discrimination?”

“3. Is he aware that this regulation or rule often acts to the advantage of the buyers at the Brisbane market and to the detriment of the fishermen concerned although the fish is of the same quality in each case?”

Hon. A. JONES (Charters Towers) replied—

“1. The regulation referred to is in conformity with a provision in an agreement made between the Fish Board and the

Queensland Professional Fishermen's League which has been signed by the majority of full-time fishermen. This provision is as follows:—

'No fish shall be accepted by the Board for purchase by the Board or received by the Board for sale on behalf of the Vendor at any depot branch market or market between the hours of 8 o'clock in the forenoon on any Saturday and 7 o'clock in the forenoon on the following Monday, and no fish which has been in cold storage other than on a fishing boat during that period shall be purchased by the Board, but any such fish may be consigned to the Board for sale by auction at the Vendor's risk:

'Provided that the Board shall receive fish from all boats arriving at any such depot branch market or market before 4 p.m. on a Friday.'

'2. To comply with the provision of the Agreement.

'3. Such is not the case as fish of equal quality of the same variety is invariably sold at the same price, whether it is purchased by the Board or sold on consignment.'

TRANSPORT OF FISH FROM THURSDAY ISLAND.

Mr. WORDSWORTH (Cook) asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

'In reference to the decision of the Fish Marketing Board that fish sent from Thursday Island by plane is accepted at Cairns at contract prices, whereas if sent by the 'Elsanna,' it is accepted only at owner's risk,—

(1.) In view of the fact that the fish sent by plane is out of refrigeration for over twelve hours (and often then sent to Brisbane by rail), whereas if sent to Cairns by the 'Elsanna' it would be continuously refrigerated, will he have inquiries made into this matter and advise the reason for such apparently unreasonable discrimination?

(2.) In view of the regular shortages of fish at the Brisbane market and the fact that, during many periods, abundant supplies could be obtained from the fishing grounds of the far North, will he reconsider the Regulation which prevents fish being sent direct therefrom to Brisbane by the 'Elsanna'?

(3.) Will he also consider the advantage that would accrue both to the fishermen of the far North and the Brisbane consumers if their fish were accepted at contract prices for direct transport by the 'Elsanna'?

Hon. A. JONES (Charters Towers) replied—

'1. The reasons for the discrimination are:—Under the Agreement between the Fish Board and fishermen it is provided that any fish to be purchased by the Board shall be in first-class condition. Consignments of fish by air from Thursday Island

to Cairns reach the Market in a few hours, and being carried at a high altitude suffer no deterioration and are received in a first-class condition. On the other hand, fish carried in the refrigerated chamber of a ship becomes hard frozen by the time it arrives at the Market, and it is not possible for an Inspector to determine its condition in that state. The Board, therefore, considers it a reasonable condition that it should be accepted for sale at the consignor's risk. In this connection the Board has been advised by the operating Air Company that if the fishermen who are basing their operations on Thursday Island can guarantee an increased freight of fish, say, in the vicinity of 10,000 pounds weekly, a special plane will be put into service.

'2. There is no regulation or rule which prevents fish being consigned to Brisbane from the far North by the 'Elsanna' or any other ship which has refrigerated accommodation, provided it is sent to the Market for sale at the owner's risk.

'3. See answer No. 1.'

MEMBERS RETURNED IN ELECTORAL ZONES.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) asked the Attorney-General—

'As a result of the elections held on 29 April last, how many Government and non-Government members were elected in (a) Metropolitan Division, (b) South-eastern Division, (c) Western Division, (d) Northern Division?'

Hon. J. LARCOMBE (Rockhampton) replied—

'I am sure some hon. members would object to me placing them in Party Political categories. I suggest that the hon. member make his own classification and calculation.'

COST OF HEARING AIDS.

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

'In view of the high original and replacement and servicing costs of mechanical hearing aids, will he consider either supplying these to persons unfortunately suffering from deafness and in need of them, or alternatively, will he consider financially assisting those sufferers who need them and at present cannot afford them?'

Hon. W. M. MOORE (Merthyr) replied—

'In October last the Commonwealth Government announced its decision to provide as part of its National Health Scheme hearing aids without charge to deaf school and pre-school children through the Commonwealth Acoustics Laboratories. Inquiries are being made as to the Commonwealth's proposals for an extension of the service to the deaf generally.'

PHOTOGRAPH OF WOMAN IN POLICE CUSTODY.

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

"1. Has his attention been drawn to a photograph appearing in the 'City Final' edition of the 'Brisbane Telegraph' newspaper of Tuesday, 15 August, depicting a woman prisoner on remand and in charge of escorting police officers, lying insensible on the roadway outside Roma Street Railway Station, after she had lost consciousness, collapsed and fallen as a result of the callous, despicable, and illegal attentions of Press photographers who had lain in wait for her arrival?

"2. Will he cause inquiries to be made to discover how the Press photographers knew the woman would arrive at Roma Street Station at that time, and if any police officer was responsible for giving the information to the Press, will he take suitable action against such officer?

"3. As our conception of justice deems a person innocent of any charge until proven guilty, will he take appropriate action against the members of the police escort who failed to protect their prisoner from the illegal interference by Press photographers which culminated in the shocking incident depicted?

"4. Will he examine the possibility of prosecution of the Editor, Publisher, and Press photographers of the 'Brisbane Telegraph,' who, by the taking and publication of the photograph, reached an all-time low in sadistic and sensational journalism?

"5. Will he instruct members of the Police Force to at all times protect prisoners so as to prevent them being subjected to similar brutal indignity and injustice?"

Hon. W. M. MOORE (Merthyr) replied—

"1. I have seen the photograph, but there is no evidence that the weakness with which the prisoner was overtaken was contributed to by any outside agency.

"2. I am satisfied from my inquiries that no information was given by any Police Officer to the Press. The Honourable Member very well knows that the Press have representatives in all parts of the State. The Police do not exercise censorship over communications between the Metropolitan Press and their representatives in country areas. On this occasion, on account of the intense publicity created by the Press in this case, their representative at St. George would have an intimate knowledge of the movements of the prisoner.

"3. There is no evidence that any Police Officer failed in his duty.

"4. I am advised that no prosecution lies for the publication of this photograph. Publication of matters such as this are the responsibility of the Editor of the newspaper concerned. Whilst we deplore the low standards of ethics in this particular case there are no grounds for prosecution.

"5. The Police entrusted with the responsibility of escorting prisoners are at all times fully instructed as to their functions in relation to the protection of all interests involved in such circumstances, and on this occasion, on account of the prisoner being a female with a young baby, especially humane treatment was extended to her for which she has expressed her deep gratitude to the Police concerned."

GEIGER COUNTERS FOR PROSPECTORS.

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

"In reference to the statement in a special article in the 'Courier-Mail' of 16 August that the Government of South Australia is providing Geiger counters to approved uranium prospectors at a rental of £1 per month, is any similar provision made in this State?"

Hon. W. POWER (Barooka) replied—

"No. In South Australia there are known radium deposits, and the instruments can be helpful in tracing the richer ore. However, in Queensland, the known occurrences carry traces of uranium only and are of purely academic interest. The Department of Mines, however, has Geiger counters which are used by its trained geological staff. The use of these instruments by untrained or inexperienced persons can be misleading as such instruments do not distinguish between radio-active minerals, and react also to monazite which is of fairly common occurrence. The present practice whereby prospectors submit samples to the Department for examination by experts is more suitable under conditions obtaining in this State unless and until there has been uranium ore located."

FREIGHT ON INDUSTRIAL MACHINERY TO BOWEN.

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin) asked the Minister for Transport—

"In view of the great number of classifications for freight charges in the Railway Department, will he explain why the railway officer, who consigned the rotary furnace for Mr. Mack, did not advise him of the necessity for a detailed and adequate description of the material consigned?"

Hon. J. LARCOMBE (Rockhampton—Attorney-General), for **Hon. J. E. DUGGAN** (Toowoomba), replied—

"The rotary furnace for Mr. Mack was consigned on his behalf by an experienced carrying firm well aware of the procedure to be followed in consigning goods by rail. It was the responsibility of the consignor to adequately describe the goods consigned."

WATER SERVICES, KENMORE SCHOOL.

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

“1. Has he seen a report that at the Kenmore State School the only drinking and ablution taps provided for the use of the pupils are situated away from any overhead shelter, and that, during wet weather, the only approach to them is through thick mud?”

“2. Will he verify the accuracy of this report and, if correct, will he issue instructions that more suitable arrangements be made for these very necessary conveniences?”

Hon. G. H. DEVRIES (Gregory) replied—

“1. Yes, I have seen the report regarding the drinking and ablution taps at the Kenmore State School. I also know that representatives of the school committee called on an officer of my department, who advised the people concerned that the matter had been referred to the Department of Public Works. That department, after having investigated and considered the situation, decided to defer the work. It is thought that in this rapidly growing district additions to the school will be necessary at some time in the future. The possibilities are that the arrangement of the taps will be altered when additions to the school are provided. It is suggested to the Honourable Member that if he desires any work to be done at any school in his electorate he should make representations to my department in the proper way instead of seeking publicity per medium of a question addressed to the Minister in this House.

“2. As Minister for Public Instruction I shall do my utmost to ensure that the children in any school under my control will have the amenities that the Government can provide, and this decision is independent of the electorate in which the school is situated.”

NEW NURSES' QUARTERS, BRISBANE GENERAL HOSPITAL.

Mr. DECKER (Sandgate) asked the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs—

“1. When was the building of the new nurses' quarters commenced at the Brisbane General Hospital?”

“2. What was the original estimate for the completed structure?”

“3. What has been the cost to date?”

“4. How long is it anticipated to take to complete the building?”

“5. What is the average number of workmen employed weekly on this project?”

Hon. W. M. MOORE (Merthyr) replied—

“1. September, 1946.

“2. £110,000, exclusive of furnishings and equipment.

“3. £61,996 to 31 July, 1950.

“4. Two years.

“5. The average number of workmen employed weekly since the project commenced is 17. There are 59 workmen employed at present. The acute shortage of steel delayed this project for approximately two and a-half years. The quantities of steel necessary to complete the project, have been imported by the Government and are on the job.”

HELIDON RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. CHALK (Lockyer) asked the Minister for Transport—

“1. Was a departmental inspection made some little time ago of the Helidon Railway Station with a view to providing better passenger and rail facilities there?”

“2. Were the recommendations of the departmental inspector considered by him or his chief departmental officers and considered necessary?”

“3. If so, what steps have been taken since that date to have such improvements carried out?”

Hon. J. LARCOMBE (Rockhampton—Attorney-General), for **Hon. J. E. DUGGAN** (Toowoomba), replied—

“1. Yes.

“2. and 3. The recommendations were considered by the Commissioner and his chief departmental officers, and whilst it is realised that some improvement at Helidon is desirable the proposal would mean an expenditure of between £30,000 and £40,000, even by using most of the existing buildings which, however, are very old. To provide an entirely new modern building with all the necessary facilities would cost about £75,000. In view of the shortage of materials and manpower and because there are many other more urgent works to be undertaken, it was decided that the scheme for Helidon would have to stand over.”

ASSISTANCE TO INDUSTRIES.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Darlington) asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

“Since 1945 and up to 30 June, 1950, what persons, firms, or companies have received assistance under the Industries Assistance Acts and the Labour and Industry Act by way of (1) advances, and (2) loan guarantees, showing in respect of each (a) date, (b) period, (c) amount approved, (d) amount advanced, (e) rate of interest, (f) repayments, and (g) balance outstanding?”

Hon. A. JONES (Charters Towers) replied—

“I lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing the details required.

Paper.—Whereupon Mr. Jones laid upon the Table of the House the statement referred to.

CHARGES FOR DELAYED STOCK TRUCKS.

Mr. EWAN (Roma) asked the Minister for Transport—

“Where loading of cattle or sheep trucks is delayed because of circumstances beyond the control of the person who ordered them, such as, weather conditions or an instruction of a Government official, is it the practice of his department to waive or to refund the charge made for the period of the delay?”

Hon. J. LARCOMBE (Rockhampton—Attorney-General), for Hon. J. E. DUGGAN (Toowoomba), replied—

“Where livestock wagons are not loaded due to rain a full refund of the deposit is made. Delays due to other causes are dealt with on their merits.”

CARMILA CYCLONE RELIEF.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah), for Mr. EVANS (Mirani), asked the Premier—

“1. What was the amount allocated for Carmila Cyclone Relief by (a) the State and (b) the Commonwealth?”

“2. How much has been paid to date to those concerned?”

“3. If not yet fully allocated, will he kindly expedite the distribution of this fund?”

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca) replied—

“1. (a) £500, (b) £500.

“2. By agreement between the State and Commonwealth Governments, the moneys made available are being distributed by a committee comprising the chairman of the Breadsound Shire Council, the officer-in-charge of police, the station master, and the local postmaster. It is understood that between £300 and £400 has already been allocated.

“3. The conditions laid down by both the Commonwealth and State Governments provide that moneys shall only be granted for the relief of distress in necessitous cases. As the Honourable Member will readily appreciate, each application for relief must be carefully examined by the committee and dealt with on its merits to ensure that only genuine applications are approved. The committee expects to finalise the distribution at an early date. The amazing voluntary effort of Mackay tradesmen who went to Carmila immediately following the cyclone and who, oblivious of regular hours and working conditions, proceeded to rebuild the vast majority of damaged homes in the district, resulted in considerably fewer applications for relief from Governmental sources than would otherwise have been the case. I am sure the Commonwealth Government, like the Queensland Government, is most appreciative of the splendid citizenship displayed by those workers from Mackay who voluntarily went to the assistance of their distressed neighbours.”

FEES PAID BY CROWN TO BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS.

RETURN TO ORDER.

The following paper was laid on the table—
Return to an Order relative to fees paid to barristers and solicitors, 1949-50, made by the House on the motion of Mr Müller on 3 August.

PAPERS.

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies, Building Societies, and Co-operative Societies.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Aliens Acts, 1867 to 1948 (3 August (2)).

The Supreme Court Act of 1921 (3 August).

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SECOND ALLOTTED DAY.

Debate resumed from 16 August (see page 92) on Mr. McCallie's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. INGRAM (Keppel) (11.18 a.m.): In adding my contribution to this debate I first of all want to extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my sincere congratulations on your re-election as Speaker of this Parliament. I trust sincerely that your health will improve so that you can continue to carry out your duties in the same efficient manner as you have done in the past and to the satisfaction of each and every one of us.

I also want to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of this motion, the hon. members for Haughton and Windsor, both of whom delivered very able addresses. I am sure that hon. members will agree with me that their discourses indicated that they will be acquisitions not only to this House but to the Labour Party in this House as well as to the people of this State.

I listened very attentively to the speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition on Tuesday last, the main theme of which was the Korean war and Communism. He virtually accused the Government of being Communists and for not giving any assistance whatsoever in the prosecution of that war. He also referred to World War II, and gave no credit to the two Labour Prime Ministers who had charge of the destiny of Australia at that period, the late Mr. John Curtin and Mr. Chifley. He implied that they had done virtually nothing during that period for the Commonwealth of Australia. I am game to say very definitely that had it not been for the fact that the late John Curtin and Ben. Chifley were in charge of Australia's destiny at that critical period of the world's history

we should not be enjoying the freedom that we are living in today. I will proceed further and say without fear of contradiction that no two greater statesmen have occupied the office of Prime Minister of Australia than those two hon. gentlemen.

On the other hand the hon. member gave some praise to the present Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, but Mr. Menzies was not game to rule when the last war broke out, and he ran away, as he did in the 1914-18 war; when he was captain of the militia when the 1914 war broke out he resigned so that he would not be called up, and during the last war he was not game to attempt to govern this country.

The Queensland Labour Government and the Federal Labour Party have been repeatedly accused by the Opposition parties of being Communist-minded. Nothing is further from the truth. They have accused us of encouraging Communism and of being hand-in-glove with the Communists. I say emphatically that those who are encouraging the Communists and breeding Communism are the Opposition parties. They are the people who are encouraging Communism and they are the people who encouraged Communism by their dirty deliberate actions during the period 1929 to 1932 when they were in power in this State. One has only to look back to see how they have encouraged Communism and how they have solicited the support of Communists. In the early part of last year at a by-election in New South Wales there were a Labour candidate, a Liberal candidate and a Communist candidate. The Labour and the Liberal candidate were running neck by neck, but suddenly it came out in the Press that the Liberal Party was relying on the preference vote of the Communists to put their candidate in power; yet they talk about the Labour Government as being Communist-minded and being hand-in-glove with the Communists. What did the Premier of Victoria do when there was a coal boat lying unloaded for months? He did absolutely nothing; he was not game to take action against the Communists. It was the Hon. Ben Chifley, who was then Prime Minister, who ordered the Navy to unload that boat. What did the Tory Premier of Victoria do during the nine weeks' tramway strike? He took no action. It was the Federal Labour Government and the Queensland Labour Government who took action against the wreckers of this country. The Tory parties have never taken any action against the Communists. They rely on their support at election time; and I shall produce evidence to prove the truth of that assertion.

If they listen to the speeches of members opposite the ill-informed may come to the conclusion that the Australian Labour Party is composed of Communists. Again nothing is further from the truth. Before any person can become a member of the Australian Labour Party he has to sign a pledge that he is neither a Communist, a supporter of Communism or a sympathiser with the Communist Party. I challenge the Opposition to prove to me that their parties have anything like that in their rules. We have that safe-

guard and we do not allow Communists to come into our ranks. But there are Communists in the primary producers' organisations, and some of them are in official positions. There are Communists in the B.M.A. and in the private banks; and they have gone over the air time after time in an endeavour to defeat the Australian Labour Party. Did hon. members opposite object to that? No. Did they object to the Communists' support at election time? No. We tell the people that we do not want the Communists' support; and we do not want it. Nobody has attacked the Communists more than the Australian Labour Party; nobody has trounced the Communists more than I have; but you do not hear any such denunciation from the Opposition. During the whole of the election campaign all the Opposition Parties thought about was accusing the Labour Government of being Communist, Socialistic and undemocratic. Did you ever hear such stupid nonsense? The final figures in the last State election show that the people of Queensland did not believe one word they said. They even accused the Government of gerrymandering the electorates and underhand work. What ridiculous nonsense to come from men who are supposed to have brains! What did the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Coorparoo, say? He accused this Government of gerrymandering the electorates. In one breath he did that, but almost in the same breath he said that the Opposition would be returned with a majority for this State Parliament. If that was to be so, where did the gerrymandering of the electorates come in? They are hostile because the people of Queensland believe the Labour Government have a policy that is best for them.

Hon. members opposite also accuse the Labour Government of stuffing the rolls. I do not know what sort of stuffing is intended, but in my life I have never heard such arrant nonsense. The Labour Government did not stuff the rolls. In my electorate alone there was a 95-per-cent vote and this applied throughout the State. They spoke about underhand methods, but what happened in my electorate? I will tell you here and now what happened there. As far as my opponent was concerned I never had a cleaner opponent to fight against as Country Party candidate. But I cannot say that about the Liberal Party opponents in other parts of the State. I never had a cleaner election fight than I had with my opponent, but I do blame his campaign director. They talk about underhand work; what did that woman do in my electorate? She resided at the Gresham Hotel, William Street, Rockhampton, and had her name put on the roll for Broadmeadows in Keppel. She was in the electorate now represented here by the Attorney-General. They also sent out application forms for postal votes fully filled in to people 60 or 70 miles away from Rockhampton. I know all about this because application forms were returned with a footnote stating that receivers did not require postal votes. That is the type of thing they were doing to defeat the Labour Party. These are the types of under-

hand methods adopted, but they will persist in saying that we are the people who gerrymandered the electorates and did underhand work. It is the members of the Opposition parties who are guilty of such rackets.

Throughout the whole of their campaign they said that the Labour Government have done nothing for this State, especially the outback and the North. They accuse us of being a Brisbane party, but nothing is further from the truth. No Government of Queensland have done more for the benefit of Queensland than the present Labour Government; for instance, I would remind them of our irrigation policy. I would ask hon. members present, particularly members of the Opposition, to listen to the localities I will enumerate—The Commissioner has under construction at present 10 weirs to provide a further storage of 11,750 acre feet. Weirs are being constructed on: Eureka Creek (Dimbulah), Timaroo Creek (Mareeba), Molongle Creek (Bowen), Burnett River (Mundubbera), Three Moon Creek (Mulgellie), Monal Creek (Mungungo), Barker Creek (Nanango), Balonne River (St. George), Macintyre Brook (Inglewood), Dumaresq River (Bonshaw).

Mr. Aikens: Do not forget the Somerset Dam for Brisbane.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members must remember that only a little time ago I asked for order, and I must again ask that they obey my request.

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member for Mundingburra will not obey my call to order I shall have to take steps to deal with him.

Mr. INGRAM: Accusations were levelled against the Government during the whole of the election campaign that we were a socialistic Government and that if we were elected to power we would take the cattle and horses from the people and that we would even take the schoolboy's pony and bicycle away from him. Did you ever hear such ridiculous insinuations coming from men who are supposed to have brains? It has been said that we would stifle private enterprise, but let me remind hon. members that no Government in the world has helped private enterprise more than the Labour Government have done in the past and will continue to do in the future. For instance, let us take the cement works to be established in North Queensland. This Government have guaranteed through the Industries Assistance Board to the Bank of Australasia £200,000 for the company erecting those cement works. Furthermore, the Government financed the company at Mount Isa to the extent of £500,000 in face of the opposition by hon. members opposite to the Government's action in building a line to that place. We have assisted the North Queensland Tobacco Association by advancing £9,892 through the Agricultural Bank and giving a Government guarantee up to June, 1949, of £34,150. In June, 1949, the Government gave a further guarantee on the basis of £2 for every £1 provided by growers up to a combined total

of £50,000. Not only are we doing that, but we are building a line from the Callide Valley line to assist a private coal-mine, at a cost of £400,000. Furthermore, if this Government had not been in power at the time, how would Mr. Bruce Pie have been able to start his textile industry in Brisbane and bring it to the stage at which it is at present? He was guaranteed an overdraft of £6,000 to establish that industry here. Yes, it can be truly said that we have assisted private enterprise in this State and that we shall continue that policy in the future. No Government composed of hon. members opposite have ever done anything like that in the past.

We have heard hon. members opposite, particularly the hon. member for Aubigny, chastising this Government on our roads and railways, but did a Tory Government ever do anything in regard to main roads? Did a Tory Government ever have a main-roads policy? No; they did nothing to provide roads for the benefit of the people of the State—absolutely nothing. I propose to quote figures showing what this Government have done since the institution of their main-roads policy. To 30 June, 1949, no less than £12,872,618 has been spent on permanent work in connection with main roads, and £6,726,526 on the maintenance of roads. The hon. member for Aubigny is one of our greatest critics and he has continually been saying that we are not giving local authorities the help they want. It has cost the local authorities only £624,212 out of a total of £12,872,618. The cost of permanent works borne by the commission was £12,248,406 and of maintenance of roads £4,711,381. The percentage borne by the Commission on permanent works was 95.2, and on maintenance works it was 75.1. Does that not prove that this Government are doing everything possible for the benefit of the people in the outback areas of this State?

As another example, take the section of the northern highway from Rockhampton to Mackay. It has been said that this is a Brisbane party and I am producing these figures to prove it is not. This Government are looking to the benefit of the whole of the people of this State. On the road from Rockhampton to Mackay, £660,000 was spent on permanent works and £122,000 on maintenance. On the section from Mackay to Townsville, £1,242,000 was spent on permanent works and £297,000 on maintenance. From Townsville to Cairns, £887,000 was spent on permanent works and £339,000 on maintenance. The total amount spent was £2,789,000 on permanent works and £758,000 on maintenance.

We have been accused repeatedly in this Chamber—and we heard it again the other day—of not looking after the sick and suffering in this State. It has been said that we are not building hospitals in various parts of the State, that we are not building schools, that hospitals are overcrowded, and that schools are overcrowded. Nothing is further from the truth! I have travelled my electorate, not by plane from one city to another city, but from little town to little town.

I will deal with hospitals first. The amount allocated for hospitals for the 1949-50 programme was £1,674,886. The largest country hospital in this State has been built at Townsville at a cost of £400,000, excluding new nurses' quarters which are under construction at a cost of £240,000. Is that in Brisbane? It is in Townsville. I shall quote every hospital in this State and I should like Opposition members to take particular notice of the names of the towns that I shall mention. Major hospital works have been completed in the past three years at Babinda, Biggenden, Brisbane, Chinchilla, Gympie, Herberton, Innisfail, Kilcoy, Mareeba, Miles, Monto, Mount Morgan, and Wondai. Major hospital works are in progress at Atherton, Brisbane (at the Base Hospital, South Brisbane Auxiliary Hospital, and Chermside T.B. Sanatorium), Barcaldine, Bundaberg, Cairns, Charters Towers, Emerald, Gladstone, Gympie, Innisfail, Ipswich, Mareeba, Maryborough, Milmerran, Murgon, Mossman, Mount Isa, Roma, Southport, Taroom, Toowoomba, and Townsville. Does that show that we are a Brisbane party, as the Opposition were when they were in power? In addition, major hospital works are commencing at Mackay and Rockhampton.

The total cost of maintaining hospitals in Queensland in 1948-49 was £3,412,268, and the estimated cost for this year is £4,085,000. As the result of legislation passed by this Government it is not necessary to rely on street collections to keep our hospitals going. We have not to rely on nurses going onto the streets and begging money to keep the hospitals going. During the period 1929-32 the Tories promised the people on the hustings that they would abolish the system of hospital precepts, but they failed to do so. It was the Labour Government who did it. Every person in this State—man, woman, and child—can now get free treatment at any public hospital in the State.

There has been a great deal of squealing by hon. members opposite on the score that we are a minority Government, but we are not a minority Government. There are really 5 parties in this Chamber but the Labour Party is a party on its own—we do not rely on assistance from any other party in order to govern the State. Labour gained the greatest number of votes of all the parties at the last elections having got 295,138 against 121,199 by the Country Party, 188,331 by the Liberal Party and 7,689 by the Aikens Party.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. There was no such party as the Aikens Party in North Queensland at the last elections but there was the North Queensland Labour Party and I ask the hon. member to refer to it as such.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of order; there was no such party.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. Mr. Speaker, you have no right to say that.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. INGRAM: The Independents got 14,954 votes and the Communists 2,351. Let us suppose that there were no Independents, no Communists and no Aikens Party, or North Queensland Labour Party as the hon. member for Mundingburra wants me to call it. How do hon. members opposite know how the people who supported those parties would have voted if those parties had not been in the field?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the hon. member for Keppel that he refer to the Aikens Party as the North Queensland Party.

Mr. INGRAM: Yes. We are not a minority Government, because we do not rely on the political support of any other party. Ours is an independent single party. On the Opposition benches we have first of all the Country Party and I do not care a hang what anybody says, it is the main Opposition party. It is all moonshine to say that the Country Party and the Liberal Party are working harmoniously for the benefit of the State. They have joined together for one purpose and one purpose only—to defeat the Australian Labour Party if they can possibly do it. Of course they cannot do that.

Here is a report of the remarks of the State president of the Country Party in connection with the Liberal Party—

“ ‘C.P. will have no merger.

“ ‘The Country Party would reject any Liberal Party overtures for a merger in Queensland’, the C.P. State president (Mr. A. J. Campbell) said to-night.

“ ‘Mr. Campbell said an amalgamation would be disastrous to both parties.

“ ‘Three Liberal Party country branches have submitted motions for the party’s annual State convention in Brisbane next Thursday, urging negotiations for a complete merger.

“ ‘Might go labour.

“ ‘Rank and file C.P. members would not stand for it’,” said Mr. Campbell.

“ ‘Some of them would probably go over to the Labour Party’

“ ‘Country people feel the Liberal Party is a city party, and their own organisation is the only one which can look after their interests’.”

The Country Party can look after the interests of country people without the intrusion of the Liberal Party.

Here is a report, too, of the remarks of Mr. Moss about the Liberal Party—

“ ‘Mr. Moss said the Liberal Party in Victoria had let the Country Party down on a number of occasions. Labour had always kept its promises in its dealings with the Victorian C.P.’”

Labour has always kept its promises with the Country Party and the country people of the State. The report continues—

“ ‘The conference unanimously opposed any amalgamation with the Liberal Party, but urged the utmost co-operation.’”

This is what Mr. Hudson from North Queensland had to say about the Liberal Party—

“The Country Party in Queensland has carried out its obligations with dignity, and to avoid political dissension with the Liberals.

“I do not know how much patience some of our fellows have, and how long they will continue with this arrangement, which seems to take quite a lot from us, and does not pay any dividends.

“We will see how Mr. Nicklin and Mr. Hiley can steer the Parliamentary ship, and how the Liberals will carry out their obligations in the Parliamentary team. If they are as loyal as the Liberals in their arrangements with the N.C.P. in North Queensland, it will not be long before we will have three political parties in Queensland.”

That is what the Country Party heads today think of the Liberals, and that is what I think of the Liberal Party today. The Liberal Party talks about Communism but I say without fear of contradiction that the Liberal Party is the twin of the curse of Communism because its adherents breed and encourage Communism by their actions in standing for a lower standard of wages and a lower standard of living. That is what breeds Communism. I am surprised at the Country Party's endeavouring to merge with the Liberal Party. I am surprised because I have had a lot of time for the Country Party and I still have, but I have no time for the Liberal Party as it represents the big banking institutions, the big industrial interests and the beef barons. If that party had its way it would reduce Queensland to a state of starvation and poverty, the same as when it controlled the Treasury benches of this State during the period 1929-32. That Government would not give either the boy or girl a chance as they pledged themselves to do and compelled men out of work to walk 50 and 60 miles from station to station before issuing rations to them. I was one of them, and my own son could not get a job, even on the roads. We were merely two of thousands who had to walk, as I said, from station to station for 4s. 6d. worth of rations. That is what the Liberal Party did in 1929-32 and what it would do again if given a chance to administer this State. I am confident that people of this State have sufficient brains not to return that party again to the Treasury benches, even though it may change its name from time to time.

We as a Government go to the people as a party under the same banner year after year. We have never had any need to change our name in order to appeal to the people for their votes. The Australian Labour Party has stood the test of time for donkey's years and I am convinced that it will continue to stand the test for many more years to come.

Dr. NOBLE (Yeronga) (11.48 a.m.), who was received with “Hear, hears,” said: I wish to associate myself very sincerely with those hon. members who have spoken

previously in congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the high office of Speaker of this Parliament, and to assure you, and through you His Excellency the Governor, of my abiding loyalty to the throne and person of His Majesty the King.

I want to thank also those electors in Yeronga who did me the very great honour of returning me to this Parliament as their member. I am indeed very deeply conscious of this honour. I am aware of the great responsibility that this position entails, believing as I do that every member of Parliament should speak as his conscience dictates in the interest of his electorate and in the interests of the people of Queensland, to praise where praise is due, and to criticise where criticism is needed.

This State of ours is a vast and great State, a State vast in size and area, in natural wealth, and in its great potentialities. But I am sure you will agree with me when I say that although the State is large in size and its distances are long its population is small, tragically small. By our geographical position we are indeed the bulwark of the Australian nation. Close to our very near North is the State of Indonesia, which has recently acquired its independence, and whose people are being fired with a spirit of intense nationalism. Even in this morning's paper we have news that its leaders are now reaching out avariciously to our shores in search of new territory for themselves. Further north we have the mainland of Asia, with its teeming millions, large numbers of whom are Communist-inspired and led, and with a portion of whom we are already at war. And in our relations with these people neither you nor I, Mr. Speaker, can see or realise where we shall be in the near future.

So I would say the defence of this nation is indeed of paramount importance. One of the means of defending this State is to populate it. It should be the duty of this Government and of all Governments to seek by every means in their power the migration of people to this country. This migration should be on a vast scale; and it should be the duty of the people of Queensland and Australia to make these people truly welcome. We are indeed an insular race; we do not find it very easy to make welcome the people who come to our shores. I suppose it is the result of a fear complex—we all fear that when these people come here our jobs might become insecure. This fear is not confined to one section of the community; it is prevalent in the professional sections too. But we should remember that every additional migrant is an additional unit in the defence of this country. We should make them all welcome and do everything to throw open jobs to them—trades and professions or any job for which they have the qualification. For if we do not populate this country we shall be in a very difficult position. It has been truly said that unless we double the population in a limited time we shall have to quit this great heritage. Another way of increasing the population of any country is by increasing the birthrate in that country. I do not intend to enlarge on how the Government

should do this, but I should like to praise the maternal and child-welfare centres of the State and the doctors and nurses who by their devotion to duty have made our infantile mortality rate the lowest in the State's history.

We must have a national health service—I admit this freely—and I should like to say a few words about it. There are many shades of opinion about how this should be instituted. The Labour Party desired to have a completely socialised medical service, following the socialistic parties in England and New Zealand. Its leaders tried hard to bring this about, but they were opposed by the British Medical Association. The Opposition parties also opposed it. It was said that the B.M.A. went on strike, but I wish to point out that its members carried out their duties as they did before and as they are doing now—with devotion to duty. These men realise that a completely socialised medical service would not be in the best interests of the people. In the socialised services I mentioned every medical man and nurse became the paid servant of the Government. The expenditure in running these services became enormous, threatening the economics of the State. The members of the B.M.A. in Australia realised that the quality of such a medical service was not the highest, so they fought it and they were successful. I believe however, that in these days of high cost of living, in which every family budget is threatened, there should be some form of national medical service.

There are three requisites. Firstly, it must be a service satisfactory to the doctors; secondly, it must be a service satisfactory to the people—most important of all; and thirdly, it must be a service satisfactory to the Government. Surely we can find some service with these three requisites? In a service satisfying these three requisites we should have a truly national medical service. In the first place I think that if the present outpatients' departments were related to the national medical service it would be an improvement. I think all of those services should be increased in scope and if we did this we should be going a long way towards giving the people the service they require.

I should like to examine this problem in the light of the one-man medical towns, towns where there is one medical officer, usually the superintendent of the hospital and as a general rule with the right of private practice. The people of such towns can see the medical officer either privately or publicly, and if private beds were allowed in these small-town hospitals these people could go into them either as public or private patients. Surely to goodness we have in this the basis of a full-time national medical service—allowing the people freedom of choice to see their doctors privately or publicly, and allowing the doctors the opportunity to treat their patients either privately or publicly as they require, and the people the option of being treated in the hospitals privately or publicly? The doctor would be quite satisfied, and the people also.

These hospitals, moreover, should be equipped with modern diagnostic facilities to allow the people of each district, if they so desire, to have the use of these instruments. I will take the towns in which two to six doctors practise—and these would cover virtually the whole of the State. Let me examine one such town. I have spoken to most of the practitioners in such towns and they feel very sore about the fact that in some of them they are unable to treat their patients in the public hospital and some of the private hospitals are not equipped to give the full service required. I suggest we could create a national medical service by encouraging these men to go to the out-patients' department of these hospitals, as is being done now at Murwillumbah in New South Wales, to follow their patients into the public wards if they so desire and equipping the hospitals with private beds and allowing these men, if they wished, to treat these patients in these private beds. I think the doctors would be satisfied with such an arrangement and the people in the towns would have the right to see any particular doctor in the district either in a public or a private capacity and the doctor could follow the patient into the private or public bed in the hospital. The public could then obtain treatment from most experienced doctors in the district. This should be done quickly, especially in the interests of those people who are finding it very hard to make ends meet. They could then get the medical men of their own choice in their own particular district, in which modernised facilities should be open to all free of cost.

Now I come to the great metropolis of Brisbane. I do not need to labour this point, but it is a bad thing to concentrate all the public hospital facilities in the city at one point, in Brisbane, in the General Hospital at Bowen Bridge. Really, a Gilbertian situation exists in regard to this hospital, which has to service patients right from the New South Wales border, Coolangatta to Landsborough, and from the coast almost to Ipswich. It has to service a population of some 500,000 people. In this hospital is housed the public diagnostic service and if the people want this service they must travel miles to get it. Sick children have to be taken there to get it. The mistake was made in the past of not having more district hospitals established in the outer suburbs, such as at Southport, Redcliffe, Wynnum and similar places at which there could have been out-patients' departments. The base hospital equipped with the most modern appliances could be at Bowen Hills to treat the more serious cases, as well as patients requiring ordinary hospitalisation.

The authorities are going ahead at the moment with the erection of another large hospital at South Brisbane. I hope they do not make the same mistake of building there a grandiose hospital. There is already an efficient hospital in South Brisbane in the Mater Public Hospital. I have been associated with this establishment for the past 16 years and feel that with an out-patients' department there it would have been wiser to

go further afield before embarking on the immense expenditure of erecting a large hospital in the grounds of the Diamantina Institution at South Brisbane.

What can we do in the meantime? It takes time to build hospitals and the people cannot wait till we get these hospitals built so that they may be able to get attention near at hand. It could be done by the provision of outpatients' departments throughout the city and suburbs where local doctors on a part-time and paid basis could give their services. This would be the means of enabling people to see a medical man either publicly or privately and they would thus have the quality of service obtaining in the district. There would be no great expense or at least only a minor one to the Government.

The adoption of such a system would raise this question: what reciprocity can you give to the doctors if they agreed to do this? There is a shortage of private beds in all hospitals. I personally have tried and failed to get private patients into hospitals for immediate treatment. They can go to the General Hospital and I must say that the General Hospital is always willing to accept these cases. I do not quarrel with the work done there; that hospital is doing a mighty job under difficult circumstances. But I do say 100 or 200 beds should be opened for intermediate cases. This was done at the Brisbane Women's Hospital. As soon as it was opened two floors were devoted to public beds and two to private beds and at present there are three floors for intermediate patients and one floor for private patients. We have to ask ourselves the question: who owns these hospitals? The owners are the electors, and the electors want to have this intermediate service and they should have it. It should be the duty of the Government to throw open intermediate beds to the people. And what is more, when they are filled it would be the means of financing the hospital system.

You will say that there is no arrangement for domiciliary treatment in this scheme. I agree. But after all this would not amount to much. I suppose most homes have only one or two visits from the doctor each year. If the case is more serious it could go to hospital.

Medicine today is expensive, I admit, but if you had out-patients departments throughout the city and people had the right to go there they would get medicine free of cost as they are getting it now. What is more, the Commonwealth Government's scheme of giving drugs which are necessary for life and the more expensive drugs will go a long way towards helping people.

There is a nursing shortage at present and convalescent wings where skilled treatment is not needed so much should be put up at every hospital to help in this regard. I further suggest that people should be sent out of hospital a little earlier when in the convalescing stage and if there was a district nursing service the nurses could follow up their cases at the homes of the patients. We often see urological cases coming up for

dressings but much of this work could be done in homes, which would lift the burden from hospitals and the Ambulance Brigade, which has to transport them.

Diagnosis today is a big thing and costs money. Whereas the usual fee for a doctor is £1 ls., X-ray and other costs will amount to about £13 13s. If a diagnostic service was established at out-patients' departments X-Ray, bio-chemical, and pathological laboratories could be run on a part-time paid basis. For the smaller towns the Government might consider the institution of a diagnostic service by the provision of a travelling diagnostic clinic to perform all these services.

I am pleased and bucked by the thought that the spirit of self-help is coming back again into the community. I give much praise to churches, which are and intend to go on carrying out a public hospital system. I have been associated with the Mater Hospital at South Brisbane very closely for the past 16 years and I cannot speak too highly of the efficiency and treatment in that hospital and the devotion and skill of the sisters. I feel quite certain that when the Presbyterian and Methodist churches come into the field, the people of this State will receive there the same benefit as they are getting from the wonderful sisters at the Mater Hospital. I should like at this stage to praise the Government for subsidising these hospitals £1 for £1, but it should be the duty of the Commonwealth Government, through the State, to give these people interest-free loans covering the whole cost of their buildings and installations, remembering at all times that the first cost would be the last.

I was very interested to hear, during one of my first days in this Chamber, when the Premier was congratulating the Speaker on his re-election to his high office, his statement that he was very concerned with the lack of respect shown to authority in these days. There was a great deal of truth in what he said. To what can this lack of respect be attributed? I think it can be attributed to many things. First of all, one of the main causes is the departure from religion and the tendency to scoff at religious habits; secondly, there is a feeling of insecurity in the hearts of the people resulting from threats of war and a feeling that those in authority are not doing their job properly and cannot cope with the international situation; thirdly, there is the glamourising and the so-called emancipation of the teen-age group. Too many children of from 14 to 17 are going about unchaperoned. By the time they reach their twenties they are a little bit jaded with regard to these things. Besides being one of the causes of the present disrespect for authority, perhaps this is also one of the causes for the growing divorce rate.

Again, dignity of itself will always bring about respect. Perhaps some of us in authority in the community have not the requisite dignity to command respect. In the Army we frequently saw that an officer could not command authority because he did not possess the requisite dignity. It is necessary to be dignified when in office.

I should like to lead up to the last, but perhaps the most important, cause of disrespect for authority by quoting from a book written by a man who is not a political propagandist but who has the interests of Australia at heart. He is a sincere and intelligent Englishman who has come here as an onlooker and sees us as perhaps we do not see ourselves. This is what he has said—

“Australians have not been led as often as they deserve by their best men. ‘A dirty game, politics,’ they say; and leave politics alone. Professionals have largely taken their place, men whose living depends upon their putting party before country. They have made bluff an art. They cover their mistakes by blackguarding the other side and do not hesitate to make promises if promises will help to keep their own side in office. These are the men who keep class bitterness alive, because it pays them to do so.”

There is a great deal of truth in that statement. The Labour Party of this country, by its propaganda of class-hatred, has tended to bring about a sagging in the moral fibre of the people and a falling-off in respect for authority. I am glad to belong to my party, because it has never brought that sort of thing into its politics. I am glad to belong to the combined Country and Liberal Parties, which at Canberra are led by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, who is perhaps the greatest Australian living today or even the greatest Australian of all time. He has by his actions and service overseas been a great boost to our country; he has shown the world what a great man he is and has brought honour not only to himself but to every Australian whom he represents.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

When the hon. member for North Toowoomba was speaking the other day he read an article by Professor Murdoch and I inferred from his remarks and attitude that he believed what the article contained. The article suggested that Mr. Menzies had more or less been forced by his Cabinet to bring in the Communist Party Dissolution Bill. Now, I can give the lie direct to that. I recall a policy meeting of my party at which I was present three years ago in Sydney. At that time Labour Cabinet Ministers in Canberra were still saying that Communism was just another political philosophy. One in particular said that the teachings of Communism were in conformity with the teachings of Christ. What greater sacrilege could you have had than that? At the time when that was being said Mr. Menzies realised what would happen. He knew all about the Communists' ideals and what the Communists intended to do with the world and he said that the only way to protect this country against the Communists was to ban it. The Labour Party in this country stand accused before the Australian people of opposing the Communist Party Dissolution Bill. These Communists would sell out this nation by their nefarious and traitorous work.

One reason why the hon. member for North Toowoomba puts forward in justification of

Labour's opposition to the Communist Party Dissolution Bill is that it could not agree to the onus-of-proof clause on principle, but let me remind hon. members that there are other Acts on the statute book of Queensland containing this very principle and one that I mention in particular is the Dairy Produce Amendment Act of 1936. It is an axiom of British justice that before a man can be found guilty the charge against him must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt and that is a sound principle of justice, but in the Dairy Produce Amendment Act it is departed from. And the matter does not stop there. In a court of justice, if there is any doubt it is given to the prisoner but under this Act it is given to the Crown. Therefore if the onus-of-proof clause in the Communist Party Dissolution Bill is bad in principle the provisions in the Dairy Produce Amendment Act are heinous. We have had enough of this sentimentality about the Communists, these traitors to Australia who would sell out this country tomorrow, just as Dr. Fuchs sold the atomic weapon to Russia and if a war were to commence tomorrow he would be to blame. Were the South Koreans given any opportunity to insist upon the application of the principle of onus-of-proof? They were attacked without warning by the North Korean Communists.

Let us see what this onus-of-proof clause really means. Before a person is declared a Communist he must be screened by the Security Service. A report of his service is taken to the head of the department, surely a responsible man, and before he can be declared a Communist the matter must go before the Cabinet of the country, surely also composed of honourable men? There all the evidence is considered in detail. If they decide that he is a Communist they declare him a Communist. If they say he is guilty of being a Communist he has the right of appeal. He can say, “I am not a Communist” and he can go before the Supreme Court in the State in which he has been declared or the High Court and say he is not a Communist. Having once declared that he is not a Communist it is then the duty of the Government to prove before the Supreme Court that he is.

And what is the penalty when a man is declared a Communist? What is the penalty imposed on these traitors to Australia? They are worse than murderers but the only penalty that is provided is that they shall be excluded from the unions and from Crown employment. If I had my way I would deal more severely with them.

We have heard much talk of Socialism, and we have heard a lot in the last few days of how the Labour Party has helped private enterprise. The Treasurer himself pointed out how his Government had opened up Crown land for private enterprise to develop, the amount of money that the Government had advanced to private firms and individuals under the Industries Assistance Acts, and the great good that has resulted from this assistance. The Government do help those who they believe will help the State. I take it that before the Government advance any

firm or private individual financial assistance they first go into the pros and cons of the application, including the character and ability of the applicant to carry on the business successfully, his or their business acumen, and what business assets they possess. If that is not done, he should not have the handling of public money. After the Government have advanced money under this Act to private enterprise, successful businesses are very frequently built up that provide work for thousands and give contented employment, more often than not, to those engaged in them. In this way private enterprise does great work for the State. I believe it is with that in view that these advances are made, but we must not overlook the fact that the Government are composed solely of men who have adopted a socialistic platform, which includes the plank for the nationalisation of all means of production, distribution and exchange. If any adherent of the Labour Party who has signed its platform does not believe in it, he must be a perjurer, and if he believes in the platform he has signed then the danger of the nationalisation of any business is ever-present. I do not say for one moment that the present Government would go so far, nevertheless, a socialistic party is in power and when it desired, and when the opportunity offered, it could proceed to put that plank of its platform into operation. That is my position in regard to socialism. The Labour Party is a class party and every one of its members when signing the party pledge embraced that part of the party's platform adopted in 1921 for the nationalisation of all means of production, distribution and exchange. It was because I am firmly opposed to such a principle and the evils of class legislation that I decided to enter politics and play my little part in resisting any encroachment on the freedom of the individual, and do all in my power to develop this great State.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. ROBERTS (Nundah) (12.18 p.m.): It is with considerable pleasure that I rise to support the motion so ably moved by the hon. member for Haughton and seconded by the hon. member for Windsor. I am quite sure, with those hon. members who have preceded me, that those two hon. members will prove themselves to be decided acquisitions to this House. I also at the outset should like to congratulate the new members who have participated in this debate so far, irrespective of the side of the House on which they have spoken. I feel quite sure that they also will be valuable acquisitions to this Assembly.

Since the last Parliament we have had in this State two elections. First of all, of course, we had the Federal elections on 10 December last year, and more recently, on 29 April last, the State elections. Once again, in addition to those two elections that we have had, and which we have waged, we have seen a further change in the name of one of our political opponents. It is desirable that we should, on an occasion such as this, recall the history of the Liberal Party, as it is now known, over the last few years.

Hon. members undoubtedly remember that only in 1943 the present Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Mr. Chandler, contested the Hamilton electorate at a by-election as a champion of non-party politics. On that occasion Mr. Chandler won a considerable number of votes because he was able to gull a number of people in that locality into the belief that he was sincere when he stated that there was no room for party politics in this State, but no sooner had he been elected, than he founded a party which became known as the Queensland People's Party, a party which in two subsequent elections appealed to the people of this State for their support under the banner of the Queensland People's Party.

On those occasions they endeavoured to hoodwink the people into the belief that there was a difference between the Queensland People's Party and the bad old Tory political organisations of the past, and that there was no relationship or affinity between the Queensland People's Party and the United Australia Party or the National Party or the party known by any one of the other 15 names by which it has been known over the last 35 years of Australian political history. It was only last year that the Queensland People's Party added two brackets with a few words to its title so that it came to be the "Queensland People's Party (Queensland Branch of the Liberal Party of Australia)." As such its candidates contested the Federal election on 10 December, realising full well that they could no longer hope to gull the people into the belief that they were not associated with vested interests, which have always financed and supported the anti-Labour political organisations of Australia so they, this year, came out openly and changed their name again to the "Liberal Party." Even since this House has assembled we have witnessed yet another change of name by these people, because in this Chamber today we have Country Party-Liberal, or perhaps Liberal-Country Party. That is their official name, I take it?

Mr. Hanlon: Liberal first.

Mr. ROBERTS: Liberal first. The position is undoubtedly that the Liberal Party supplies the finance and whoever supplies the finance has the privilege of placing its name at the head of the list.

I want to say a word or two about the Federal elections, first because during that campaign we in Queensland and the people throughout the length and breadth of Australia listened to numbers of rash, reckless and dishonest promises by the opponents of Labour such as we have never witnessed in the political history of Australia. I refer to promises made by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, and by his deputy Mr. Fadden and by their supporters, made when they knew full well they could not be implemented—made when they knew full well they had no hope of fulfilling them. They were made with one object and one object only, that is, to win the Treasury benches of the Commonwealth. During that campaign I know that my friends on the opposite side were embarrassed by the

extravagant finances that were made available to them to fight that election—finances made available by the private banking institutions and the big financial institutions of Australia in order to defeat the Ben Chifley Labour Government.

The Attorney-General yesterday referred to some of the promises made on that occasion, and to the Public Service in particular. We all remember how during that election Mr. Menzies and Mr. Fadden and their supporters criticised the size of the Commonwealth Public Service, and you and I and the people of Queensland and Australia were led to believe that if they were returned to power all these bureaucrats and all these parasites in Commonwealth Government offices, as they called them, would be thrown out and the Commonwealth Public Service would be made an economical and efficient organisation.

As the Attorney-General mentioned yesterday, not only have the Liberal-Country Party Federal Government failed to carry out that promise but in fact they have today some 5,000 more Commonwealth employees than at 10 December, 1949. I do not say there is anything wrong with that. I am firmly convinced that public servants, whether in the Commonwealth or State sphere, carry out a very great job indeed, but what I and the people of Australia object to is the rash promise made in connection with this—a promise that the anti-Labour Federal Government have miserably failed to fulfil.

The Attorney-General mentioned also two other promises that the Menzies-Fadden Government failed to fulfil, promises that gave them throughout Australia thousands of votes. They have failed to do anything about fulfilling these promises since taking the reins of office, the promise in relation to the cost of living and that in relation to putting value back into the £.

But what of one or two other promises? For the benefit of hon. members let me recall to them that the Right Hon. A. Fadden, Deputy Prime Minister of Australia, made a promise as to a reduction in taxation. He stumped the length and breadth of Australia gulling the people into the belief that Mr. Chifley, then Prime Minister, and the Labour Government had more money at their command than they knew what to do with and that for some reason they did not explain that the Labour Government were continuing to tax the people of Australia beyond all reason—not only beyond the capacity of the people to pay but beyond the limit that was requisite for the financial commitments of the Government. Mr. Fadden and his supporters, prior to 10 December, promised the people of Australia that if returned they would not only review taxation but reduce it and since then we have been hourly awaiting some action by this financial genius, Mr. Fadden. I have in my hand a copy of today's "Telegraph"—many hon. members are at the moment reading this paper and will notice that it publishes the headline "Fadden denies cuts-in-taxes promise." So much for the promises of these anti-Labour people who

during the State election campaign endeavoured to hoodwink the Queensland people into the belief that the Liberals kept their promises.

Another promise was made about petrol and this promise undoubtedly won thousands of votes to them. Hon. members will remember the statements broadcast over the air, the headlines contained in the Press, stating that there were ample petrol supplies available for Australia from sterling areas—that there was no necessity to worry about dollars. The phrase they used was "ample petrol from sterling areas." Nobody will deny that Mr. Chifley possesses some political acumen nor that he had some desire to remain Prime Minister of Australia but the difference between that hon. gentleman and those who occupy similar positions today is that he was not prepared to sell his soul for the sake of remaining Prime Minister. As Mr. Chifley explained during the Federal election campaign, petrol was not available from sterling areas sufficient to meet the requirements of Australia.

What has happened since? The price of petrol has gone up. Mr. Fadden said that there was no necessity to ration it. Whilst out on the hustings during the Federal election campaign speaking in support of Federal Labour candidates I endeavoured to point out that in France, which was one of the countries Mr. Fadden directed attention to as being one of those where there was no petrol-rationing, although there was no rationing as we knew it there were two prices for petrol. One price was set for the owner who drove his vehicle for private pleasure only and another, and a much lower one, for the man who was running a vehicle on an essential service. In Australia, under the Menzies-Fadden Government we did not have the advantage of even that variation in price that existed in France at that time—whether it still does or not I do not know—because petrol has been put up for everybody. Because the Menzies' Government have dissipated our dollar resources in supplying the requirements of Australia as to petrol, we have our peripatetic Prime Minister, spoken of in such eulogistic terms by the hon. member for Yeronga, travelling round the world just a few months after he has attained office, and at a time when he should, as every other Prime Minister, irrespective of Party, has done, been doing his job at Canberra. He has been travelling round the world being feted and dined in England; he has travelled across the other side of the world and had great parties given to him in the United States; and now he is in Japan on the last lap of his world tour at the expense of the Australian people, taking the salute of Australian soldiers in that country. I can well imagine the thoughts flashing through the minds of our Australian boys as they see their Prime Minister in Japan at this time. What has he done, apart from being feted and dining?

Mr. Menzies has endeavoured—and perhaps he will be successful—to obtain another dollar loan to make up for the losses in dollars caused by the lifting of petrol-rationing in Australia. And we should give this policy of a

dollar loan some considerable thought. During the Chifley Labour Government's period of office I think every hon. member of this Assembly appreciated the action taken according to the policy of the Australian Labour Party of repatriating overseas loans as they matured. On this occasion we have the present anti-Labour Prime Minister again, as was done in the past, selling out this country of ours to the financiers of Wall Street and America generally.

Mr. Morris: I have never heard so much rubbish in my life.

Mr. ROBERTS: The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha interjects something about rubbish. If I had been responsible for the despicable statement he made in this House only a couple of days ago in connection with our scholarship examination I should undoubtedly keep my head lowered in shame for the rest of my sojourn in this Assembly. However, I do not want to be diverted from my train of thought.

Another promise we heard during the election campaign was about the outlawing of Communism. We should take considerable notice of what happened in connection with that promise. During the Federal election campaign the anti-Labour forces daily proclaimed and promised the people that if they were returned they would, in effect, outlaw Communism. They were returned to power on 10 December and every two or three days for some four months we saw published in the Press and heard over the radio statements by Mr. Menzies and the men supporting him about what they intended to do with the Communists—all sorts of dire warnings about what they were going to do with the Communists. However, it was not for four months, or perhaps more, that they did anything concrete about the Communists. Why was that period of four months allowed to elapse? I will tell you. It was so that their friends the Communists might be given an opportunity of realising on their assets and getting their underground movement in order before the Government introduced the Bill that was subsequently introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament. That is borne out by the fact that Mr. Menzies kept continually warning the Communists that he was going to introduce this Bill in order to fulfil his promise to the people of Australia. What happened? Marx House in Sydney was sold. What happened to the proceeds? They were socked away. What happened to the Communists' printing business in Brisbane where they published their newspaper? It was sold too. What happened to the proceeds? They were socked away for a rainy day. We also saw published in the Press a statement to the effect that the Communists had similarly realised on their assets in Melbourne. That sort of thing went on all over Australia. It was not until the Communists had put their money into places where the Commonwealth investigating officers could never find it and until the Communists had perfected their underground machinery that Mr. Menzies and the anti-Labour Party in the Federal House introduced that Bill.

Mr. Morris: Is that why the Labour majority in the Senate refused to pass the Bill?

Mr. ROBERTS: The hon. member mentions the attitude of the Labour Party in the Senate. If the anti-Labour Parties in the Federal House were not satisfied with the attitude of Labour in the Senate they had their remedy; they could have gone to the people of Australia again as the result of either a single or a double dissolution. But what happened? They dared not go to the people of Australia, because undoubtedly the people who had spent millions of pounds in seeing that they were returned to power were not prepared to risk seeing their money go down the drain. They were not prepared to risk a double dissolution. We heard quite a lot of ballyhoo by these gentlemen to the effect that they would quickly go to the people unless Labour adopted a different attitude. However, Labour did not adopt a different attitude and there has been no double dissolution.

I should like to take this opportunity of commending to hon. members the article by Professor Walter Murdoch that was read in this House a couple of days ago by the hon. member for North Toowoomba. One of the finest phrases that I think one could ever wish to read as a commentary on the Communist Party Dissolution Bill was that in which Professor Murdoch said, "I declare Mr. Menzies!" Mention was made this morning by the hon. member for Yeronga of the onus-of-proof clause. I have the Bill here and I should like to read one very small part of it. Clause 10 says—

"A person in respect of whom a declaration is in force under this Act—

(a) Shall be incapable of holding office under, or of being employed by, the Commonwealth or any authority of the Commonwealth."

I should like to point out the grave danger of that piece of legislation.

Let me instance, for example, the case of a young man employed in the Postmaster-General's Department who has some ability as a panel-beater. Someone in the department may not like the colour of the ties he wears or the way in which he parts his hair and on that account will run round to the men in authority and furnish them with some information. It could be quite fictitious, without any foundation whatever. But the man is declared and is immediately sacked from the Commonwealth Service. No need to give him 28 days' notice to enable him to appeal—he is sacked automatically from the Commonwealth service upon being declared. Perhaps he gets a job at a little garage where motor-cars are repaired, but after working for two or three days, what happens? Someone with a motor-car comes in, sees him there and knows what has happened. He takes his employer aside and says to him, "I do not like your employee. Do you know that so-and-so whom you have there has a history? Do you know his history?" No

matter how just or fair the employer may want to be he must, because of his business, tell the young man that he will have to finish up. There are many ways in which we can see dangerous opportunity of a heresy hunt in the administration of the Bill, and that is all it amounts to.

I do not wish to go through the Bill in detail; it has been debated at length in the Federal House. However, there is another part that I think hon. members should take notice of. One of our most cherished possessions and one for which we have had to fight harder than for any of the other privileges we now enjoy and one that we must do our utmost to preserve and safeguard at all costs, is our system of trial by jury. We find that during the debate on this Bill in the Federal House the expressions of opinion from members of the Menzies-Fadden Government clearly show what is the desire of that Government in this country. It is nothing short of a desire to establish a dictatorship with them or their officers holding absolute control over the liberty of Australian subjects.

In this connection I should like to refer to the speech by Senator Ian Wood, of Queensland, on 15 June last. His remarks should be broadcast throughout the length and breadth of Queensland at least, so that the people of this State may realise exactly what the Liberal and Country Parties stand for so far as our democratic system is concerned. This is the speech contained in Federal "Hansard" of 15 June, 1950—

"Senator WOOD (Queensland) (12.25): A lot of sentimental and maudlin claptrap has been talked about the jury system. I think that if Senator Willesee were charged with an offence and had the right to elect whether he would be tried by a judge sitting alone or by a judge and jury he would be foolish if he did not elect to be tried by a jury. The jury system, in my opinion, is a failure, because many of those who serve as jurors will not accept the moral responsibility expected of them, and the undoubted tendency of many jurors today in criminal trials is to allow their sympathy with an accused person to over-ride their sense of justice."

So he goes on. Then there is an interjection. Is it an interjection from a horrified member of his own party, or of the Country Party sitting on the same side of the Senate Chamber? Is it an interjection denouncing so far as the Liberal and Country Parties were concerned the sentiments expressed by Senator Ian Wood? No. The interjection is by Senator Fraser, who says—

"The honourable senator does not believe in trial by jury?"

To which the hon. Senator Ian Wood goes on to say—

"No, I do not believe in it. I consider that it failed long ago because of the reluctance of jurors to assume moral responsibility for their verdicts."

Later, Mr. Speaker, only a few minutes later, Senator Ian Wood was followed by a Labour senator, Senator Ashley, who said this—

"Senator Wood has shown just where the Government stands on this matter. He has shown that a streak of Fascism runs right down from the Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) to the back-benchers of the Government parties. I am deeply indebted to Senator Wood for the admission that, in his opinion, trial by jury is not honest."

And even after those words do we find in this report of the Senate debates on that occasion any denial from a senator belonging to the Liberal or Country Parties that this interpretation by Senator Ashley of what Senator Wood had said was correct? Do we find any denial of the allegation that a streak of Fascism was running riot through this party from the Prime Minister to the back benchers? Not one! The only interjection following on those words of Senator Ashley was this one by Senator Ian Wood who said—

"It is not."

Senator Ashley went on to say—

"I ask the Committee to mark those words. The Government is trying to supplant the ordinary processes of law with a police state in which the Executive will determine whether the people shall retain their liberty."

I do, following on what we heard this morning from the hon. member for Yeronga, commend the debate on that occasion as reported in the Federal "Hansard" to him for his very earnest consideration. Had any political Labour representative expressed those sentiments on that or any other occasion, the Labour Party would have never lived it down. Yet we find such sentiments expressed by a Liberal Party senator and to all intents and purposes no notice was taken of them, and no denial made on the spot. Some time later there was some formal denunciation of the sentiments expressed by Senator Ian Wood.

I also want to touch on this occasion on another matter which is affecting each and every one of us to a considerable extent today. Some months before the Labour Government in the Federal House went out of office we had a prices referendum. On that occasion hon. members on the opposite side of the House stumped Queensland, proclaiming that, the States could control prices more effectively than the Commonwealth Government. On the contrary we on this side of the House, led by our Federal colleagues, and by Mr. Chifley himself, endeavoured to point out to the people of Australia and Queensland the constitutional difficulties involved in prices legislation by the States in themselves. Following that calamitous decision of the Australian people when they refused to give the Commonwealth Government the power to continue legislating with respect to prices every State of the Commonwealth endeavoured in the interests of the people of those States to control and police prices.

Soon of course it was found that those constitutional difficulties we endeavoured to point out during that campaign made it impossible for them to do it. As a result prices of consumer goods over the length and breadth of Australia have continued to soar and are still soaring. Today we are feeling the pinch in the price of beef in this city and State. I only wish that those people who beguiled the electors of Australia into voting "No" during the Prices referendum campaign could be segregated into a little community of their own where they could put up with the ever-increasing price of consumer goods, so that the rest of us would be able to control prices of those essential commodities in the interests of each and everyone of us.

In connection with the State elections mention has already been made of the fact that prior to the actual opening of the campaign various officials of the Opposition commented favourably upon the redistribution—they had no fears that because of the redistribution they were going to do any worse than they had done in the past. Despite such published statements, during the campaign we found them not backward in using it, nevertheless, for what political advantage they might hope to gain out of it. After the poll, of course, we heard much more screaming in connection with the matter.

I want to take this opportunity of commenting upon the fact that there were, according to our opponents, two major issues in the election of 29 April, issues on which, if Labour was returned to power, would have given it as a Government very, very wide mandates indeed. For the information of hon. members I will read part of the editorial that appeared in "Courier-Mail" of 29 April, 1950—

"The future of Queensland is in your hands today.

"Your votes will confer upon the chosen party much more than a mere opportunity to govern for the next three years.

"It is not merely the granting of temporary power for a brief hour on the Treasury benches.

"The real issue today is much more vital to you and your children. The Labour Party says it intends to use another term of office to carry out its policies of socialising the State. This does not mean socialisation for three years; it means permanent changes in our political, business, and industrial life."

I say without fear of contradiction that on the issue placed before the people of Queensland by reason of that editorial published in support of the candidature of hon. members opposite, the result of the election of 29 April is, if the Labour Party wanted to use it—and I am not suggesting for one moment the Labour Party, being a responsible political party, would do so—a mandate to socialise everything in this State. That is the mandate that our opponents themselves gave to us on 29 April, 1950.

We read in the same "Courier-Mail," in a column headed "The Last Word," certain comments by the leaders of the Liberal and Country parties. According to the comments made in these two small articles this Government have a further mandate, so far as the Opposition are concerned, to gerrymander electorates as much as we like. In short, they themselves have endeavoured to give the Labour Government a mandate to abolish for all time free elections as we have known them. No responsible and reasonable person would assume for a minute that the Labour Party would do any of these things but it goes to show to what depths the opponents of Labour will descend in an endeavour to create fear in the minds of the electors at election time and the depths to which they will descend in propaganda in their attempt to oust Labour from the Government benches. That is what it amounts to. Mr. Speaker, I hate to think what would happen to the Liberal Party and perhaps also to the Country Party had the Labour Party the same machinery and propaganda, the Press and radio, available to it as had those parties on 29 April.

Mr. EWAN (Roma) (12.57 p.m.): At the outset I sincerely thank the people of Roma for the confidence they have reposed in me in electing me to this Assembly. I look upon myself as the representative not only of those who voted for me but of all the people and all sections of the people. It is my intention to endeavour to look after their interests as a whole in the hope that I may be of some benefit to this State, and during my term in this Assembly to devote myself wholeheartedly to my public duties.

I hope I may succeed in at least awakening in the minds of the Government members and city people generally the realisation that a great debt is owing to the people of the western areas. Economically the whole State is dependent upon the prosperity or adversity existing from time to time in the western areas. Strangely enough, I am sorry to say, a full realisation of this fundamental fact has not been made apparent nor has it been stressed by the representative of western areas who have occupied seats in this House during the last 18 years. Only 25 per cent. of the population of Queensland are engaged in rural or primary industries, nevertheless they are responsible for double the output of production and real wealth of the remaining 75 per cent. of the population of this State. Surely such an achievement is worthy of encouragement and stimulation by sound and sympathetic legislation, to permit of the expansion and full development of those areas on which we must admit the economic prosperity of this State is dependent.

Unfortunately during the past 18 years development and expansion have been retarded by the inept and unsympathetic legislation of successive Labour Governments, resulting in a most serious drift of population from the western areas, exemplified by the decline in

population of 512 in the shires of Bungil and Bendemere since 1939. A similar decline is noticeable in most western shires and the drift from the West will be halted only by improving conditions of life, communications, housing and educational facilities. The cost cannot be regarded as a charitable handout by this Government but the spending of the West's money in the West for the benefit of the nation as a whole.

Let us consider the contributory causes of the decline in population and the lack of expansion and development. First of all I say to hon. members that the Labour Government stand condemned for their lack of appreciation of the deplorable state of the snake-like, winding, back-breaking, glue-pot tracks—bush tracks—masquerading as main roads, which from time to time cripple and dislocate all forms of travel in my electorate and other western areas. Yet the Government in their amazing ignorance of conditions obtaining in the West have seen fit to impose upon us the same motor-car registration and transport fees as is levied on users of cars and vehicles on bitumenised roads and streets in the metropolitan and other favoured areas of the State, without having any regard for the undeniable fact that the repair bills for motor vehicles in western areas are four times as great as those for the more favoured parts. I suggest with all the emphasis at my command that the state of the main roads in the western areas of this State, particularly in the Roma electorate, constitute perhaps the most damning indictment of the mishandling of public funds by the Labour Government of Queensland. Communications are essential for security reasons, as well as for the development of this State. During the war convoys were continually moving west to Charleville, thence on to Darwin, but they were on many occasions bogged in the glue-pots of mud on the western roads. This Government must have been fully seized of the position obtaining at that time; they must recognise the possibility of a repetition of these conditions, perhaps in the near future. For defence and developmental undertakings I suggest that it is absolutely essential that an all-weather bitumen road be built from Roma to Muckadilla, thence on to Mitchell, Mungallala, Morven and Charleville. That would bring an infusion of trade and commerce to those languishing western towns whose expansion and development are vital if we are to retain a happy and contented population in those areas and provide the necessary amenities of life for the inhabitants out there.

Furthermore, for the reasons already mentioned it will be necessary to construct an all-weather road from Rolleston to Injune to Roma and then to Surat and on to St. George, providing an inland defence road direct from Sydney to Rockhampton, as well as providing an outlet for countless millions of superficial feet of timber growing under natural conditions in the Carnarvon Ranges, probably unknown to the present Administration. It would also be wise to extend the railway from Wandoan via Taroom to Springsure so as to enable huge timber resources, variously estimated—and this no doubt will shock the

members of the Government—at from 500,000,000 to 700,000,000 super feet, to be utilised to the full in an effort to overcome the existing housing shortage. Further, such a line would be of tremendous assistance in expanding the beef-cattle industry, which is so necessary if Australia is to meet its export obligations to the Mother Country and to provide for its own domestic needs.

In this connection, I should like to strike a note of warning to the Secretary for Public Lands, whose eulogistic Press releases in connection with the Government's agricultural soldier-settlement scheme in the Taroom area, to my mind, will definitely mislead the public and intending soldier-settlers, as well as retard the much-needed development of the beef-cattle industry in this State. If the Government are sincere in their expressed desire to settle ex-service men on agricultural land—of which we have had very little evidence to date—I feel they could better achieve their purpose by abandoning their socialistic venture at Peak Downs and kindred properties in that area and forthwith make available to soldier-settlers the whole of those lands as going concerns.

Mr. JESSON: I rise to a point of order. I do not want to interrupt a new member, but this may be an opportune time for you, Mr. Speaker, to inform new members that the reading of speeches is not the proper and correct thing to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter has been the subject of discussion during the last 10 years, and has also been the subject of consideration and a subsequent ruling in the House of Commons to the effect that as a general practice the reading of speeches is not in order, except when an important ministerial statement is being made. The point raised by the hon. member for Hinchinbrook has been raised in this House previously. There is a tendency on the part of hon. members, both new and old, to go beyond what in my opinion is a reasonable limit. That has been the cause of some discontent. With regard to the point of order that is now raised, I noticed that although the hon. member for Roma appeared to be referring to copious notes, he at times gave me the impression that he was not reading his speech. I suggest to all hon. members, however, that the practice of reading speeches is not desirable. A speech is not nearly as interesting or attractive when it is read as when it is delivered otherwise. I ask hon. members to desist from reading speeches. I shall bring the matter under the notice of the Standing Orders Committee so that the position may be more clearly defined.

Mr. EWAN: By doing what I suggest, judging from past experiences in this State of socialistic State ownership, the Government will be fulfilling certain of their obligations to ex-service men, who in turn, I venture to say, will out-produce by at least 50 per cent. the present set-up, to the betterment of themselves and the nation as a whole.

Reverting to the unpleasant subject of roads, I submit that for developmental and humanitarian reasons it will be necessary to construct an all-weather bitumen road from Yuleba to Wallumbilla and on to Roma, and provide adequate bridging of Blyth's Creek which holds up the ambulance with sick people and other people who have to be transported to the Roma base hospital. This happens even when the smallest amount of rain falls. The nearest doctor for these areas is Roma, where a base hospital has been established. It is a magnificent building, but it must be remembered that if there is the slightest delay whatever in many cases of sickness or accidents life is thereby endangered.

That brings me to the subject of hospitalisation and nursing facilities available in western areas, and at the outset I should like to say that no matter how magnificent the building may be, or how well equipped with the most modern medical appliances and equipment, it cannot in any circumstances fulfil its actual purpose unless the people can be transported to the hospital from the whole of the area that it serves. Furthermore, such an institution cannot function adequately in the circumstances, no matter how capable the resident medical officer may be. It may be said that in Western Queensland at least the Labour Party has failed to provide adequate nursing staffs, which is so urgent that it is my intention to rise above political partisanship and in a spirit of helpfulness make suggestions to the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs that after very full investigation I believe may tend to relieve the present deplorable state of affairs in connection with nursing staffs in various western hospitals of this State.

First of all, I must deal with the trainee nurses, and although Government members will object to my reading the matter, I ask your permission, Mr. Speaker, to quote the conditions applicable to nurses under the State Nursing Award and the conditions applicable to domestic employees under the Public Hospitals Award. First of all, the nurses work 80 hours a fortnight and may be worked up to 60 hours in any one week, or 10½ hours consecutively in any one day without the payment of overtime or a penalty rate. The domestic employees work a 40-hour week, and they are entitled to overtime for all hours worked in excess of 8 hours in any one day.

Nurses receive no allowance for working week-end or shift work, and trainees are required to do night duty without extra payment. Domestic employees are paid extra for work done at week-ends or afternoon or night shifts.

Nurses are taxed at the rate of 25s. a week for board, with lodging supplied, whereas domestic employees pay only 21s. for board, although the standard is the same in both cases.

The rate of wages paid to nurses is graduated according to service, whereas a domestic employee receives 75 per cent. of the minimum male rate, consequently receiving a

higher weekly rate of pay immediately she begins employment without regard to age or experience.

To attract trained nurses to country hospitals I submit that the following improvements to award conditions might be considered—

1. Fares and travelling expenses should be refunded at the expiration of three months' satisfactory service, in lieu of the six months as at present.

2. The allowances to relieving sisters as at present paid should be discontinued completely. Return fares and higher wages are payable if relieving duty for a fixed limited period is undertaken. Permanent staff members feel aggrieved by the concessions given to relieving sisters. These conditions merely encourage sisters to "tour" from one district to another. (3) Sisters should receive award rates of pay during their first three months' service with an increase of at least 10s. a week for the ensuing three months and 15s. a week thereafter, if their work is continuous with one hospital board. This would tend to encourage sisters employed at the base hospital to accept relieving duty at associate hospitals under the board's control, and to maintain continuous service with the one board. (4) Nurses in country regions should receive a country allowance to compensate for the loss of amenities and living conditions available in coastal areas. "Country regions" might be designated to include only those hospitals in the northern, central-western and south-western areas of the State.

The allowance should vary according to the region. It is absurd that a western allowance of 2s. a week should be considered sufficient to compensate nurses for the difference in living conditions, quite apart from amenities, buildings and the like in coastal areas as compared with western areas. The allowance should be at least 10s. a week. I say without fear of equivocation that the costs involved would be a mere bagatelle compared with the cost of advertising in all the papers throughout the State in an effort to rectify this absurd and ridiculous position that exists under western hospitals boards.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. EWAN: Other possible attractions should include—

(5) the provision at country hospitals of staff amenities such as lighted tennis courts and recreation rooms apart from their sleeping quarters, together with pianos, table tennis, etc., and also provision for transport facilities to enable the staff attached to country hospitals to take part in social functions.

Attention should also be paid to the deplorable state of many of the roads from the many business centres to the hospitals in western areas. Is it any wonder that nurses will not go out into those western areas when the hospitals are often situated two miles from the town, which means that in wet weather when taxis, or any form of transport cannot operate they are compelled to

walk the intervening distance? If they adopt rubber boots they might walk out of them. Nurses will not engage in the noblest profession known to women under those conditions.

I submit that after full investigation the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs will consider the suggestions I have made. Their adoption would in some small measure overcome the deplorable and often fatal conditions that prevail in our western areas.

It must be admitted that the Government have failed to provide communications to exploit our natural timber resources, particularly in the Injune and Taroom districts and along the foothills of the Carnarvon Range, coupled also with their restrictive milling licences and their ineffective efforts to obtain suitable quotas of roofing materials, iron and other building materials, in many instances brought about by absurd transport policy.

Furthermore, during its eighteen years of unbroken office, Labour has done nothing to provide housing for many of the Government's permanent administrative officers stationed in the various towns throughout the State, such as land commissioners, rangers, and agents, stipendiary magistrates, clerks of petty sessions, stock inspectors, veterinary officers, and many others too numerous to mention, with the result that many of these officers perforce are compelled to live at hotels while their wives and families, in many instances, live in other towns. It is bringing about unhappiness and discontent. Many of these officers are unable to build their own homes or to buy homes, but if they are lucky enough to rent homes or buy or build them, when they are transferred to other parts of the State, they do then, because of the inept tragic economic disequilibrium brought about by the Chifley socialistic administration, stand to lose perhaps the whole of their life savings on the resale of such houses. That is obvious. Surely this constitutes a particularly sad commentary on a Government who claim to represent the workers.

I must touch upon the Government's educational policy, or lack thereof, so far as it applies to the western areas. I refer to the need for the establishment of hostels to enable the children of parents engaged in farming or grazing to receive the benefits of education. The present position is such that it is impossible for those people to avail themselves of the State educational instrumentalities which they have helped to provide by way of taxation.

Mr. Jesson: You cannot tell me that graziers cannot afford to send their children to high school.

Mr. EWAN: I will deal with the hon. member at a later stage. I know that members sitting opposite—particularly the interjector—will say, "Why do they not use the correspondence system?" Of course, they would not know that the use of the correspondence system falls on the already overburdened shoulders of the country housewife.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. EWAN: The housewife knows full well that she can expect no relief whatsoever under existing conditions. She knows that the only way by which she can get relief is by leaving those areas and coming to an area where a State instrumentality can be used.

A Government Member: Graziers' wives?

Mr. EWAN: Yes, graziers' wives. Imagine a happy contented married couple living on a station property—to which my friend opposite takes such exception although it provides him and many of his sort with a living—in a comfortable house provided by the employer.

Government Members: No.

Mr. EWAN: In many instances, yes. The trouble is, hon. members opposite never get out of the metropolitan area to know what is going on.

After a few years the first child comes along, then the second and perhaps a third, to the great satisfaction of the employee and the employer. In due course the first child becomes of age to attend school and then the second one, and the housewife immediately enrolls them under the correspondence system. After a short time she finds, owing to the paucity of labour in all western areas, that she is unable to give these children their rights by way of supervision in their lessons. She tries very hard—in spite of the laughter from the Government benches; they would not know—withstanding the indignities inflicted upon her by men such as the members who have interjected, and in a short time it is apparent to her husband that she is nervy and overwrought; and in many cases she falls ill. What does the husband do? Western people are imbued with the spirit of humanitarianism. He hastens in most instances to rent a house or find accommodation in the nearest town where educational facilities exist.

He is successful in renting a house and his wife and children repair thereto. I put it to you hon. members opposite that if you possess some love and affection for your wife and family, as we do in the west, you will not stay out there in isolation without becoming hungry for your loved ones. In a very short time the husband leaves his job and seeks employment in the nearest town and in many instances the larger cities, where work is obtainable. Thus we lose that family to the industries on which this State is dependent.

Alternatively the husband is faced with the problem of keeping his wife in some measure of good health and endeavours to send his children to a hostel provided by the Country Women's Association or some church body. These are doing magnificent work. After a very short time the man engaged in the industry in the west finds he has to pay 30s. and in some instances up to 35s. a week for board for each child. Take the example I have already quoted of two children. Thirty shillings a week is a conservative estimate. It costs him £3 a week to send these two children to the nearest hostel to enable

them to take advantage of the State instrumentalities that he has helped to provide by way of taxation, and in a very short time he finds he cannot afford to do this. Consequently, as in the first instance, the father leaves for the nearest city or larger town and there obtains employment. If this state of affairs is allowed to continue the already depleted pool of labour in the western areas is drawn from. Most people leaving these industries engage in many instances in uneconomic industries in the cities, which in all cases are bolstered up at the expense of the primary industries of this State. Well, then, there will be nothing but complete chaos and economic collapse with the resultant destitution and want that members of the Government never miss an opportunity of endeavouring, unsuccessfully, to the best of their ability to attribute to the actions of the Moore Government. (Government laughter.)

What is the remedy for this educational position? The Queensland Country Women's Association and many church organisations have established hostels in various centres of the State. Again I emphasise that they are giving magnificent service to the country children. The Government must help these bodies. If this Government want to overcome the difficulties already existing and to prevent the chaos that I have indicated results from the depletion of the labour pool in those areas, they will build a chain of hostels at strategic points and have the management of these establishments put in the hands of these bodies, which from practical experience have indicated their capabilities to run successfully and economically; and not expect the station hand, the small farmer and graziers to pay 35s. a week for each child by way of maintenance of these public utilities—which in fact they are. The Country Women's Association and church bodies are doing the job that rightly should be done by the Government.

I go further and say that by way of maintenance the Government should subsidise those establishments to the extent of 10s. in the £1, as is done with the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade. If that suggestion is adopted, I feel that more people will be attracted from the city areas to country areas. This Government must not lose sight of the fact that unless they are prepared to provide all-weather roads for the areas I have indicated they cannot expect people to stay in those areas. One hon. member opposite in his volubility said that there are no small graziers in the West, but by the look of him he left there 50 years ago—

Mr. Sparkes: Never was there.

Mr. EWAN: No, he was not there. Let me tell him—

Mr. Aikens: He would not know a dilberry from a gooseberry.

Mr. EWAN: No, he would not. I understand that some years ago a very prominent Labour leader told the beef barons or pastoral potentates or the sheep magnates,

as we have all heard them described, that by the legislation of a Labour Government he would make them squeal. Well, Mr. Speaker, that gentleman has achieved his purpose. He has made those non-existent pastoral potentates, beef barons or sheep magnates squeal to such effect that the people of this city are squealing and wanting meat. (Government interjections.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EWAN: I thought, Mr. Speaker, that being a new member to this Chamber I should have had the privilege extended to me—and you suggested it at the opening of this session—of being heard in silence, but it is with great satisfaction that I hear the interjections, because I know that my remarks are driving home and hitting the sore spots. What I say is the undeniable truth and cannot be disputed by any Government member. Those of them who have been game to come out and look at the conditions will say that they are as I have endeavoured to describe them.

Mr. Rasey: We will reply to you at a later date.

Mr. EWAN: I thank the hon. member. I now wish to reply to the cyclone from Keppel—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! An hon. member must refer to another hon. member by using the name of his electorate. It should be "the hon. member for Keppel."

Mr. EWAN: Very well, the hon. member for Keppel, who so vociferously denied that the Labour Government have a twin they condemn—a twin known as the Communist Party. I feel after listening to the various speakers for the last few days that maybe they protest too much. Perhaps I am somewhat harsh in making that statement, because perhaps some of the more decent and well-read members on the Government side might understand the meaning of the nationalisation of industry and the means of production, distribution and exchange. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is the basic principle of Communism. I do not ask hon. members to accept my interpretation of Communism, but because I did a course of economics in my younger days, I propose to refer to this little book entitled "The Dictionary of Economics."

Economics is just plain common-sense. Presuming on your good nature, Sir, it is my intention to try to help the more decent members of the Government to arrive at a sound conclusion in regard to their pledge in relation to Socialism. Communism is the view that the agents of production, land and capital should be owned by the community as a whole so as to secure a more equitable distribution of wealth than under the present individualistic system. I now refer you, Sir, to Socialism, which is a proposal to establish a system of society in which all land, capital and enterprises shall be owned and organised by the State instead of being owned and organised by individuals.

Mr. Jesson: Who is your authority?

Mr. EWAN: It is the recognised economics dictionary, on which the course of economics is taught.

Mr. Jesson: Written by Bob Menzies?

Mr. EWAN: No, it is not.

I hope that any of my interested friends on the Government side might come over to me and say, "Let us have a look at that dictionary." They would then find, as I understand the history of the Labour Movement, that perhaps one other very honoured and revered Premier of this State, with great effort and trial and tribulation to himself, was able to have that offending clause expunged from the party platform. I feel quite certain from reading Press reports that an effort was made by the moderate section of the Government Party to have that offending communistic pledge removed from the Platform of what they like to term "The Great Labour Party." That effort was made at the Toowoomba Convention, but unfortunately it was unsuccessful.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) (2.52 p.m.): I also desire to congratulate the hon. members for Haughton and Windsor for the way in which they respectively moved and seconded the motion that is the subject of debate before the House today. They both indicated by their contributions that they will prove acquisitions to this Parliament and, if I am any judge, I am sure the political futures ahead of them will compare very favourably with those of their predecessors.

On 29 April last this vicious Government, according to hon. members opposite—and particularly those who seem to be infected with the virus of hate, like the hon. member who has just resumed his seat—committed the great crime of winning the State election seven times in succession. In the eyes of hon. members opposite that is an unpardonable sin for which we should all hang our heads in very shame. However, we can console ourselves with the fact that even if we are no better off as the result of being elected, the people of Queensland will unquestionably benefit. If they do not benefit by the fact that we have been re-elected, they will certainly benefit by the fact that the Opposition were not elected.

I suppose political historians will give reasons for the habit of the Labour Party in winning elections and it will be interesting for some of us to come back to the earth in 50 or 100 years and read the reasons they give. I dare say that some of them will attribute it to the soundness of the policy of the Labour Party, while others on the other hand will put forward the theory that it is due to the weakness of the Opposition. The argument will go on, but we shall have to leave it to assumption to be discussed over campfires, round firesides, and in various other places. To be quite candid, I am inclined to think that there is a good deal of backing for both reasons. I think that it is because of the weakness of the Opposition and the strength of the Labour Party that we have been on the Government benches for

such a long time. And there is every indication that we shall continue there for a period as long as we have already been there.

The Australian elector is not deceived by oratory.

Mr. Sparkes: Not by yours.

Mr. BURROWS: Let me tell the hon. member that I do not make any claim to being an orator. I was born at a time when I had no opportunity to prepare along those lines. I was reared in the bush and when I say in the bush I mean the real bush, the bush that the hon. member does not know although he is a big pastoralist. I venture to say that although quite a number of hon. members opposite claim to be bushmen I could still take them out and "bush" them. I make no apology for the fact that I missed those opportunities. My only regret is that the Labour Party did not come into power 20 years earlier so that I might have had those opportunities.

In 1929 the anti-Labour forces won the election on a policy of promises and if those promises had been fulfilled, only in part, it would have ensured for them retention of the Government benches for a period perhaps as long as that of the present Government. They made promises like "Give the boy a chance" and "£2,000,000 for 10,000 jobs"—extravagant promises—and the electors were deceived by them. But I forgive them for being deceived. They were attractive promises and only time could tell whether they would be honoured. They were entirely devoid of any sincerity, there was no intention on the part of those who made them to carry them out. The average elector may be deceived once but naturally he is a bit chary about trusting the same political party again. The electors of Queensland in particular have an honest and decent outlook. I forgive them for accepting the party that promised all these decent and statesmanlike things promised by the Moore Party in 1929. What do we find? In contrast to the fulfilment of these promises they were followed by the blithest of contradictions. I do not think in the history of all Australian Parliaments such a wicked and cruel Government ever had control of a Treasury bench in any Parliament. I sincerely hope that future generations will not suffer from such a curse as that brought about by the regime occupying our Treasury bench in 1929. That Government recklessly, wilfully and indecently set out to destroy and reduce our working and living standards. That was their deliberate obsession. Their outlook was deliberately sadistic in that respect. Doubtless electors were a little chary and have been ever since when such promises have been repeated. As we all remember, the sinfulness of that Government was avenged at the ballot box in 1932. Comparatively speaking, ever since 1932 this State, notwithstanding that the war years intervened, has enjoyed that progress and prosperity which the people can rightly claim and which this State is richly entitled to have.

Without detracting from the merit of the success of the Labour Party in the last election, I contend that we might not have been so successful had the opposing party paid attention to that honesty of principle to which this party owes its success. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Coorparoo, traversed this State during the election campaign. Much of the success of hon. members of our Party was due to his underestimation of the intelligence of the people and in my particular case I am going to publicly acknowledge that help—I am glad the hon. gentleman is here—and thank him for the part he played in my re-election in Port Curtis. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was greatly responsible for the large majority that I obtained. If a black-fellow did me a good turn it would be my duty to thank him; I take this opportunity, therefore, to thank the hon. member for Coorparoo for the part he played in my return.

I will illustrate the part he did play. A candidate was selected to oppose me. He certainly was better-looking than I was, and he also had a better personality than I have. He had everything, outwardly, that a candidate should possess, his only disadvantage being his association with the Liberal Party. He was a much younger man than I was; he was born at a time when Labour legislation had improved the educational system; he was much luckier than I; he had the opportunity of receiving a secondary education. He had everything that was required, but he was cursed with one affliction, and that was his association with the Liberal Party.

I had a majority above the average, but I want to tell hon. members that I was not happy right throughout the race. In the course of the campaign the hon. member for Coorparoo came to Gladstone and addressed a meeting. Gladstone contains approximately two-fifths of the voters in the Port Curtis electorate; whoever gets the big majority in Gladstone gets in front; that vote usually indicates what the result of the election will be. I was not in Gladstone when the hon. member spoke at the opening of my opponent's campaign, but I read his speech with a good deal of concern a couple of days afterwards. According to his remarks the hon. member was going to build a railway to Callide and develop the port and shut up every other port in Queensland. Gladstone was to be the only port and Callide was to be the only coalfield in Australia. Hon. members can understand my concern when I read that. I will admit that I did not stop to read the news in the paper after reading the hon. member's speech, but turned over to the "Positions Vacant" column (laughter), and I began to look down that column; I thought the hon. member for Dalby might want another cowboy. (Renewed laughter). I saw visions of myself working on the Darling Downs under the Sparkes's award, as I did years ago—eat prickly pear and vote whichever way the boss tells you. I was definitely concerned about the possibilities

of my re-election after reading the abundant promises of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

I will admit that my anxiety and suspense were short-lived because the following night he addressed a meeting in Rockhampton where he told the people he was going to shut Gladstone up and open a port at Rockhampton. (Laughter.) Rockhampton was to be the only port. My hopes rose higher and higher as the hon. member progressed north, repeating the promises, *mutatis mutandis*, as the draughtsman says, right up the North. Mackay was going to get a port, Townsville, Bowen, Cairns and Cooktown; and if he had gone as far as Burketown he would have opened a port there.

As I said previously, immediately I read that speech at Rockhampton I felt sure and the farther north the hon. member went the more my confidence grew. Probably, had the elections been postponed and he had had time to journey round the coast of Australia my opponent would have lost his deposit. When he was in Rockhampton I was very amused to read his remarks, and had I been a political trickster similar to some of the men who represented the party opposite but were not successful at the polls, I should have made use of some of his remarks against him. In Rockhampton he made a violent and vicious attack upon northern members who had the temerity to buy homes and live in them at Brisbane instead of living at the Lodge, as some of us have to do. He said members of Parliament must live in their own electorates, that his members would have to do that. But he did not say that when at Gladstone because the local man who wanted to contest the seat—and I was pleased he did not (laughter)—did not obtain the endorsement of the poohbahs of the Party. They brought a candidate from Southport.

Mr. Plunkett: That is a good place.

Mr. BURROWS: It suited me, because when I read that the hon. member for Coorparoo advised electors not to vote for anyone who did not live in their electorate, Southport was even too close to Gladstone for me. Had I been unscrupulous, perhaps I should have used that as propaganda against my opponent.

I am not likely to be selected for the job of writing the political history of the day, but if I were I should be undecided whether to attribute the success of the Labour Party to its soundness of policy or the political perfidy and the obvious shallowness of the policy that Labour's opponents have found. Perhaps here I may be pardoned for repeating the hackneyed, "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time." The electors were fooled in 1929. They had partially forgotten that in 1948, but unfortunately for Australia they were fooled again in December last year. They were not fooled on 29 April, 1950.

By the way the Federal Government are carrying on I do not think they are likely to

fool the people for another 20 years. That Government promised to develop Callide and build railway lines and the Deputy Leader of our Opposition came out with an article in the "Telegraph" saying that the Callide line had to be built and Callide had to be developed. Where do we find the Deputy Leader of the Opposition today? He is defending the men who betrayed Callide and Australia's economy. He definitely is. He came out last week and tried to justify the importation of coal.

Mr. Hiley: You are lining up with the Communists now—keep the steel works shut!

Mr. BURROWS: The hon. member says that I am lining up with the Communists, but he is a member of a party that is continually adopting the Communist Party's policy. If the hon. member sat beside a Communist in school, I guarantee that the hon. member would be getting the cane every day for cheating and copying. I remember that I missed a well-known Communist in Gladstone, but was told that he was down attending the political classes. This took place about two years ago. The Liberals were adopting the principle of calling their members down to attend political classes. Strangely enough, after my opponent was selected I wondered why he was not around the country getting to know the people and the electorate. I was informed by my grape-vine that he was in Brisbane attending the Liberal Classes. We find that under our Young Liberal's League and the Eureka League—

Mr. Hiley: Yours?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Mann): Order!

Mr. BURROWS: Where did the Liberals' League get its inspirations? It got them from the Eureka League. I say that there is no party that is closer to the Communist Party than the Liberal Party. I want to be fair and dissociate the Country Party from that statement—the Country Party as we knew it before it became contaminated and corrupted by its unholy alliance with the Liberals. It was not an illegal marriage; it was not a marriage at all. (Laughter.) If ever a party should hang its head in shame in respect of its association with Communism, it is the Liberal Party or what we knew as the Queensland People's Party.

Mr. Walsh: They financed the Communists.

Mr. BURROWS: They would do anything to help the Communists and would prefer the Communist Party to the Labour Party. So far as I am concerned, I reciprocate their wishes. I will say this much for Communism, that Communism at its worst has not done a greater injustice to Australian industry than the Menzies-Fadden Government have done by subsidising imported coal, and anybody associated with them is just as big a traitor as are the members of that Government.

An Opposition Member: You are getting your steam up.

Mr. BURROWS: I do not need steam, but I boil when I read of those members taking the oath of allegiance to a Government who are spending £10,000,000 in order to crucify an industry in Australia to bolster up one in a black-labour country.

All jokes aside, I suggest that hon. members opposite should give the matter serious consideration. If they are honest with themselves, I venture to say that they will consider seriously dissociating themselves from such a party.

The hon. member for Yeronga this morning enunciated a policy for the development of our hospital system and medical services generally. In his approach to the problem of medical services he said that every consideration should be shown for the welfare of the doctor, the public and the Government. I was particularly interested in the sequence in which he placed them. He placed the doctor first, the public second and the Government third.

Mr. Hiley: Whom did he say was the most important? Be fair!

Mr. BURROWS: The hon. member is asking me to be something that he has never been; he is asking me to be fair. He is about as fair as a black gin's foot. (Laughter.)

In the principles enunciated by the hon. member for Yeronga in respect of hospitals, he said that the ideal system was one where the doctor could put the patient into a hospital, either public or private, and the Government provided the hospital, the staff, the diagnostic instruments, and so on. In effect, he said that the Government should supply the doctor with everything essential for him to carry out his work. I was associated rather intimately with hospitals for 20-odd years before my election to this House, and these problems have cropped up in hospital administration for more than 20 years to my knowledge. Many doctors have adopted the idea that the taxpayer should provide them with all their tools of trade, which are no more essential to the doctor than the lumper's hook to the wharf-lumper, the theodolite to the surveyor, and the typewriter to the stenotypist.

Further, according to some of these selfish doctors the taxpayer should supply them not only with their tools of trade but also with the buildings wherein they work and the necessary trained staff to help them. The only thing they do not require the hospital to supply are the billheads on which they can send out their accounts to the patients they have treated. I suppose that 95 per cent. of the time occupied in treating patients is given by the nurses, not by the doctors at all. As I said before, everything required by the doctor to make a livelihood should in the opinion of some of the more selfish doctors be supplied by the general taxpayers. That may be the position in Russia and similar states, but I am not conversant with them and I cannot say.

Let us be honest about the idea, let us follow it to its logical conclusion. If the Government are to supply the tools of trade

and the place in which to work in the case of doctors, what about the surveyor, who requires a theodolite? Is not he also entitled to ask the taxpayer to find that theodolite for him? And is not the garage man entitled to ask the Government to supply him with his tools of trade and a garage in which to work? It would be no more illogical for the Government to provide tools of trade and working place for a garage man than it would be for them to provide a hospital, tools of trade and trained assistants such as nurses to enable doctors to carry on their work. If the hon. member of Yeronga can convince me that there is anything in his argument, I shall be happy to support him in anything—

Mr. Decker: The help must come first.

Mr. BURROWS: But the public own cars and cars have to be repaired by technicians and mechanics. The hon. member for Yeronga, who is a doctor by profession, was honest in outlining his scheme and particularly mentioned that the first consideration must be the doctor, secondly the public, and thirdly the Government.

Mr. Plunkett: That is not what he said.

Mr. BURROWS: I know what he said and I also know what the hon. member hoped he would say. I have not exaggerated his statement. It seems to be the idea of certain members of the medical profession that because a man is a doctor he is a law unto himself and entitled to special selective treatment. If a wharf-labourer goes on strike, then according to these men he should be put in gaol whether his cause is right or wrong. On the other hand, according to the medical men, it is absolutely an error to call it a strike when a doctor does not work, as was the case when doctors defied the law of the country. A law was introduced and the doctors defied it, but imagine the hue and cry there would be if members of some of the less fortunate sections of the community defied the law of the country by refusing to work and carried on a strike in a manner adopted by members of the B.M.A. when the Government introduced a certain law. If a law of the country is passed, whether we agree with it or not, we should as citizens be law-abiding and respect it. We must do that if democracy is to continue and to succeed. The country cannot be maintained if sections of the community can openly defy the law and treat with contempt the Acts of the Parliament and the country.

Mr. MUNRO (Toowong) (3.30 p.m.), who was received with "Hear hears," said: In rising for the first time as a new member of this House I should like in the first place very briefly to pay a tribute to the former representative of my electorate of Toowong, Charles Wanstall.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MUNRO: Charles Wanstall probably is better known to hon. members than he is to me and for that reason it is not necessary for me to sing his praises. I just want to mention that in the passing of Charles Wanstall to other spheres this House will have

lost something in his keen wit, energy and initiative, and if there is any compensation at all connected with the loss to this House it is in the gain to the legal profession.

As a new member I listened with very considerable interest to His Excellency's Speech and to the speeches of hon. members on both sides of the House. I have heard a considerable number of speeches that covered many matters of interest and gave a great deal of information. I must confess, at this stage, however, to a certain sense of disappointment at what appears to me to be a lack of awareness of the fundamental problems of Queensland and Australia at the present time. Before developing that point I should devote a few minutes to the speech of the hon. member for Port Curtis who preceded me. It is worthy of about 7½ per cent. of the time allotted me. He dealt with a number of points but I would very briefly take three of them, namely, Gladstone (his own town), coal, and Liberalism. Let me say at the outset that I am entirely in agreement with the views of the hon. member for Port Curtis in so far as he evinces his dissatisfaction with the treatment that Gladstone has had throughout the history of Queensland. I should regard Gladstone as one of our neglected spots. Hon. members on both sides would, I am sure, be glad if Gladstone was given its proper share of development in the future. But the question of Gladstone and the Port Curtis area generally must not be confused with the more important general question of coal.

When we get onto the question of coal we have to recognise in the first place that we are dealing with a basic commodity of tremendous importance to the economy of Australia. We are also dealing with a very technical subject. We cannot consider coal as coal without considering all the various classifications as well as all the various kinds of coal within those classifications and all the various uses which coal of various kinds can be put to. The matter will be dealt with by other speakers, but I do wish to indicate that this House would be entirely misled if it were to consider it on the basis of one particular locality.

The hon. member also referred to a particular candidate as being at a disadvantage on account of his association with the Liberal Party. Again I wish to be very brief. I speak as one who, for the greater part of his life, has not been associated with any political party. I have come into this field virtually as a newcomer to party politics, and I have just recently chosen to associate myself with the Liberal Party.

Mr. Power: You will be sorry.

Mr. MUNRO: No, I shall not be sorry. I feel that there may be a number of members in this House who really do not understand and appreciate the concept of Liberalism. The basic concept is open-mindedness. We have come here—and I speak particularly of some of the newer members—in a spirit of open-mindedness. We have come here because we want to do the best we can for the people of Queensland, and we want to do it without being

tied to any particular method of dealing with economic or social affairs, as members of some other party in this House may be. Perhaps I shall give further information on that point as I proceed.

Turning to His Excellency's Speech, I must confess that I felt disappointment to some extent at the apparent evidence of lack of appreciation by His Excellency's advisers of the fundamental problems with which this Parliament should now be concerning itself. I did see a ray of hope when subsequently I read over his Speech and I obtained some inspiration from the first paragraph, on which I propose primarily to base my remarks. It reads:

"You have been called together to give your attention to, and make decisions upon, matters concerning the welfare of the people of this State."

I think we should constantly remind ourselves of that; we have been called together to give our attention to, and make decisions upon, matters concerning the welfare of the people of this State. Referring particularly to what we have heard from the Government side of the House, I have not yet had any very clear indication of the practical application of those words. I sincerely hope we shall not find that the first paragraph was included merely as a formality.

There were a few more words that gave me perhaps a little inspiration or hope, and they were these—

"We meet at a time of crisis."

That was not carried very much further. I suggest that we do meet at a time of crisis; and I think the most important matter with which the House should concern itself is the really fundamental questions we should consider. If I had to name them quickly and in a few words I should put them under three headings—

National Security;

Social Security;

A better spirit among our people and a better way of life.

I mentioned these because I think they are all interdependent, they are interwoven, and although national security as such should be primarily the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, it is interwoven with the providing of the material things of life for our people and the State must see that there is no sagging in our national spirit. We must realise each of these three things is vital. I would also suggest that national security and any other subject that may be closely associated or interwoven with it should be regarded as a thing over and above party politics and something to which we should be prepared to apply our minds to find out what must be done to improve the position. At this point I am hopeful that we might find a substantial measure of agreement among many members of both sides of the House.

I fully realise, coming to the second stage, the method by which we are to attain the things that are generally regarded as desirable, there might be some difference of opinion. Before considering methods, to some extent we should endeavour to take

stock of the present position. I say this because both in His Excellency's Speech and subsequent speeches in this House there have been a number of what I should regard as self-satisfactory references to records that are being made as to how well we have done. The first point I would make is this: where those records are expressed in terms of quantity I am very much impressed, but where they are expressed in terms of the Australian pound they leave me entirely cold. In my hands I have the latest report of the Government Statistician, Bulletin No. 21 of 1950, which gives the details of the retail price index for the June quarter, 1950. These figures show that compared with the year ended 30 June, 1939, 11 years ago, the increase in the C Series retail price level is 67.6 per cent. I mention that but the reduction in the purchasing power of the pound is greater than indicated by that figure, for reasons which are well known to most hon. members. To illustrate my point would not be very difficult. I need only state that for the purpose of measuring the pound today with the pound in pre-war years, we must remember that it is now worth approximately only 10s. Applying the physical measurement, our foot-rule today is approximately only 6 inches long. It is most important, when making financial comparisons, that that point be kept in mind.

The most serious thing is that the inflationary tendency is continuing, for the bulletin shows that the increase for the 12 months compared with the quarter ended June, 1949, has been 8.1 per cent. The increase for the last quarter of the 12 months has been 2.3 per cent. My point is this: an inflationary increase to that extent is unhealthy and has the effect of confusing the position and causing many of us to fall into the error of thinking we are doing very well whereas really our economic position is not nearly so good as we might be persuaded to think. There have been references to the problem of inflation but they have mostly been of a personal or party nature by way of disparagement of the Prime Minister or the acting Prime Minister of Australia. I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that instead of referring to what we might regard as the shortcomings of other responsible persons we ask ourselves what we can do about the problem.

The problem of inflation is not one that can be cured by an Act of the Commonwealth Parliament and it cannot be cured by a revaluation of the currency. Basically, if we take up the question of inflation we find that it is a disequilibrium between money and purchasing power on the one hand and the supply of goods and services on the other. It is obvious, therefore, that if the trend to inflate is going to be cured we must remedy this disequilibrium and if we are going to remedy it we can do it in one of two ways. The first is the negative way of in some way reducing the purchasing power or the application of the purchasing power, and the other is what we might regard as the positive way, increasing the supply of goods and services. I do not wish to discuss the negative way because it is to a considerable

extent outside the province of this legislature, but I think the positive way is very much within our province and something for which we must take some share of the responsibility. There is a short-term way of increasing supplies of goods by bringing them into this country but there is the long-term and the more satisfactory way of increasing our own supply, and it is to this problem that the members of the Government should apply themselves.

If we are going to find any solution on the long-term basis we have to consider what are the points handicapping production, and amongst other things—and when I say this, I think I have the general agreement of all members—one of the basic factors is the lack of full co-operation between employers and employees. The fact is that our industrial relations are not generally what they should be. The members of my party have a policy of open-mindedness. We assert that every avenue must be explored to find a better means of building up a better employer-employee relationship, putting to the fullest use all available machinery and using technical and scientific knowledge to the utmost so that we can in fact produce the goods our people urgently require.

On this point I do not cast any doubt at all on the sincerity of the objective of this Government, but I do cast very considerable and serious doubts on the effectiveness of the methods at present being employed to achieve it. Our greatest problem, I think, is this very regrettable trend towards misunderstanding between different sections of the community. I think there is a lack of understanding. I believe there are many sincere men who could be regarded as representatives of big business, and I know many earnest and sincere men who are members of trade unions. Our great problem is to have a greater understanding by one side of the problems of the other side and a better spirit of tolerance, so that we can overcome these difficulties. In that connection, the hon. member for Maryborough gave a very good example of what has been achieved in his electorate. That, I should say, is largely the result of the satisfactory industrial relations existing there.

But in considering this problem we must go further. We must consider the experience overseas. If we do that, we shall find that there are many ways from which to choose along the general lines of profit-sharing, co-partnership, incentives, and various other ways of giving some reward for extra effort, which in the majority of industries are absent today, and which, if they could be employed, would go a long way towards restoring this greater production that is necessary.

The next point with which I wish to deal is the need for a better spirit among our people, because we shall not solve our problems in material matters alone. As has been said, we meet at a time of crisis. There is a threat of external aggression and there are evidences of internal dissension. Any legislation that may be passed by the

Commonwealth Government to enable the Commonwealth authorities to deal with disruptive elements in our community will not provide a complete solution of our problems. I believe that the vast majority of Australians are completely loyal. The very small minority who may not be loyal, or who may be disruptive, yet can represent a very great danger to us. Therefore, we must give some thought to the spirit of our people, and perhaps it is a good thing to remind ourselves of what I do not think I can put better than by quoting what I think is a liberal interpretation of an old Hawaiian motto, which says, "The life of the land is preserved in the righteousness of its people."

Another matter with which I should like to deal, because of its tremendous importance to the future of Australia—it has already been touched on by the hon. member for Yeronga—is that of our new settlers. In the 1949 calendar year about 168,000 settlers came to Australia and of this number 54,000 were from Great Britain and of the remaining 114,000 approximately 75,000 were displaced persons from Europe. In 1950 it is expected the number will be even greater, probably very little short of 200,000 persons. The point I want to make is the great importance of these people not only to our Commonwealth economy but to our national security in the future. If we can make these new settlers good Australians they will be a wonderful asset to this country, not only from the viewpoint of defence in order to stem aggression but from every other view point. On the other hand, if we fail to make them good Australians they will be nothing but a weakness to Australia.

In this connection I should like to pay a tribute to the work of the departments that are concerned with these people and particularly to the New Settlers' League of Australia, which at the present time is doing wonderful work. But what is being done, even through those two agencies, is not adequate and it should be the concern of this Parliament, the Government and other Governments throughout Australia to see that we do everything that is necessary to ensure that the new settlers become good Australians.

There are two points of view that must be considered. We as Australians are inclined to be a little insular. Not only is it necessary to condition the new settlers so that they will become the right type of people but it is necessary also to remind ourselves that one of our first responsibilities is to condition ourselves so that we are in the right frame of mind to treat them rightly, to welcome them and to receive them with the respect that is their due, so that they will become worthy units in our Australian society.

There is another matter that also might well come under the heading of New Australians, one that I should like briefly to mention, a similar problem, and it relates to the young people of this generation. There are many problems which we as older people, men of the age of hon. members of this House, may regard as almost insolvable but

considered in relation to the young generation are not insolvable. Young people are easily impressed and that is at once a strength and a weakness. Therefore I say, in relation to both the educational system and other things, that we must give the very greatest care to the young people of this generation, first of all to see that they are not infiltrated with false or sectional ideas. We are all familiar with the term infiltration, but I would remind the House that infiltration can be of two kinds. There is physical infiltration but there can be also moral and psychological infiltration. After hearing what we have heard at various times of the disruptive elements there may be in this community it is necessary for us to be very careful of the lives of our young people in these respects, and see that they are educated along sound lines and that opportunity is afforded them of acquiring knowledge by the pursuit of truth on a broad and solid basis.

Lastly, we should ask ourselves: what of ourselves? If, as I suggest, the people of Australia and the people of Queensland have a responsibility in this matter, then have not we as members of this Parliament an even greater responsibility? We in this House have one object in common, that is, good government in Queensland. But how are we going to attain it? At this stage I come back to that opening paragraph of His Excellency's Speech where it was said—

“You have been called together to give your attention to, and make decisions upon, matters concerning the welfare of the people of this State.”

I do trust that this 32nd Parliament of Queensland will be unlike some of its predecessors, in that we shall have given to us an opportunity of concerning ourselves with any important decisions that are being made, particularly in relation to the welfare of the people of this State.

Then, before finally dealing with that question of our particular responsibilities, it would be appropriate if I read something that is on record, and which I myself said six years ago. I am going to quote this not because I happen to be the one who spoke these words but because they were spoken six years ago. They were submitted by me in a representative capacity, as a representative of the commercial community. The occasion was the annual meeting of the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce on 24 August, 1944, when as retiring president I made the usual references to more or less domestic matters and then said—hon. members will realise that this was in the latter years of the war—

“I must confess I am not altogether happy as I survey the outlook. During the earlier time of extreme danger to our national existence we saw wonderful examples of self-sacrifice, devotion to duty, and mutual helpfulness, but with the recession of the external danger these qualities also tend to recede and there arises a new threat and danger of internal discord and sectional differences. These influences, if permitted to grow unchecked, may deprive Australia and her people of many of the

ideals and even of the material resources and benefits for all of which our young men have fought.”

If we can throw our minds back to those times we will realise that there is cause for some disappointment at the lack of progress that has been made.

Very hurriedly, too, I should like to read a further paragraph in which, after considering the problem in detail, I asked—“Is there any short and clear formula for successful post-war reconstruction?”, and I went on to say—

“I believe there is. The formula that I would suggest may be shortly stated as that of ‘Good will and Co-operation.’

“I believe that if we, as an Australian nation, are successfully to solve the problems and surmount the difficulties of the post-war years we must first of all have a better spirit among the people, a spirit of good will, a desire to understand the other fellow's viewpoint and, more particularly, a spirit of co-operation. We must have co-operation between Australia and other nations. We must have co-operation between the Commonwealth and the various State Governments. We must have co-operation between Governments and industry. And finally we must also have co-operation and a spirit of good will and understanding between employer and employee.”

Returning to what will be my final thought of our own responsibility, I think we should consider that, first from the viewpoint of the members of the Government and secondly from the viewpoint of members of this Parliament. So far as the Government is concerned, I should like to say this: the Ministers should not merely have their ears to the ground; they should be rather in the position of the leaders of a symphony orchestra, who are not guided by that section or those persons who make the greatest noise, but endeavour to give a lead and guide all sections and all instruments to create the greatest harmony and the greatest production.

So far as this Parliament is concerned, I submit we have three responsibilities; first, I suggest we must see that our laws are just and fair to everybody and if we have any law that is not, it should be amended or repealed; second, although it is fairly obvious that it is not always applied, we should see to it that the law is upheld; third,—and this is perhaps no less important than the others—we who are members of this House should, by both precept and example, see that the honour, dignity and prestige of this House is maintained. If we are able to do these things, then I submit that we, in these respects at least, shall have done our part in seeing to it that democracy in our land does not weaken, and that democracy will not fail.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Debate, on motion of Mr. Davis, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 4.10 p.m.