

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 25 AUGUST 1953

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 25 AUGUST, 1953.

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

QUESTIONS.

VOTING FIGURES, BURANDA AND WINDSOR.

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

“In view of his reply to my question regarding the gazettal of election results in Buranda and Windsor, will he state why Section 83 of the State Elections Act was not complied with in these cases, and what action he now proposes to take as required by Section 86 of that Act?”

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona) replied—

“The requisite notice in each of the cases mentioned was published in the *Gazette* on 22 August, 1953. No further action is required to be taken.”

OLD UPPER KEDRON SCHOOL GROUND.

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

“As the residents of Upper Kedron are desirous of building a modern hall and sports recreation reserve on the ground on which the Upper Kedron State School was previously situated, will he agree to a transfer of this land to a board of trustees or other persons under suitable and satisfactory conditions?”

Hon. G. H. DEVRIES (Gregory) replied—

“The total area of the subject land is 5½ acres. Of the total area 5 acres is freehold vested in the Secretary for Public Instruction. It was purchased in 1914 for £37 10s. from Mr. T. Marshall. The remaining portion, ½ acre, was donated to the Department. If the larger portion is declared surplus to Departmental requirements it will be sold by public auction. This is the usual procedure. If the smaller portion is no longer required for school purposes, it will be returned to the donors or their beneficiaries upon application.”

FOREIGN CONTRACTORS, STATE HOUSES.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) asked the Secretary for Public Works and Housing—

“Has any provision been made in the contracts let by the Housing Commission to foreign firms for the protection of the wages and other emoluments earned by workers employed by such firms? If so, will he fully inform the House as to the measures taken?”

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) replied—

“Yes. The contracts provide—(1) The contractors are responsible for payment of wages of their employees, and the payment of wages of their sub-contractors’

employees in the event of the sub-contractors failing to make such payment; (2) For payment by the Commission to workmen out of moneys due to the contractors on production of court orders for the amount of the unpaid wages.”

ROUTE OF BOWEN-COLLINSVILLE ROAD.

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

“In reference to his letter to me of 30 April 1953, relative to the proposed route of the Bowen-Collinsville main road—

1. Has the discussion with the Wangaratta Shire Council yet been held?

2. If so, which route has it been decided to adopt?

3. As £10,000 was allocated towards this road from the Federal Aid Roads Grant in 1950, when is it expected that the construction of the road will be commenced?”

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

“1. No.

“2. See reply to 1.

“3. Sufficient survey information is now available to discuss the route to be adopted with the Wangaratta Shire Council, but no date has been fixed for starting work on the section north of Binbee.”

FREE BUS TRANSPORT TO SCHOOLS.

Mr. V. E. JONES (Callide) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

“In view of the fact that the State Education Acts recognise that in the case of children under ten years of age, residence over two miles from a school is a justification for non-attendance, will he kindly give favourable consideration to reducing the present three-mile minimum, which applies to free bus transport, to over two miles in the case of such children?”

Hon. G. H. DEVRIES (Gregory) replied—

“At present it is not proposed to depart from the existing policy.”

ENFORCEMENT OF MAINTENANCE ORDERS.

Mr. KERR (Sherwood) asked the Attorney-General—

“1. What is the number of court orders for maintenance which are still effective?

“2. How are they being enforced?

“3. What number is being ignored, not being complied with or partially avoided?

“4. What action does his department take to enforce such orders?

“5. In cases where affected mothers have to go out to work to maintain and educate their children, will he give consideration for financial help or free rations to such families?”

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona) replied—

"1. The number of Maintenance Court Orders registered at Brisbane Court of Petty Sessions were: At 1 January, 1953, local 3,933. Interstate 1,690. Total 5,623. At 20 August, 1953, local 4,086. Interstate 1,784. Total 5,870. Since 1 January, 1953, new Orders registered at Brisbane totalled 207, of which 79 have been registered since 1 July, 1953.

"2. By virtue of the provisions of the Maintenance Act of 1949 and the Interstate Destitute Persons Relief Acts, 1914 to 1944, by (a) Notice of Demand; (b) Summons for Disobedience; (c) Attachment of Wages.

"3. Of the total of 5,870 Orders in force as at 20 August, 1953, 2,495 are active. Of the balance a large proportion are Orders where the defendant cannot be located for the enforcement proceedings or where the wife has requested that no action be taken to enforce the Order, although no application has been made to the Court for the Order to be discharged, and accordingly the Order must still remain on the active list. In many instances either of the parties may be deceased and the Court has no knowledge of such.

"4. (a) On the request of the wife to enforce the Order, action is always taken either by way of Attachment of Wages, or Summons for Disobedience. (b) From time to time, action is taken by the office staff, when it is noted the Order is in Arrears, to issue a Notice of Demand on the defendant and if satisfactory arrangements are not made, a Summons for Disobedience is issued. (c) For the year ended 31 December, 1952, prosecutions for disobedience amounted to 494 for local and 164 for interstate Orders, a total of 658. From 1 January, 1953, to date there have been 516 prosecutions for disobedience of the Orders. (d) Attachments of Wages approximately 50 per annum.

"5. This question should be directed to the hon. the Minister for Labour and Industry."

QUOTAS OF TABLE MARGARINE.

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"In view of the present adverse seasonal conditions and the great importance of encouraging the expansion of the dairying industry, which is wholly Australian, and in view also of the fact that in 1952-1953 the quantity of table margarine manufactured was only 913 tons out of a total quota of 6,850 tons for Queensland, will he kindly give consideration to a reduction of the table-margarine quota to a quantity not more than 50 per cent. greater than the 645 tons allowed in August, 1951, as is the case in all other States?"

Hon. H. H. COLLINS (Tablelands) replied—

"Quotas granted for margarine will be kept under review."

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Comptroller-General of Prisons for the year 1952-53.

Report of the Licensing Commission for the year 1952-53.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Ordinance under the City of Brisbane Acts, 1924 to 1952.

VOTING AT GENERAL ELECTION.

RETURN TO ORDER.

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

Return to an Order made by the House on 20 August last, on the motion of Mr. Sparkes, showing the details of the voting at the last State elections.

DIVIDING FENCES BILL.

INITIATION.

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona—Attorney-General): I move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill relating to the construction and repair of dividing fences between certain lands."

Motion agreed to.

UNAUTHORISED DOCUMENTS BILL.

INITIATION.

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona—Attorney-General): I move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to prevent the misleading use of forms resembling court process and for purposes connected therewith."

Motion agreed to.

PRINTERS AND NEWSPAPERS BILL.

INITIATION.

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona—Attorney-General): I move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to repeal the Printers and Newspapers Act of 1914, and to enact further provisions relating to printing presses, and to the printing and publishing of books and papers, including provisions relating to the preventing of the printing and publishing of books and papers by persons not known, and provisions relating to the printing and publishing of newspapers."

Motion agreed to.

AUSTRALIAN CONSULAR OFFICERS'
NOTARIAL POWERS AND EVIDENCE
ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona—Attorney-General): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Australian Consular Officers’ Notarial Powers and Evidence Acts, 1946 to 1949, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

COMPANIES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona—Attorney-General): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Companies Acts, 1931 to 1942, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

REGISTRATION OF FIRMS ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona—Attorney-General): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Registration of Firms Act of 1942, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—FIRST ALLOTTED
DAY.

Debate resumed from 20 August (see p. 113) on Mr. Diplock’s motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. McCATHIE (Haughton) (11.17 a.m.): I desire to associate myself with the Address in Reply to the Speech His Excellency delivered to this House on 5 August. When I read that Speech, I was impressed with the record of achievement of this Government in Queensland and I was particularly delighted with the programme of work the Government propose to embark upon. Particularly was I pleased with the stress laid on water conservation and irrigation. My Government appreciate to the full the need for this form of development, especially in North Queensland.

His Excellency, in travelling the State as he has, has made himself very well known to people in the far-flung parts of Queensland, and I am deeply appreciative of the fact that he has seen fit to make himself acquainted with not only the cities of Queensland but also the outback areas.

At this time particularly, I should like to associate myself with the expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II., and to say how delighted I was to see the upsurge of feeling that occurred in Australia on the occasion of her Coronation. We are delighted to know that our young Queen is settled on the Throne, and we are very appreciative of the fact that the glories that were possible in the years when Queen Elizabeth I. was on the Throne of England, and when Queen Victoria reigned, might well recur in the years to come under Queen Elizabeth II. We all wish her well, and I am quite sure that all who associated themselves with expressions of loyalty on the occasion of her Coronation will renew those expressions of loyalty next year when the Queen visits us, to allow herself to be seen and to see for herself something of her far-flung dominions. We hope that her reign will be one of peace; we sincerely hope that the lead she has given, and will continue to give, will in turn enable the British Commonwealth of Nations to show the way to peace in this troubled world, and that that peace will endure for many years to come.

I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your re-election to your position in the House. Those of us who obey the Standing Orders have never had any difficulty in keeping peace within the House, but those who endeavour to find some way of getting round the Standing Orders and behave like Peck’s bad boy, must expect to receive some attention from you. We are delighted that you have again been elevated to the position of Speaker, and we are quite sure that you will exercise impartiality in this House for the next three years.

I should like to pay a tribute to our leader, the Premier, the Hon. V. C. Gair, on being returned to the Government benches with a largely increased majority on the first occasion on which he had the opportunity of putting our case to the people. The people of Queensland showed in no uncertain manner what they thought of the policy of the Opposition. It was really not a policy but an attempt to tell the Labour Party how to conduct its own affairs in Queensland. The people very emphatically rejected their suggestion and accepted Labour’s policy. The crowded Government benches are proof of what they thought of our policy in this State. A number of new Government members come from the northern part of the State and their presence in the Chamber is a clear indication that North Queensland wants the Labour Party.

I should like to congratulate the Deputy Premier, the Hon. J. E. Duggan, on his excellent handling of Queensland’s case at the recent Premier’s Conference. The members of the Government party feel that he gave Queensland’s case a thorough airing and did not miss an opportunity to put Queensland’s needs before the men who control the purse strings.

Before proceeding to deal with several points that I propose to raise affecting my electorate I should like to congratulate the

hon. member for Condamine, Mr. Diplock, on the excellent speech he made in moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. Mr. Diplock is to be congratulated first, on the courage that he showed in his speech and again on his excellent victory at the polls, in being able to convert such a large majority in favour of the Country Party into a majority for himself as a Labour representative. I have no doubt, in view of his approach to the subject of representations for his electorate, that he will be here for many years to come.

I offer my congratulations also to the hon. member for Nash, who seconded the motion. He took a bold step indeed in referring to the subject of wage incentives, a matter of vital concern to our party. I desire also to pay a tribute to the former member for Nash, Mr. Thomas Dunstan. Tom Dunstan for many years has been a friend of my family, who were associated with his in Gympie, and as a Gympieite I have always felt that the names Dunstan and Gympie were synonyms. I have a very pleasant recollection of his gentleness and courtesy three years ago after I made my Address in Reply speech. He was the first to come by me after I had made the speech and with a gentle pressure of his hand on my shoulder he said, "Well done, Gympie." My association with Tom Dunstan as a friend and colleague for three years in the Queensland Parliament will be one of the most pleasant recollections in my parliamentary career.

I should like to pay a tribute to the work done in my electorate by the Department of Public Instruction and the Department of Public Works. Acting in association, the two departments have provided many new schools and important facilities in my area. Following on the representations I made during the first 12 months that I was in Parliament, the Secretary for Public Instruction saw fit to build a new State school at East Ayr. The school was opened in February last year with an attendance of 110 pupils, but today the number has reached 220, which indicates that there was a need for the new school and that its construction was appreciated by the people of the area. I pay a tribute also to the people who were associated with the actual construction of the school, including the officers of the Department of Public Works, which gave such good service that the building was erected more quickly than was expected.

I should like to pay a further tribute to the splendid work that was done at Clare where a school was moved and a new wing incorporated to provide accommodation for 86 pupils. It is expected that next year the attendance will be further increased and more accommodation will be required.

While I pay these tributes I want it always to be known that more educational facilities are needed in my district. The first of them is a senior class at the Ayr High School. At present the school takes pupils to Junior standard, and we are faced with the position that is facing many country towns, of having to see a number of our children not proceed beyond Junior because the parents cannot afford to send them on to a school with education to Senior standard. We feel that the

school's results in the past have been sufficiently gratifying to all officers of the department to warrant this increase in the standard. In the years that I have been in Ayr, during which I have been associated with many public bodies, I have emphasised the necessity for a Senior class on numerous occasions. Recently when I approached the officers of the department I found the inspector who had just visited Ayr had informed the Head Office that there were seven pupils ready to proceed to Senior next year. I know that the department's attitude is that six pupils are sufficient to constitute a class and I have been asked to ascertain from the parents of the seven pupils whether they still hold the view they expressed to the inspector, that their children will go ahead with the Senior at Ayr. I have done that. While I appreciate the need for having some such requirement I am still of the opinion that the Ayr district, a large and growing one, would be better served by the establishment of a Senior class even though there might only be three pupils. We have had five as recently as last year. We had seven who were to take the Senior but two of these were domestic-science pupils who would have to go to Brisbane. On that occasion the report was that of the five two would probably not pass their Junior. The five of them passed, however, and are now away at secondary schools at Charters Towers or Townsville. Again Ayr lost the opportunity of having a Senior class. On this occasion I am hopeful that the seven who indicated to the inspector during his visit that they would proceed are still available; although, as you, Mr. Speaker and hon. members will appreciate, it is rather doubtful whether as late in the year as August the parents will not have made other arrangements.

Because of the crowding that is occurring in denominational schools close to us it is essential that people make up their minds and book early, otherwise the children will not get the Senior that they desire. In Ayr we are likely to lose a number of children. We know that numbers could proceed to our teaching service, which is in need of recruits, or go to other useful positions in the Government service, but because the Junior standard only is available they look for apprenticeships or drift into bank or office jobs; and that is to our loss.

I make that plea very earnestly. If it is possible to find the necessary staff I should like to see the Senior standard established at Ayr next year. I am quite certain that once the announcement is made that the Senior class will be established there will be no difficulty in keeping up the numbers. From my observations I prophesy that in 1955 there will be about 14 offering at Ayr to go on to sub-Senior and eventually to Senior.

While I believe it is very important to have that class established, I do think there is something we can do at the Ayr High School that would be of tremendous value to the district, an agricultural one, that is, the establishment of an agricultural Junior at Ayr. As everyone should know, Ayr is the centre of the most important farming

district in Queensland. We have a potential that many other districts would like to have, the certainty of crop owing to our irrigation. We know we can always produce, although at times our market may be rather difficult. It is absolutely vital to the development of the area that the agricultural Junior be established at the Ayr High School. We claim to be an agricultural district. There is a rural school at Home Hill and some project work is done at the various State schools in the area, but once the children go to the Ayr High School any association with agriculture, other than that which they may have at home, is lost. I contend that if we can take them that step further, of giving them the opportunity of the agricultural Junior, we shall be doing a great deal for the development of our district and towards retaining on the land the sons of many farmers who are now drifting away from it. In our district we grow the best sugar in Queensland. I do not have to stress this fact to sugar-growers: they know it. I know also, with experience of years in the sugar industry, that today we are producing better sugar than ever. There is a sugar experimental station in the Pioneer Mill area and at Clare Road there is an experimental farm of the Department of Agriculture and Stock. We have been informed that there is every possibility of this department's establishing a large experimental station at Millaroo. However, these institutions only serve the people who are already farming. Nothing is being done in our district to encourage young men to take up farming although, heaven only knows, today more than ever before it is essential that we should attract young people to the land. Over the years I have been associated with many developments in the Burdekin area and hitherto we have had a sugar complex and it has not been possible to interest people in much but the sugar industry. Even those engaged in mixed farming always wanted to get cane assignments. Since the Government established the Clare settlement and it has been shown again that the area has possibilities in other crops I find there is a keener interest in the further development of the Burdekin area by other means than sugar-growing. I commend to the House the news announced today as to the International Sugar Agreement and I am quite sure it will make sugar-growers happy but we in North Queensland who appreciate the need for bringing to the area a greater number of people realised that development along the lines I have suggested will do something towards increasing the population of the North.

In the last few years we have seen an agricultural boom in the Ayr district and since the war ended 100 permits for new homes each year have been granted there. These houses have been erected in the shire and hon. members will appreciate how the population of the town and district has improved. These permits do not include any development in the Burdekin Valley, in which Clare, Millaroo, and the settlement at the Gorge have brought many hundreds of people into the area. Many of these people are

eager to stay on with their work of development in association with the Sub-department of Irrigation, and many will wish to find land in the area.

The press indicates that the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing is interested in the establishment of a cannery in the area. For years we have tried to establish one in or about Ayr but our attempts have not had very much success. Some years ago I was associated with an organisation known as the Lower Burdekin Marketing and Development Committee and to illustrate what I mean by a sugar complex I would point out that this organisation sent circulars to 500 sugar-growers. In that circular we asked whether they would be interested in supplying a cannery if it was established and what crops they would grow, and what acreage of those crops. We received just over 100 replies, and of those 100 who showed us the courtesy of replying, less than one half were interested in growing crops other than sugar-cane. But the position is entirely different today. We know that we cannot develop on sugar alone, that we must have other industries, and the primary industries that are capable of establishment and development in the Burdekin are legion. The Department of Agriculture and Stock, by its experimental station at Clare Road, has shown that cattle-fattening under irrigation is now beyond the realms of possibility, that it is a certainty. It has been able to show that with irrigation it is possible to carry two beasts to the acre quite comfortably. From what I have seen of the interest shown by graziers, I have no doubt that many of them will engage in pasture improvement. Some of the areas there are now carrying no more than a beast to 32 to 35 acres, and these graziers have realised that with irrigated pastures they could increase their carrying capacity considerably.

The dairying industry also is at a low ebb in the Burdekin. Blessed as the Ayr district is with unlimited water, we cannot produce enough milk to supply the needs of the area and have to draw supplies all the way from Malanda. Because of an upsurge of interest in dairying recently, I approached the Department of Agriculture and Stock and the Minister has informed me that Mr. Rice, the Director of Dairying, will be in the Ayr district at the end of the month to discuss with farmers the possibility of improving dairying there. Some of the men who are engaged in dairying in a small way have tried out the method of irrigated pasture, and improved their returns as a result, but we need something that will give us that improvement during winter months that will help to keep up the supply when it is most needed. The farmers of Clare have approached the Department of Public Lands and the Sub-department of Irrigation as well as the Agricultural Bank to see whether they can get some help to engage in dairying on a small scale, but to date, because their holdings are so small—they are only from 50 to 70 acres—the department has stated that there are many problems connected with dairying on such a small scale and these will have to be investigated before permission to proceed will be granted.

Interest in dairying in the area at the moment is very great, and I have no doubt that as a result of a recent interview with the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock, at which he stated the Government would give these men all possible help provided they were able to furnish some of the finance, we shall see established there a pasteurisation plant and so have the first step taken towards establishing a sound dairying industry. There is ample land available and I am certain that the men who are showing interest in dairying today will go ahead and do much to prove to Queensland that the Burdekin has all the things that we claim for it. It has all the potential for development and I have absolutely no doubt that in the next few years we shall see tremendous development in agriculture in what is the prince of areas in Queensland.

I do not wish to conclude without mentioning Clare. Hon. members can appreciate that it was only natural that during the recent election campaign Clare was the subject of much discussion. As a result of the statement made by the Premier that the Government would consider the formation of a committee to which would be appointed a member from each of the departments interested at Clare, with a growers' representative, the farmers are much happier than they had been. That committee is at work today and is investigating first-hand the problems of the farmers, giving them much helpful advice and transmitting its requests for help very speedily to Brisbane. Clare is settling down and while we are sorry to know that some farmers found it necessary to leave their farms we are hopeful that under the present set-up the remaining farmers will be able to meet their commitments. Despite the recent attempt by the Country Party organiser, the ex-member for Roma, to stir up further trouble in the area, I am convinced that the farmers have no cause to worry because they have been told definitely by the Premier what the Government's policy is in the matter. They are prepared to work and give of their best to see that they make Clare a very sound settlement. They know, too, that under the Act they are entitled to a review within five years and a review should take place next year. I have no doubt that they will get from my Government the same sympathetic consideration as they have had before.

Mr. Sparkes interjected.

Mr. McCATHIE: The hon. member for Aubigny is here again with his interjections but they do not disturb me. On 7 March last the electors in my area gave a very fitting reply to any attempt made by Country Party leaders or supporters to disturb my position and whilst their candidate on that occasion was able to nose in second, just ahead of the hon. member for Mundingburra's party—the representative of the break-away party got 20 per cent. of the votes polled, and the Country Party candidate 21 per cent—I got 59 per cent.

There is no doubt that hon. members opposite would like to be able to say that there is a lot of discontent at Clare. I

know that there has been discontent but I am quite pleased that the Government have listened very attentively to representations I have made and have given the farmers in that area every consideration. The Government are still giving them every consideration and I know that when everything is summed up and this review takes place the farmers will have no cause to be sorry for having gone to Clare to grow tobacco to supply a need in Australia, a need that the Federal Government refused to recognise and protect. That Government are allowing unlimited quantities of tobacco to be imported into this country and they have attempted, as they have done on previous occasions, to ruin the tobacco industry in Queensland. The farmers up there know all these things and are taking their own steps to prove to the Federal Government just what the position is at Clare.

I have attempted on previous occasions to give the public of Queensland some knowledge of the way tobacco farmers have been treated by the present Federal Government, and their treatment of the farmers of Clare is no different from the treatment they mete out to North Queensland generally. We have had no support from the Federal Government for projects in the north of Queensland. No support has been given by that Government to the Burdekin scheme. Recently we made the suggestion that we should become an agent State in soldier settlement and we were told plainly that we were not wanted. We require a great deal of help in North Queensland at the present time but we are not likely to get it from the Federal Government, a Government who have been playing politics with one of the most vital parts of Australia, which is very vulnerable to attack, as I have stated often before. The people of that part of the State have shown their dislike for the Federal Government by continuing to elect Labour members, not only in the State elections but in the Federal sphere. We can quite justifiably accuse them of playing politics when they refuse to help projects in North Queensland that are capable of bringing to that part of Australia much-needed population.

Queensland has always shown that it appreciates good government, and at the last election the people showed very clearly that they appreciated the good record of the State Labour Government and returned us to the Government benches for a further three years. I have no doubt that when we go before the people in 1956, with the record behind us that we shall have and with the development for which we have been responsible, we shall have absolutely no trouble in being re-elected. Nor have I any doubt that hon. members opposite, who are smarting under the very severe defeat that they suffered on 7 March, will make many attacks on us during the session. I deeply appreciate the help that was given to me throughout the Houghton electorate during the campaign. The people showed very clearly that they did not want Country Party representation or any form of break-away organisation claiming to be Labour, but that they wanted a State Labour Government. They knew this Government's record.

It is for that reason we are here, and we are quite capable of carrying on the same good government that we have given Queensland for many years.

Mr. MUNRO (Toowong) (11.47 a.m.): Most members of this Parliament have something in the way of a hobby-horse to which they like to refer on an appropriate occasion. My particular hobby-horse, one that I raised in my own electorate prior to entering this Parliament and that I have since referred to, is the general objective of a better Parliament, and I hope that by pursuing that objective we shall perhaps at some time or another achieve not only a better Parliament but also a better Government. For my present purpose, I regard the Government as being something in the nature of a secondary consideration.

In speaking to this motion I propose to divide my remarks into three sections. First of all, I propose to speak rather briefly on one or two matters of parliamentary procedure, after which I propose to examine what appear to me to be some of the problems of our Commonwealth Constitution, particularly as it applies to the States, and finally I should like very briefly to discuss the responsibilities of this Parliament in relation to one or two matters of very great topical interest at the present time.

In referring to the Standing Orders, I should like in the first place to acknowledge, and to express my appreciation of, the courtesy of the Acting Premier in nominating me as one of the members of the Standing Orders Committee. I realise, of course, that this is not an appropriate occasion on which to endeavour to make any detailed analysis of the Standing Orders, but I hope and trust that during the present session of the thirty-third Parliament, the Standing Orders Committee will meet and will endeavour to correct some of the weaknesses that at present exist in the Standing Orders.

In my view there are three main purposes in the Standing Orders. The first one is—

“To provide for the effective and convenient functioning of Parliament.”

The second is—

“To preserve to the Government of the day reasonable power to carry out their legislative programme without any disruption or unjustified delay.”

The third and very important one is—

“To preserve all reasonable rights of the minority represented by the official Opposition and all reasonable rights of private members as such.”

I think that the Standing Orders Committee should direct its attention to those three important purposes. First of all I should like to refer to Standing Order No. 332, which some hon. members of the House seem to take for granted but which I think is a particularly important one. It says—

“Any of the foregoing Standing Rules and Orders may be suspended or dispensed with by the majority of the House.”

In plain language that Standing Order really means that the Standing Orders in their

entirety are binding on the minority of the members, that is, those represented by the Opposition, and are only binding on the majority of the members, that is, those on the Government side of the House, so long as the members on the Government side of the House wish to abide by them.

If at any time the Standing Orders appear to be in any way inconvenient to the majority of the members in this House, the whole of the Standing Orders can be suspended by a simple vote of the majority of the members of this House. That appears to me to be entirely wrong and I suggest that it should be considered. While I say it is wrong, I would point out too that it is only a latter-day development and that I think we should go back to the Standing Orders we had in the House in the past, which much more effectively preserved the interests of the minority.

I will give another example, and this time will refer to a part of the Standing Orders in which I think there should be some revision in the interests of the Government of the day. There comes to my mind a very recent experience. You will recollect the debate we had at the beginning of this the thirty-third Parliament during that short period when we were called together before we had elected the Speaker. Just sufficient happened in that short period to indicate very clearly to me that there is a very great weakness in our Standing Orders, in respect of the period at the opening of a new Parliament before the Speaker is officially installed in his chair of office.

There are quite a number of minor points to be considered but I stress the fact that there are important weaknesses that provide sufficient cause for the calling together of the Standing Orders Committee so that members from both sides of the House may have the opportunity of considering the Standing Orders in a non-party spirit and from the viewpoint of providing for a more efficient, more convenient and safer working of this Parliament.

In referring to the Standing Orders I do not want to overstress them because I think that in a well ordered and sensible gathering of men the rules should be for guidance rather than for compulsion. Even more important than a revision of the Standing Orders is the fact that one thing we need in this Parliament is a better code of ethics, and by a better code of ethics I mean the unwritten rules that we build up during the course of our practice and that guide the conduct of our members without a threat of any specific penalty.

We have some such ethical rules in this House. I think one of the very best examples is the unwritten rule under which we accord to any new member the right to make his maiden speech without being subject to interruption. That is a sound ethical rule that is honoured in this House and I suggest that we might take that as an example of the things we might do during the years. We may perhaps visualise some of the fine precedents established by the House of Commons and build up a tradition that will help us in carrying out our deliberations and making

our decisions in such a way that we shall gain more of the respect in which this parliamentary institution should be held.

In referring to that little ethical rule, may I say also that I have been very much impressed on this occasion by the speeches of some of our newer members! I think on many occasions the speeches of new members are like a breath of fresh air, because such men come in with new views and ideas. I particularly mention the speeches of the mover of this motion, the hon. member for Condamine, and on this side the speech of the hon. member for Cunningham. I think in both those speeches we had very good and very practical contributions to our deliberations, and no doubt we shall have further excellent contributions from them in the future.

Proceeding now to the Commonwealth Constitution, I think it is convenient to consider it for two reasons. The first is that although we refer to this Constitution as being the Commonwealth Constitution, it has in very material respects limited the powers of the Parliament of every State. Although legally described as the Commonwealth Constitution, it is the most important part of the Constitution of this State. Connecting this with my previous remarks, I think it may be said that the Constitution is to the people of Australia and Queensland substantially what our Standing Orders are to the members of this Parliament. Following that line of thought perhaps it may be helpful if I give shortly what I think are the primary purposes of that Constitution. If I could group those purposes in the same way as I did the purposes of our Standing Orders I would say the first of those purposes is—

To preserve to every individual in the community the capacity and the right to live a full and free life.

The second is—

To provide for the effective functioning of parliaments and governments within the framework of democracy.

And the third is—

To protect the rights and interests of minorities.

Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know, our Commonwealth Constitution has served us for a little more than half a century. In suggesting now that the time has come when it needs some review, I am not going to be in any way critical of the framers of that Constitution. If we attempt to visualise the conditions of half a century ago, which were in many respects entirely different from the conditions of today, I think we shall all concede that those original founders of the Australian Constitution did a very wonderful job. But political and economic affairs do not stand still, and the Constitution that was an excellent document 50 years ago is now beginning to show certain creaks and strains as the result of the passage of time and the development of new conditions.

Without attempting to go into too much detail I will mention four aspects in which there are evidences that this Constitution does not quite meet the needs of the times. These aspects to some extent refer to certain

relationships between different bodies because our Commonwealth Constitution, under a Federal system, to a very considerable extent creates a series of partnerships. The first problem I mention is that generally referred to as the problem of the Senate, which on analysis is found to be merely the problem of the partnership relationship that exists between the House of Representatives and the Senate in our Commonwealth parliamentary system. I am sure it is not necessary for me to go in any detail into a description of the present state of affairs to establish a case that we need some reform of the Constitution in relation to the Senate. Recent history in connection with frustration and threats of a double dissolution, and so on, are sufficient to indicate that our Senate does not completely meet the requirements that the framers of our Constitution had in mind. Very shortly, the new factor there is the growth of extreme partyism in politics, and with that growth, which did not exist in 1900 and which I think was not visualised by the framers of the Constitution, the position has been reached where a Senate, composed of members of the same political colour as the members of the House of Representatives, does not completely fulfil its proper function. On the other hand, if the other state of affairs exists—a Senate composed of a majority of members of a political colour opposite to that of the members of the House of Representatives—the Senate is an obstruction and frustration.

The second problem is the financial relationship between the Commonwealth and the States. Some years ago, with the making of the Financial Agreement between the Commonwealth and the States, there was the setting up of the Loan Council, and the Premiers' Conferences, and later in 1942 the establishment of uniform taxation, and we now have the new problem of the financial relationship between the Commonwealth and the States.

That problem has the very unsatisfactory feature that one Parliament is responsible for providing the revenue to be spent by another Parliament. That does require examination. I think almost every hon. member will agree that the present position is not satisfactory, although there might be considerable disagreement as to what exactly the remedies are to be. I shall deal with remedies later.

The third problem is the maintenance of a proper balance of power between Parliaments and executive Governments. Again, one of the modern trends, which could not possibly have been visualised at the time our Commonwealth Constitution was drafted, is that now-a-days Governments, as such, as distinct from Parliaments, are tending to have more and more power whereas Parliaments, as such, as distinct from Governments, are tending to have less and less power. That is a very serious development when we look back over the centuries and realise how it was necessary for the people of those times to fight in order to set up their parliamentary institutions.

Mr. Rasey: Are you trying to show that there were no influences or powers behind parties and Government in the old days?

Mr. MUNRO: My point is that partyism in politics has become very much more intense than it was in the early days and, secondly, executive Governments, as such, are tending to have very much greater power. The danger is that we can reach the state of affairs where we can have an executive Government that might be comparable with the despotism we had in the early days when it was necessary to set up our parliamentary institution to protect the rights of the people.

The fourth point—I am using these four points to build up a case for something I am going to submit a little later—is the movement for new States.

There are two points that I have in mind. The first is that we have a Federal system of government and I should like to state emphatically here that I believe in the Federal system of government, that I believe that in a country with such a great diversity of climate and conditions as we have in Australia, the Federal system of government is the one best suited to our requirements. It is best suited to our requirements because, by a division of the powers and functions of Governments as between the Commonwealth and the States, we are able to get some of those functions of government much nearer to the people than we could if we had only the one unitary system of government at Canberra.

My second point is that while I am interested in the case for a new State in North Queensland it is necessary for us to be very clear in our minds that the case for new States is not in any way adequately met by referring to the case for a new State in any particular area. I look upon that as being quite secondary. It may be that there is in fact a strong case for a new State in the New England district of New South Wales, the north-eastern division of that State. There is also a strong case for a new State in the Riverina district of New South Wales, which covers, broadly, the southern part of that State. There is also, in my opinion, a strong case for a new State in North Queensland.

I mention those as examples of cases to be considered, but not at this stage to weigh their merits. There have been one or two interjections with reference to this question of new States, particularly when reference is made to North Queensland, because it is a matter of particular interest to members of this House, but let me say that so far as North Queensland is concerned I include that area particularly because of its relation to the question of defence.

Mr. Burrows: Can you not convince Sir Arthur Fadden to that effect?

Mr. MUNRO: I do not think it is altogether a matter for the Commonwealth Treasurer.

The case for new States generally rests on three grounds. The present States of Australia are out of proportion financially and politically. One has only to consider New South Wales in relation to the other five States of the Commonwealth. If one does this one realises at once that the States are

out of proportion. The development of the States within themselves is out of balance, for particular reasons, but partly because of matters that are now history and of rail development. The development of the States within themselves is out of balance because we have got altogether too great a concentration of population in a few capital cities, and I mention particularly Sydney and Melbourne, where the concentration of population is altogether too great in relation to the relatively undeveloped areas elsewhere. The third point is that there is a defence weakness in the lack of complete development of northern Australia.

Mr. Jesson interjected.

Mr. MUNRO: The United States of America does give us a very good comparison and perhaps I can claim some support for the view I put forward if we look at other parts of the world. In Australia we have an area of approximately 3,000,000 square miles divided into six States, the States themselves being disproportionate in size and population. In the United States of America there is a similar area of country, although admittedly a very much greater population, and that country is divided into 48 States. Switzerland, a very small country, with some 16,000 square miles, has 22 States or cantons as they are called.

Mr. Jesson: Equivalent to our municipalities.

Mr. MUNRO: No. The cantons are self-governing States and in the extent of their powers much more comparable to Australian States than to municipalities. In Switzerland there is a Federal system of government and the country is divided into this relatively large number of small States. That particular kind of constitution and government has been carried on successfully for something like 150 years.

Mr. Jesson: Do you think that representation should be on a population or area basis?

Mr. MUNRO: I should not like to determine that question today. I shall come back to it a little later on when I shall be referring to boundaries, but might I say that with respect to the consideration of the movement for new States, there are provisions in the Commonwealth Constitution by which new States can be formed! They are contained mainly in sections 121 to 124. The main one is section 124, which says—

“A new State may be formed by separation of territory from a State, but only with the consent of the Parliament thereof, and a new State may be formed by the union of two or more States or parts of States, but only with the consent of the Parliaments of the States affected.”

I do not propose to endeavour to examine those constitutional problems because while I am satisfied that there are provisions in the Constitution under which new States can be formed, I am equally satisfied that those provisions are not in any way ideally suited to

the practical requirements of forming new States. The reason for that is these modern developments. If we attempted to form any new States at the present time, we should have a crop of problems, problems of balance in relation to finance and in relation to the constitution of the Senate.

Mr. Aikens: There is a provision in the Constitution to the effect that every State shall have equal representation in the Senate. Is that not so?

Mr. MUNRO: Yes.

Mr. Aikens: That is our biggest hurdle.

Mr. MUNRO: I am glad the hon. member for Mundingburra mentioned that point. It is the very difficulties in the way of creating new States—constitutional difficulties, and the very great financial difficulties that I realise will arise—that have led me merely to mention this matter as one of the group of matters that should be considered in relation to the Commonwealth Constitution. I have mentioned those merely as instances, because I think there is a strong case for the convening of a National Constitution Convention, which must be very representative and composed of the most capable and experienced people.

Mr. Aikens: What you want to say is that under the present Constitution, the formation of a new State is virtually impossible?

Mr. MUNRO: What I want to say, if I am permitted to say it, is that there is a case for the establishment of a national convention, which should approach these matters in a non-party attitude in an endeavour to find a solution of the various problems that I have mentioned. I believe that could be done. The procedure generally would be similar to the procedure taken prior to the inauguration of the Commonwealth. If that is done, while it will not provide a panacea for all our problems, I think it will certainly help a great deal.

Time is getting on, and I particularly want to make some reference to matters that are disturbing me very greatly at the present time, that is, developments that have taken place in relation to this Parliament but that have taken place not in this Chamber, but during the unduly long period while Parliament was in recess, after the dissolution of the thirty-second Parliament and even before this thirty-third Parliament was called together. If I speak on these subjects, it is not because of the merits of those particular subjects but because I see in each of them a threat to the proper working of this Parliamentary institution.

The two subjects to which I shall refer are the matters of Parliamentary salaries and starting-price betting. Taking salaries first, I do not wish to express any opinion at all on the merits of the case for an increase in Parliamentary salaries. The hon. member for North Toowoomba, in stating the case for an increase in parliamentary salaries in this House a few days ago, is in some respects to be congratulated on his speech, which was

courageous and honest. Nevertheless, I would say that it was misguided. I say that because the very excellence of his presentation of the case and the fact that he was a good advocate in the case—makes him unfitted to be the judge also in the case. That is the difficulty that faces every other hon. member in the Chamber. It is contrary to natural law for one to be both advocate and judge.

Mr. Aikens: Can you create a tribunal superior to Parliament itself?

Mr. MUNRO: I have only a little time left; allow me to continue. A principle of law is that a judge does not act in a judicial capacity in any matter in which he has some interest himself. Therefore, the answer is very obvious. At the present time the reputation of this Parliament is being trampled in the dust and we should do something about the matter. The position can be retrieved only by the appointment of an impartial and independent tribunal, one that will consider these matters and make a recommendation. Hon. members on this side of the House have made our position clear but I am afraid that even now that has not been completely appreciated by the public. So far as I am concerned I put forward this view myself when I was a very new member in this House and I have adhered strongly to that view ever since. This matter was considered at the Liberal Party convention in 1951, largely because parliamentary members wished it to be considered. We supported the proposal that the determination of parliamentary members' salaries, both State and Federal, should be by or on the recommendation of an independent tribunal.

Mr. Aikens: Who would appoint the tribunal?

Mr. MUNRO: I will deal with that; give me a chance. That was followed by the Country Party and again reaffirmed by our leader in a joint policy speech, which said that "whilst we are the Government there will be no increase in the salaries of members of Parliament except following the recommendation of an independent tribunal." In answer to the question, "Who will appoint the tribunal?", this Parliament will appoint the tribunal because it is the only body that can appoint it. That tribunal must be of such a kind that it will not on the one hand be subservient to this Parliament nor will it on the other be so irresponsible that there will be any danger of that tribunal's having some indirect power. My suggestion is that such a tribunal, in relation to Queensland parliamentary salaries, should consist of a justice of the High Court of Australia (as chairman), the President of the Industrial Court of Queensland, and a commissioner member of the Commonwealth Public Service Board. That is not a new suggestion; I put it forward some time ago in an address to the Brisbane Junior Chamber of Commerce. There may be differences of opinion as to the personnel of the tribunal, but the solution to the problem is this—that not only should we appoint an independent tribunal but that it should be an independent tribunal of such standing that nobody either inside or outside

this Chamber will criticise its findings. It should also be a tribunal of such capacity and responsibility that nobody will regard it as having any serious disability because it may happen in an indirect way to be exercising some power that some members might regard as the special prerogative of this Parliament.

Mr. Aikens: You believe in Parliament's passing the buck.

Mr. MUNRO: Not at all. In a particular case in which Government members could have stood up for the prestige of Parliament and a high moral principle was involved—S.P. betting—they did not do so. They should then have made the issue one of not accepting outside dictation. What did members of this Government do in relation to starting-price betting? They evaded the issue in the 1953 State election and said, "In this matter we will, as a Cabinet, make a recommendation to the Labour in Politics Convention." There was a case where they should have stood up for the rights of Parliament. In the case of parliamentary salaries, where members have a personal interest, it is important that we should appoint a competent and independent authority.

(Time expired.)

Mr. COOPER (Keppel) (12.27 p.m.): I wish to support the motion so capably moved by the hon. member for Condamine and so ably seconded by the hon. member for Nash. In doing so, I should like to endorse the sentiments that have been expressed as to the consecration and dedication of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II at Westminster Abbey. The Coronation was symbolic of the unity, friendship and co-operation that has made the great Commonwealth of Nations what it is, and stands for all that is best in British citizenship in world affairs.

I should like, too, to join with hon. members who have spoken during this debate in expressing appreciation of the Speech delivered by His Excellency, and particularly for the very comprehensive coverage it gave to matters affecting this State. I am pleased that His Excellency recently undertook an extensive tour of the Central Coast and the central-western parts of this State, during which he had the opportunity of meeting many people, ascertaining their many problems, and in addition cementing anew the bonds of friendship and loyalty between the people and the Crown.

I should like to make a few comments concerning the late hon. member for Keppel. Previously, I have praised the work of the late hon. member, and since I have been the member for Keppel I have travelled throughout the electorate and one thing in particular that impressed me was the high esteem in which the late hon. member was held, and the keen appreciation that is expressed of his work for Keppel.

I am fully conscious of the confidence placed in me by the electors of Keppel at the recent by-election, and subsequently

repeated and emphasised at the general election. Having been re-elected as their representative in this Parliament, I assure them that I will give of my best to further their interests, and the interests of Central Queensland and of the State as a whole.

In his Speech His Excellency directly referred to the setting up of a committee to report on the possibility of the establishment of a nitrogenous fertiliser works in the Rockhampton district. It is pleasing to note that the committee referred to came to the conclusion that all the raw materials are available in Central Queensland, and having regard to the market potentialities of the central and northern parts of this State it is highly desirable that the commercial community should avail themselves of the opportunity to help in the development of this State by establishing this important industry in the Keppel electorate.

The wisdom of the Government's policy of the regional development of electricity is becoming obvious. The various regional boards will link up large areas and eventually the total of £25,000,000 expended on electrical development in the past five years will seem to be a small amount compared with the value of the great development that will result from this expansion. As a result of this policy, electricity systems constructed or in the course of construction will serve three regions, concentrated on Rockhampton, Townsville and Cairns, a territory approximately equal in area to the whole of the State of Victoria. The Cairns region alone will comprise an area half that of Victoria and nearly double the area of Tasmania. It is easy to appreciate, therefore, that schemes responsible for the development of such areas as these are now working on a large scale, demanding a high degree of foresight and imagination, and planning on a large scale. In the central region with which I am more closely associated, work of a major nature has been undertaken. In September, 1952 a new power-house was opened at Rockhampton, capable of supplying the whole of the Capricornia region, which includes Gladstone, Monto and Biloela. It will make electricity available for such established industries as Mt. Morgan Mines Ltd. and the meatworks at both Rockhampton and Gladstone. Electricity is also available for the new cannery at Koonagal and the new coal-handling facilities at Gladstone and other projected industries in the area, such as the manufacture of carbide and fertiliser. Electricity will now be available to farms in the Callide and Dawson Valleys and other places. Many of these places, such as Biloela, Baralaba and Thangool, Wowan, Gladstone and Monto, and Yeppoon have already been linked to the electricity supply. It is expected that the regional board will officially switch on the supply of electricity to the seaside resort of Emu Park in October next.

This power will have the effect of enabling the area to be extensively developed economically. It will also bring amenities

and home comforts to country dwellers, amenities that they so richly deserve, and which were not possible previously. It has been found too, Mr. Speaker, that despite the high cost of the materials generally, a section of consumers in this region have already enjoyed something that is unique in these days, a reduction in electricity tariffs. That was made possible by lower generation costs at the new power-house and the general efficiency of the undertaking, and with the aid of Government subsidies. This is the kind of progress that counts with the people and this is an achievement of which this Government can feel justifiably proud.

The Government of Queensland are to be complimented also on their water-conservation policy. I believe it is sound to develop a great number of the smaller schemes from which the maximum number of farmers will benefit in a wide range of areas, while at the same time proceeding with the major Burdekin scheme, which in addition to generating electricity and mitigating flood risk in the area will eventually impound more water than will be held by the Snowy River Dams. The work already done at the experimental station, together with surveys made by the C.S.I.R.O., the Department of Agriculture and Stock, and the Bureau of Investigation of Land and Water Resources, has shown that such crops as tobacco, pineapples, sugar-cane, potatoes, peanuts, cotton, linseed and various grains can be grown successfully in this area. I do not propose to deal with this scheme in any detail but I wish to point out that on present values it is estimated to cost £70,000,000 and to emphasise that I agree that the project is a very important one that required urgent attention. But when regard is had to the estimated cost of the project and to that is added the estimated cost of between £15,000,000 and £16,000,000 needed to construct the Dajarra-Camooweal rail-link, together with other major works that urgently need to be developed in this State, we can readily understand that the financing of these undertakings is far beyond the capacity of the Queensland people. In view of this, I emphasise that Queensland has a case for special consideration by the Commonwealth, a case that, viewed from the point of view of national defence, must have the full support of the Australian people.

I believe that the adequate defence of this country is bound up with the vital question of national development. The seething unrest among 1,200,000,000 people adjacent to the north of Australia is a challenge to us to proceed with this work with the utmost expedition. It is also a warning that we shall not be permitted to hold this continent indefinitely unless we are prepared to develop and populate it. The rapid development of Queensland is of vital importance to the whole of the people of Australia and it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to lead public opinion in this direction and to point out our danger and the very grave risk to Australian security that exists while we have a sparsely populated and undeveloped Queensland.

Of its total expenditure of £106,000,000 on capital works and services throughout Australia for the financial year just ended, the Commonwealth Government spent £20,000,000 on four projects, the Snowy River scheme, New South Wales coal, the Leigh Creek railway, and the Tasmanian aluminium industry. These are all important projects, but Queensland has an equal if not more important claim in connection with the Burdekin hydro-irrigation scheme, the development of Blair Athol coalfields, the Mareeba-Dimbulah tobacco lands irrigation, the Tully Falls hydro-electricity scheme, and many other works for which financial assistance has been sought from the Commonwealth Government in vain.

It has been said that it is not the concern of the Federal Government to direct development in Queensland, but unless major projects are undertaken in Queensland on the same basis as the Snowy River scheme in New South Wales, it might well be too late for Australia as a whole to concern itself with any projects, because we should be unable to support the population that is necessary to adequately defend this country.

Finally I should like to refer to another matter mentioned in His Excellency's Speech, in respect of which the district I represent has some potentialities. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the increase in tourist traffic in recent times. The receipts of the Tourist Bureau for the year ended 30 June, 1953, increased by £53,775 over the previous year's figures and we should be safe in assuming that the business of tourist companies has increased in a like degree.

The Rockhampton branch of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau increased its business by 22 per cent. in the year referred to and there is evidence that the demand for the Rockhampton trip undertaken by Pioneer Tours is also increasing. As an additional inducement I should like to suggest that money be set aside as soon as possible to extend the scenic road from its existing terminal at Emu Park along the coast through Zilzie to Cooraman Creek, as a step towards its extension to Keppel Sands, and ultimately to complete the round trip from Rockhampton via Yeppoon, Emu Park, Keppel Sands, returning to Rockhampton via Tungamul. The extension of this link to Cooraman Creek would complete one of the finest marine drives in Australia, and would not only provide a great holiday resort for tourists, but be a great sporting and fishing ground for residents of Rockhampton and Central-western towns. It would also provide access to what is naturally a safe anchorage for fishing boats and greatly help the fast developing industry of hiring boats to day parties.

Whilst I appreciate the shortage of loan funds, I should like to stress the desirability of constructing as soon as practicable a tourist road along the Berserker Range to Mt. Archer. This, I believe, would provide a very picturesque drive and should be a great tourist attraction and help to develop this area as a health resort.

Again I should like to emphasise that in Central Queensland—and I believe for that

matter throughout Queensland—there is a very real need for great improvement in the standard of accommodation available for tourists. I know of hotels where there is only one wash-basin on each floor for ladies and a similar position obtains for gentlemen. Because of increasing demands for accommodation, it has been necessary to accommodate some Pioneer tourists at Yeppoon and Emu Park, because the standards offering in many buildings in Rockhampton are considerably below what might be regarded as reasonable. I suggest that the Licensing Commission examine this position with a view to effecting the desired improvement.

“Over the counter” receipts from the branches of the Tourist Bureau in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide are the highest in the history of those offices and it is pleasing to note that the figures for Queensland generally show a corresponding increase. The tourist trade is of great economic value to Queensland, as an analysis of the general average of money spent by tourists has shown. It shows, for example that 26 per cent. of every tourist’s pound is spent on merchandise and 18 per cent. on transport, petrol and so on. In the aggregate, the value of the tourist trade to Queensland exceeds £3,000,000 a year, which is new money for this State.

I should like to submit that the Government of Queensland is to be complimented on its decision to provide modern air-conditioned trains, which is having a tonic effect on rail travel generally, resulting in phenomenal bookings. This position will be further appreciated as the Government’s plans come to fruition and the full effect of their policy is felt. We shall then find that the comfort and the convenience of tourists will be catered for on every major line in Queensland.

In conclusion, I should like again to express my appreciation of what was contained in the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. When effect is given to the Government’s programme, I am sure that it will greatly advance the interests not only of Central Queensland but of the State as a whole. I realise that the Government in Queensland are severely handicapped by the deliberate and foolish policy of the Commonwealth Government in withholding moneys to which this State is entitled, moneys that are necessary in order to help the man on the land and the business community, as well as the workers as a whole. However, I believe that the Government of Queensland will overcome those difficulties and lead this State to further progress and prosperity.

Mr. EVANS (Mirani) (12.47 p.m.): In associating myself with the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I do so with very great satisfaction at being elected by the people of Mirani in this Coronation year. I was present with many people of my electorate at celebrations connected with Her Majesty’s Coronation, and I was very delighted by the spontaneous enthusiasm and loyalty shown by all sections of the community, not only in my electorate but throughout Australia and the British Commonwealth of Nations. I hope that the reign

of Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, will be long and peaceful, and that during it the British Commonwealth of Nations will continue to progress.

I listened with great interest to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor, but I was disappointed with it. I expected to hear in his Speech reference to many of the Bills that the Government promised they would bring down during this session. Some of those promises were made quite openly and some of them secretly, and I thought they would outline not only those that were promised openly but also those that were promised secretly. I expect that some of those Bills will be brought down as we proceed during this session, and that some of them may not.

Mr. Aikens: You will read in “Truth” when we are going to get them.

Mr. EVANS: Possibly we shall.

I have met Sir John Lavarack on many occasions, and I commend him for his energy and for his endeavours to learn the problems of the people of this great State. He travels from one end of the State to the other and I should like to commend him more than anything else for his common sense, his logic, and the way in which he approaches all our problems. I compliment him on his forthrightness when he speaks to the people in public. He is a son of Queensland, a very distinguished son indeed. He served Queensland as a soldier and now he is serving Queensland in another capacity. As a member of the Queensland community I am proud of a Governor of the type of Sir John Lavarack.

During the election campaign the Government went to the people without a policy. They stood on what they had done in the past. They had no policy whatever, and the people gave them an open cheque and told them to go ahead. I am not disputing that the Government got a majority of the votes of the people, nor am I disputing that they got a clear electoral victory. The people gave it to them. They gave them a big majority, and the Government must feel very happy about that, because for the first time in many years they now have a majority of the votes of the people. In the past they were only a minority Government, but on this occasion the people of Queensland presumably said, “These boys are very clever, they are very cunning, they have everything sewn up and it is just as well to back the winner.” Now they are getting it in the neck. The people realise that those whom they elected, those whom they voted for are not running the State at all, that they are simply robots, that they are here to do what they are told. The Government have not revealed all that could have been revealed to the people, much of which I shall reveal to them as I proceed.

We know that in the Labour Party there is the left wing and there is the right wing.

Mr. Aikens: Where is the left wing?

Mr. EVANS: They call it the left wing, and there is the right wing. Do not forget that there is a left wing, and if the swing came they would be over the fence in two hops. In between those two factions we have quite

a few legitimate, "fair dinkum" Labour men, but they are not allowed to put their beliefs into effect, they are not allowed to have their say. I see that the hon. member for Condamine is smiling, but he will be whipped into line quick and lively. I thought he made quite a good speech. Indeed, had I been outside the Chamber and listened to the speech from there, I could easily have mistaken it for a speech by Jack Pizzey, the member for Isis.

The hon. member for Condamine condemned the Government. I suppose he thought, "I am a new member, and I had better not make a half-hearted attempt in what I am saying." I think the hon. member put his case very well. He condemned the Government. After he gets three or four lashings he will obey, he will fall into line. I shall watch developments as the days and the years go by. I had mentioned that there were the left wing, the right wing, and the genuine Labour man. The genuine Labour man has to swing from one faction to the other. I knew many of them in this House and I knew that they had certain followers, but where are they today? They are there with their backs bared ready to be lashed by the very people whom they supported earlier when they first came into this Parliament. There is no doubt it was an instruction by the Q.C.E. for the launching of State enterprises that cost the State £4,500,000. The Q.C.E. said, "You must go on with your butcher shops, sawmills, State stations, etc."; and the Government had to go on with them, and there was a loss of £4,500,000. (Government interjections.) There was another occasion when the Government brought the mining interests of two of the strongest and most prominent Cabinet Ministers, who were also members of the Q.C.E. (Government interjections.)

I was in North Queensland then and there was no kick from the Q.C.E. They were big fellows physically, too.

Mr. Burrows: You were one of their strongest supporters.

Mr. EVANS: I may have been. In reply to the hon. member, there were a number of black fellows in North Queensland when I was there and I saw them living on the creek bank, and when the vermin got in even the poor old blackfellows got out.

We can go further and recall the railway strike that went on for six weeks.

Mr. Aikens: Nine weeks.

Mr. EVANS: Nine weeks. The late Premier, the Hon. E. M. Hanlon, one of the most astute Labour men the party ever had, fought pretty well up to a certain time, but the Q.C.E. came in and made him capitulate. He told the workers, "We are not concerned about arbitration. The Q.C.E. told us what we have to do. We are going to give you all you ask for." (Government interjections.) Hon. members do not need me to prove that. It went before Mr. Riordan, of the Industrial Court, who started to hear the case. The union representative said, "The Government have approved of this; they have agreed," and

Mr. Riordan said, "You had better go away and draw it up and come back with an agreement." (Government interjections.) Take the case of Blair Athol. What was the action of the Q.C.E.? Hirst came along and got the Q.C.E. They came into this House in an endeavour to sell out the greatest seam of black coal in the world. I personally told them in this House where they were going. It was not the British Electric Supply Corporation; it was a subsidiary with virtually no capital, just a bunch of go-getters. The Government reduced the royalty and they gave the company a franchise that excluded other people in the area. Its representatives went overseas; they went to Europe and Switzerland to try to get finance for this subsidiary company—a bunch of go-getters.

Mr. Aikens: You admit that the Liberal and Country Party fell for it.

Mr. EVANS: I am talking for myself. It was in my electorate that part of the line was to be built. There is no doubt about my attitude. They handed it over to the Traction finance company. The same thing happened. The Labour Government instructed again I assume by the Q.C.E. were prepared to give the greatest coalfield in the world away and the royalty would have been a paltry £600,000. That proposal was brought up in the House and it had the approval of the House and the Q.C.E. raised no objection.

Mr. Devries: It had nothing to do with it.

Mr. EVANS: It is the body that interprets Labour's policy.

I have told hon. members that the Q.C.E. were prepared to allow the Government to exploit the best possible coal deposits in the world under conditions that were absolutely against the interests of the State of Queensland. I told them it was a racket and that these people were go-getters. Every statement was proved. The late E. M. Hanlon, who was then Premier, went overseas. He went to Switzerland and other parts of Europe in an endeavour to get finance to carry on. Although we want Blair Athol developed we want to have the railway direct from Blair Athol. It is a jolly good thing that this scheme fell through. Not only would the company have depleted the great coal resources of that area but we should have got virtually nothing out of them because in the franchise it had the right to export the coal without any conditions at all. This company would have formed subsidiary companies in other parts of the world, to which it would have sold the Blair Athol coal at a fictitious price. Thus it would have avoided the payment of income tax; the profits from the Queensland coal would have gone to its subsidiaries in other parts of the world. Three years ago the late E. M. Hanlon, who was then Premier, promised to have a complete investigation made by the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works into the building of a railway into Nebo and the hinterland. The three years have passed and unfortunately E. M. Hanlon has passed on also. The present Premier on three occasions, when questioned, has

promised me that he would have an investigation made by the Bureau of Industry. It was only the other day I asked a question of the Acting Premier, who told me the old story of the Federal Government. The Federal Government do not come into it. The potentialities of that district in pastoral, agricultural, mineral, and timber resources are great from the economic aspect but the Government will not carry out the promises made so as we analyse the economic aspects and decide whether a railway should be built. Why was that? Because again they were told by the Q.C.E. they must concentrate on Brisbane and not spend any more money in the country. The only railway the Government are building is the line from Biloela. But what is going to happen there? That line was built under instructions from the Q.C.E. in order to build up Rockhampton. A railway should be built but it should run direct from Gladstone to the coal deposits. We find now that the economic aspect comes into it. A market cannot be found for the coal heven in that field at the Biloela end and there is no chance of finding a market for it as the costs are too high. Again I say that the Q.C.E. was responsible for that.

Mr. Burrows: You know why we cannot get a market for the coal.

Mr. EVANS: The hon. member should hide his head in shame. He is coming in here trying to defend the actions of a Government who crucify his people. That is an actual fact. I now come to the Peak Downs socialistic scheme. Among hon. members on this side of the House are successful agriculturists and leaders in the various fields of industry. When that scheme was brought forward we told the Government what would happen; in fact, we told the Government to "forget about it." We said, "Give an economic price for pig-meats and the people of Queensland will produce them." The representatives from overseas said they would pay 1s. a lb. They were paying 2s. a lb. to Canada and 2s. 2d. to their own pig-producers plus a wheat subsidy, and these overseas people and the Queensland Government claimed that in two years they would be supplying 500,000 carcasses of pork to Britain from Peak Downs. We told them that what they were claiming was all hooey, that they would break down despite the preference they enjoyed, despite the fact that they had priority, that they had tractors, iron, wire and all the essentials that we could not get. Despite all these advantages, they have not been able to send 200,000 carcasses to Britain in over four years and I say again that the members of the Government whom the people elected were not the ones who made the decision. They allowed the Q.C.E. again to say, "Let us have a go at this socialistic enterprise."

Mr. Burrows: There is an answer to that.

Mr. EVANS: We know the answer. I should like to see Queensland with the £850,000 this Government lost over that venture. It has to be remembered that all

hon. members on the Government side, including Ministers, at that time are equally guilty of this mismanagement of public funds. When we opposed Peak Downs hon. members on the Government side said that we were knockers who did not want to help Britain, that we were against Britain, that we were disloyal.

Mr. A. Jones: Why do you say that?

Mr. EVANS: I say it because you said it.

Mr. A. Jones: I say you are a liar.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. A. Jones: The hon. member said we said it. I did not say it. I deny it emphatically.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the word "liar."

Mr. A. Jones: I will withdraw the word "liar," but I think he is a liar.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the word "liar."

Mr. A. Jones: I resent that sort of thing and I do not think a man should be allowed to get away with it. I withdraw it in conformity with Parliamentary practice.

Mr. EVANS: You cannot stop the Minister from judging other people by his own standard.

Mr. A. Jones: I resent that also.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member for Mirani to withdraw that remark.

Mr. EVANS: I withdraw it.

Then we had the writing-off of £1,800,000 in connection with the Brisbane sewerage. Have they written off anything for the people in the country? Of course not! The people in the country have had to pay every penny, but here again the Q.C.E. have told the Government and Labour members that they must do this for the benefit of the people of Brisbane.

Then we have the £750,000 that was written off the Story Bridge. We all know that the then Premier, the Hon. W. Forgan Smith, said, "Any Government who break this covenant are not fit to be a Government in this State," yet we know that immediately he was brushed aside the Government broke their covenant in connection with the building of the Story Bridge, because they were told to break it and by that time they had become accustomed to doing what they were told.

Mr. Foley: Did it break the people?

Mr. EVANS: This kind of thing will break the people eventually.

Next comes the electrification of railways in Brisbane. The Government had no hesitation about proceeding with the electrification of Brisbane suburban railways because again they were instructed to do it and we can be certain that they will be going on with that work in six months' time. The only reason why the electrification of these railways in Brisbane was stopped was that it was a hot potato at election time. The present Government know they are a Brisbane Government and they knew that the people of Queensland would resent the spending of more money in Brisbane when they remembered all other concessions and subsidies enjoyed by the Brisbane people and in view of these things, the Labour Party decided then to suspend this work temporarily with the full intention of proceeding with it again if they were elected.

Mr. Foley: That work would have resulted in a definite saving over a number of years.

Mr. EVANS: I have listened to many of the Minister's remarks. I have a high regard for his honesty of purpose but a very poor regard for his knowledge.

Here we have a big State with undeveloped resources. Our resources in the country are crying out for development, our country areas want roads, transport facilities and electric power. In Brisbane you have the best tram system in Australia, you have good bus and railway systems, and it appears that the Government's policy is to concentrate its efforts 100 per cent. on improving transport for Brisbane while neglecting the primary producers, who contribute 80 per cent. of the wealth of the State. It was simply an inducement to bring more people to this great old city. Hon. members opposite tell me that it is going to be economically successful; it should be but I say, "Do the most important things first." Ministers on the Government benches will tell us that we need more food production but on the other hand they look after the city people first.

Mr. Foley: We spend 50 per cent. of the money available in country areas and you know that.

Mr. EVANS: It is all worked out by the Q.C.E. This was worked out by the Q.C.E. and brought here before the House. When the commission inquired into the boundaries of electorates and zoning became the law the commission had no option on how to cut the electorates up. I do not say that the commission was dishonest. The zoning gave them no alternative but to cut up electorates to suit the present Government. It is a shocking shame to have members in this House representing electorates in Queensland with only 4,000 people.

Mr. Burrows interjected.

Mr. EVANS: I do not think the hon. member is capable of representing anything. He will soon find himself on the way out, because of the Callide coal business.

And then we come to the introduction of the 40-hour week. Without entering into the merits or demerits of its introduction, we on this side of the House contended that the Government were usurping the functions of the Industrial Court, and so they were. It was the duty of the court to deal with all questions relating to wages and conditions; it was the duty of the court to deal with all matters appertaining to industry but the Government, in order to curry favour, brought it about. Members of the Government now admit that its introduction was premature and that the measure was brought in before its time. The Government put through that legislation because they were told to do it—they were threatened. There were no plebiscites for that election and if Government members told the Q.C.E. that they were not going to do it they might have been put on the block and might not have been endorsed. The Government were told what to do.

And I want to refer also to the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act. When the Government put through that legislation they forced the Queensland dairymen to scab on dairymen in the other States. The dairymen had to produce the butter at a price of 2s. 8d. per lb. but fortunately for us the Federal Government made up the amount of money that this Government would not allow the dairymen to receive.

Mr. Burrows: You are not talking about scabbing, are you?

Mr. EVANS: I am. The hon. member was particularly a party to it.

Mr. Burrows: Didn't you lead the scabs on the wharf in Mackay?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Mirani is not in order in making that reflection upon the hon. member for Port Curtis and I ask him to withdraw the remark.

Mr. EVANS: I will, under the Standing Orders, although I do not know what the remark is. What I have said really happened under that amending Bill because the Government were prepared to force the dairymen to produce butter at 2s. 8d. a pound when the costs tribunal that investigated costs throughout Australia recommended 3s. 1½d.

Mr. Foley: What did Arthur do?

Mr. EVANS: I don't care. His Government made up the deficiency that the Minister's Government were prepared to allow.

Mr. Burrows: What did Otto Madsen get threatened for?

Mr. EVANS: The hon. member for Warwick can look after himself.

Then there is the endorsement of members for plebiscites. Members on the Government side know that the Q.C.E. did that. It was the Q.C.E. that selected the member.

Mr. Power: Where?

Mr. EVANS: All over Queensland. Possibly the Attorney-General was sure of selection and he did not bother about it but

if he had been "in the gun" with the Q.C.E. I could hear him making plenty of noise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we find the Caucus rebelling. Why are they fighting back? Because it touches their pockets on hundreds of occasions. They were told on the day previous to the Caucus meeting what they had to do, and they did it, and liked it. They were not concerned with the effect on the people of Queensland. Now, when it affects themselves, their courage has grown; they are strong; they are fighting back against this body that has dictated to them, and has treated them as robots over the years. They say now that they are going to fight. The Q.C.E. has no authority over this Parliament or over the people of Queensland, yet it is governing Queensland. Legislation is put on the statute books at its dictation. Now we learn the whole story when hon. members opposite are affected.

Mr. Foley: I heard that story years ago.

Mr. EVANS: And the hon. gentleman is hearing it now, and it is a pretty good one. The Q.C.E. has decided what hon. members opposite shall do.

There is no doubt about where I stand on this matter. When it first arose the Press approached me, and this is what the newspaper article says—

"Mr. Evans said State Cabinet had immediately ceased the sham fight against increased payment to rank-and-file members when they were successful in having the increase apportioned with increased salaries and increased allowances."

And so they did. The article continues—

"With the increased allowances only, Cabinet members would not benefit, as their expenses are unlimited. But the new set-up would actually give Cabinet Ministers £200 per annum increase, and I say they are getting too much at the present time."

And so they are. The large increase that they got on one occasion was too great, compared with what the private member was getting. However, immediately the £200 was brought in, off went the gloves. They were prepared to agree to the increases of £200 and £100.

The article continues—

"To help the economy of the State, Parliamentary members should and could be reduced by 25 per cent. To have members, as now, represent electorates with only little over 4,000 people, is simply ridiculous.

"Saying it was not the function of the Government to deal with their own salaries and allowances, Mr. Evans added—

It is only a few weeks since the sugar industry influenced the A.E.U. and the boiler-makers to go to court with the object of getting wage justice. We assisted them in that matter.

The whole basis of price in the sugar industry also rested on independent tribunals, likewise dairying and other agricultural industries.

I believe rank-and-file country members were entitled to some financial consideration, particularly with their allowances, but I strongly stress that I oppose members of Parliament fixing their own salaries."

That is what I said, and I stand by that statement.

What has happened in this fight? Firstly, Cabinet opposed any increase, but when members of the Cabinet were included in the increase in salaries—they were not included in the increased allowances—they were satisfied. There was no principle at stake then. They were satisfied, and so was the Q.C.E., to go on with the £200 and the £100. The matter went to the Q.C.E. and it was referred back for review, with the suggestion that members should accept the £200 and the £100. Where is the principle today? Where is the nigger in the woodpile in the fight that is going on today? Let us be sensible and factual and face up to what is causing the present turmoil. Is it a principle? I say it is not. The attitude of the Cabinet and of the Q.C.E. has proved that there is no principle at stake as far as they are concerned in members of Parliament fixing their own allowances. Yet they are going to call a convention.

Mr. Power: How do you know?

Mr. EVANS: According to the press. The Q.C.E. put pressure on the Brisbane City Council and brought them in so as to give them a whip with which to belt the Government—their own party. I will tell you what is behind it all—there are certain people who want to attack the Acting Premier. In "The Sunday Mail" that was denied but there was this appeal, "Dear Vince, Please come home." It was inspired for the purpose of bringing the present Acting Premier into disrepute. I have no brief for the Acting Premier and I shall be attacking him on many things this session but in all the dealings I have had with him he has been honest, clean and decent. He says "No" too often to me but he fights the plain fight, the clean fight, and he fights to do what is in the interests of the people of Queensland. The party had power to put him off the Q.C.E.

Mr. Power: He was never on it.

Mr. EVANS: He endeavours to do the best that he can for the State within the framework of the policy of his party. That is the story and he is put in that position. The Premier has been sent for, I assume, and when he comes back the Q.C.E. will soften immediately. The hon. member for Toowoomba would not do that. The Premier has to come back. The Q.C.E. will see to that. It is hard enough to be Acting Premier of Queensland without having some of your own crowd stabbing at you from the front, the back, and from the sides. That is the position with the Q.C.E.

My time is running out and I still want to deal with another pretty important matter—war-service land settlement. Time does not permit me to deal with it fully and

someone else will deal with it in detail. First of all let me read this important telegram on the subject—

“Regards the halting of Digger land settlement as sell out desire you voice our emphatic protest and call for resumption.”

Mr. Foley: I got a similar wire.

Mr. EVANS: Every man got one and I agree with it. Queensland has spent the least money of any State on war-service land settlement. We have a population of 1,238,000 and we have spent £4,500,000 on war-service land settlement. Queensland is a principal State. In Western Australia, an agent State, with a population of 601,000, they spent £12,358,000 on war-service land settlement and in South Australia, with a population of 939,000, they spent £8,111,000. Here we have two States, South Australia and Western Australia, with a population slightly in excess of the population of Queensland, spending £20,000,000 as against £4,500,000 on war-service land settlement in Queensland. Victoria, another principal State, with a population of 2,335,000, spent £32,542,000 and this State had never had a Labour Government until recently!

Now hon. members opposite, in their defence come along with the same old story, attacking the Federal Government. The Queensland Government had the opportunity to make this State an agent State but the Government wanted to write their own conditions, they wanted to involve the Federal Government in the projects they had already started, for instance on leasehold land without any security. They wanted it to go in.

Mr. Foley: You do not know your case.

Mr. EVANS: I have the facts here but I have not time to deal with them. They are trying to do what they did with hospital benefits. They opposed them; they had their publicity men getting articles out about what they were going to do. They knew they were going to accept the hospital scheme, but even when the Budget came down they did not make provision for the £1,000,000 they were going to get. In the finish they joined up under the same conditions as the other States. (Government interjections). They went to the Loan Council and they got their allocation as a principal State and immediately they got it they never mentioned that they would forego the terms and conditions that they wanted. Immediately they got the allocation they came back. I suppose the Q.C.E. said, “Here is a good political ramp; here is a chance to have a shot at the Federal Government. Make a statement that we will discontinue war-service land settlement.”

Hon. members opposite ought to be ashamed of themselves. They ought to hang their heads in shame when they see what the other States have done, and when they know they have had the opportunity—not when their own party was in power, but since the Menzies-Fadden Government have been in power—to come in as an agent State and they have refused. If it is good enough for

Western Australia, Tasmania and South Australia, and they can settle their ex-service men under it, is it not good enough for Queensland?

Mr. Hilton: How many?

Mr. EVANS: All the figures are here; I have not time to quote them.

(Time expired.)

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) (2.42 p.m.): Frankly I am astonished at some of the intemperate statements made by the hon. member for Mirani. I really thought he knew better; I am very disappointed in him.

My purpose today is to make a very temperate and truthful speech in connection with the controversy that is going on in the corridors of this House, at Dunstan House, and in the Press in connection with the salaries issue. Let us go back to 1944, the year I first came into Parliament. In that year the Labour Party decided on an increase of £200 in parliamentary salaries with the complete accord of the Liberal-Country Party. (Opposition dissent.) There was no suggestion then of an independent tribunal. There was no move then, except the eagerness of the Liberal-Country Party to share that rise in salary determined by the parliamentary Labour Party.

Mr. MORRIS: I rise to a point of order. The statement the hon. member has made is not true.

Government Members: It is true.

Mr. MORRIS: The statement is completely untrue. The fact that it is untrue can be proved by records, which will show that a considerable number of members on this side, myself included, refused to take the money because wages were pegged.

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

Mr. AIKENS: Let me present the facts, as far as I am able, in chronological order.

In 1948 there was another suggestion emanating from the rank-and-file members on both sides that a further salary increase should be granted. I wonder whether the hon. member will attempt to stand up and deny this: the Leader of the Opposition, with the Leader of the Liberal Party, and leaders of the Labour Party went into secret conclave to work out what the rise would be. They worked out the terms of the Parliamentary Superannuation Scheme and they gave certain pledges to the leaders of the Labour Party that they would not broach it in open Parliament later on. On that occasion it was agreed in secret conclave that private members were to get a rise of £200 a year. The increase to the Leader of the Opposition and the Speaker was £300 and Ministers of the Crown were to be increased £750 a year. No suggestion emanated from the Opposition then that the matter should be referred to an independent tribunal. They were just as eager as the rank-and-file members of the Labour Party—and to be quite honest just as eager as I—to take the increased Parliamentary salary.

In 1950 there was an agitation among members of the Labour Party for a further increase in Parliamentary salaries but by this time the Liberal-Country Party had decided to put on a new front. They produced a party policy on Parliamentary salaries and came forth and said, "We will agree only to those increases in Parliamentary salaries that are recommended by an independent tribunal." That was the official attitude of the members of that party. But unofficially they went round the corridors of this House buttonholing members of the Labour Party. If I remember, at that time there was a suggestion that the rise should be £200 a year but the majority of the rank and file were determined to bring salaries of Queensland Parliamentarians up to the level of New South Wales Parliamentarians and this necessitated a rise of £325 a year. I very well remember seeing, from the tactical office that I used to occupy then in the corner of the building, members of the Liberal and Country Parties buttonholing members of the Labour Party prior to a Caucus meeting and saying, "Don't forget: go for the lot. Don't be satisfied with a smaller amount," and I, being very honest in the matter, also said, "Go for the lot." When the Labour Party Caucus meeting was over and the information began to filter through the corridors of the House that the Parliamentary Labour Party had decided to increase Parliamentary salaries to £1,375 a year, they were heroes in the eyes of many of the rank and file of the Liberal-Country Party members. Let us be honest about it, and if we possibly can let us put a stop to this slobbering hypocrisy on the salaries question that is being vomited forth by the Liberal-Country Party.

Now I come to the present situation or, if I might term it so, the present impasse. It was not unexpected. All this talk of the Liberal-Country Party and all this blathering of the Tory Press that members of the Labour Party should have known their intentions and made their intentions known to the people prior to the elections is pure and simple hooey. Every member in this Parliament and everyone who reads the Press knows that prior to the last State elections there was a definite move among the rank and file of the Labour Party for an increase in salary. Everybody knows that that move was stalemated in Caucus. Everybody knows that, because it was published in the Press and it was common knowledge around the House, so that when Parliamentarians went to the people on 7 March this year anybody who did not know that members of the Labour Party were after a further increase in Parliamentary salaries were either fools, dupes or dopes. It was well advertised.

What happens after the elections? Immediately the elections were over and the Parliamentary Labour Party assembled, a move again emanated from the rank and file of the Labour Party for increases in salaries and allowances. It was well known again: these facts were published in the Press. This is where the hon. member for Mirani is wrong: although it was well known to the members of the Q.C.E. that a move was to be made in

the Labour Party for increases in salaries and allowances the Q.C.E. remained silent. The Q.C.E. issued no direction, because the Q.C.E. knew that it had no power to issue such a direction.

Then there is another point. After the matter had been brought before the Labour Party Caucus the first time, a committee of seven was set up within the ranks of the Labour Party to report back to the Caucus, and the names of those seven members were published in the Press. Again the Q.C.E. made no move and issued no direction. Then, when the second Caucus meeting took place to receive the report of the seven members of the Labour Party committee, the Cabinet, which realised the justice of the claim, went into the Caucus meeting with a proposal that the rise total £300 a year in all. The rank and file, the rebels within the Labour Party, if I might call them that, voted for a £400 rise in all. And it must be borne in mind—we must not forget this—that a lousy £100 difference was the only financial point at issue. Cabinet admitted that a rise of £300 was necessary and warranted. Certain members of the rank and file said, "No, we think a rise of £400 is necessary and warranted." We all know the strength of the division, the 25 in favour of £400 and 24 in favour of Cabinet's recommendation for £300. We know also who voted on each side, because it was published in "The Courier-Mail." It has to be remembered here that Caucus keeps no written record of Caucus divisions, so the person who gave that division list to "The Courier-Mail"—I have a strong suspicion who he is—must have either noted down the names of those who voted on one side or the other while the division was being taken, or he must have sat down subsequently and written them down from memory.

Mr. Brosnan: You would not like to name him, would you?

Mr. AIKENS: I remind the hon. member for Fortitude Valley that I said at the outset that this speech was going to be truthful and temperate and I am going to draw my own conclusions later on. At the present time I want to differentiate between facts and truth on the one hand and my conclusions on the other. I want to be perfectly clear on that.

Mr. Brosnan: It may be temperate, but not truthful.

Mr. AIKENS: The hon. member for Fortitude Valley will have abundant opportunity to stand up in this House and deny anything I say.

Mr. Brosnan: And he will avail himself of it.

Mr. AIKENS: We all view with abhorrence any person who plays with a double-headed penny, literally or metaphorically, and I am now going to accuse the Treasurer of playing the rank and file of the Labour Party with a double-headed penny, and I

make that accusation, believing it to be true. I also state, because I believe it to be true, that if the Labour Party had accepted Cabinet's recommendation of an overall rise of £300 a year nothing more would have been said, the Act would have been introduced and passed, for the salary increase Cabinet would have signed the necessary Executive Council minute, for the allowances and the Q.C.E. would never have interfered or intervened.

Mr Walsh: You are flattering me.

Mr. AIKENS: If that is flattery, then I am going to flatter the Treasurer a bit more later on.

Then, when the rank and file of the Labour Party rejected Cabinet's recommendation, it must be said to the credit of every other member of Cabinet that they accepted the majority decision of the Parliamentary Labour Caucus. But not so the Treasurer. He got in touch with Bukowski. These again are my own conclusions, based on fact. Bukowski then got in touch with some of his friends, if I may term them so, in the trade-union movement affiliated with the A.L.P., men like Edmonds, Muhldorff, Davis, Cole and others. And, by a strange set of circumstances, similar letters couched in almost identical words and terms were sent from certain unions to the Queensland Central Executive protesting against the increase of £400 in parliamentary salaries and allowances. The inner executive of the Queensland Central Executive of the Labour Party pretended to be astonished to receive these protests. It should not have been astonished, because the chief member of the Queensland Central Executive, Bukowski, inspired them and I believe actually dictated them. As a result of the protests the inner executive of the Queensland Central Executive called the Queensland Central Executive together and they decided to instruct the Parliamentary Labour Caucus to reconsider its decision. The Parliamentary Labour Caucus met and after reconsidering its decision was more emphatic than ever that a rise of £400 overall was warranted. The voting on that occasion was 29 to 20. If the occasion had necessitated it, the voting would have been stronger still.

That left the Treasurer and Mr. Bukowski and some members of the inner executive of the Q.C.E., to use the vernacular, out on a limb. They did not know what to do or what move to make next. Then certain Labour aldermen of the Brisbane City Council were contacted by Mr. Bukowski and there was rushed through the Brisbane City Council a resolution granting aldermen of that council a rise of £380 a year. That put the balloon up. The members of the municipal caucus fell for the agents of Bukowski and rushed a rise of £380 through by a council motion and, I repeat, to use an idiom, the balloon went up. That gave the Queensland Central Executive or the inner executive of the Q.C.E. another opportunity of receiving similar letters of protest from the same unions, couched in exactly the same terms.

We all know that a further meeting of the Queensland Central Executive held recently instructed the aldermen to rescind their resolution, which they did supinely yesterday afternoon; and, with regard to Parliamentary salaries it was decided that a special convention of the A.L.P. be convened if the majority of A.L.P. branches and affiliated unions so desired.

There the position rests. I repeat that had the Parliamentary Labour Party accepted Cabinet's recommendation for an overall increase of £300 nothing more would have been heard of it and the Q.C.E. would not have intervened. When the rank and file of the Labour Party bucked the Cabinet recommendation a move was made—and, I repeat, made in my opinion by the Treasurer and Bukowski—to swing the Q.C.E. into action.

Mr. Walsh: I am listening, and I will reply later.

Mr. AIKENS: I wish the hon. gentleman would; we shall be interested to hear his reply. Not one word of my speech will get into the Press because it will not suit the Press to publish what I am saying, but I guarantee that it will give the Treasurer's reply headlines. I am making this speech to get the facts into "Hansard," knowing quite well that the rank-and-file members of the A.L.P. and affiliated unions read "Hansard." They know that I always tell the truth, and they at least should know. What is more, they well know that I am saying what many members of the Labour Party would like to be saying at the present time.

Mr. Walsh: You would not be saying it for them?

Mr. AIKENS: It could be so. I should not like to say who inspired me. It would give the Treasurer a shock.

There is some reason for this. Let me deal with the men who are being used by Bukowski in this matter. I will tell the reason why they are being used later on, and I wonder whether the Treasurer will feel flattered with what I have to say. We have Mr. Muhldorff, the man who held the gun at the Labour Party prior to the last State election, but when the Premier, metaphorically speaking, in true Western Movie style went up to him, took the gun from him, turned him round and booted him in the pants, he ran away whimpering. Muhldorff, the man who in today's "Courier-Mail" is a party to an attack on the Government as being the worst employer in the State—and I do not disagree with him in that regard—goes on to say that the Labour Party has lost prestige, and the prestige must be regained. Everyone knows what is actuating Muhldorff. He wants to be a member of the Industrial Court bench. He has already made representations to prominent members of the Parliamentary Labour Party in that regard but has been rebuffed, and he thinks he can get it through the new dictatorship of the Labour Party that he hopes to see set up, the Bukowski-Walsh dictatorship from Dunstan House.

Then there are Davis and Cole; Davis, the secretary of the Queensland Railway Traffic Employees' Union, and Cole, the secretary of the Queensland Railway Maintenance Union, two men with a history of spinelessness and scabbery unexcelled in the trade-union movement in Australia. Then there is Edmonds of the A.F.U.L.E., who was refused endorsement by the Q.C.E. in 1936 because of suggestions of graft as a Brisbane City Council alderman, and who had the nerve to rush into the columns of "The Courier-Mail" when this controversy first broke out and said—and I shall quote as nearly as I can remember his actual words—

"When railway men take direct action to improve their wages and better their conditions, the Labour Government bring into force all their powers in order to crush the direct action."

Railway men took direct action in 1948 in order to increase their wages and better their working conditions. Theodore Kissick got Edmonds by the scruff of the neck and made him vote for the A.F.U.L.E. men to go out on strike. After three or four weeks, however, Edmonds led the group on the A.F.U.L.E. executive who voted for a return to work in order to line up with the Government and smash the strike and defeat the railway men.

Mr. Walsh: In Theodore's time?

Mr. AIKENS: In 1948. Does not the hon. gentleman remember the 1948 strike? I thought he would never forget that.

Let us deal with the powers of the Q.C.E. What the hon. member for Mirani said about the Q.C.E. instructing the Labour Party to do this and to do that was pure balderdash. I know quite a deal about the Q.C.E. of the Labour Party and I know it has not instructed the Labour Party on any issue for years. Its members are elected at convention and by the various members of the affiliated unions, and it has allowed the Parliamentary Labour Party to go on its own sweet way without interruption. My complaint about the Q.C.E. is that on many occasions when it could have and should have instructed the Parliamentary Labour Party to implement the Labour platform and policy, it has egregiously failed to do so. Where is the Q.C.E. when it could and should instruct the Labour Party to introduce legislation in the interests of the workers, the farmers and other useful people? It is silent on all those matters on which it could and should instruct the Labour Party. It is there from convention to convention to interpret the platform and policy of the Labour Party, and if necessary to give instructions to the Parliamentary Labour Party on the questions of platform and policy. However, where the platform and policy deal with the workers, the farmers and other useful people, the Q.C.E. has always been silent. At no time has the Q.C.E. had the power—and I hope that it never will—to write into the Labour Party platform any new planks that it thinks fit. The Q.C.E. has never had the power to make the policy of the Labour Party. On this occasion it is trying to make the policy of the Labour Party, but I hope it will fail.

Let me deal with the Treasurer, who appears to like my type of flattery. We all know of course that the Treasurer is a man of consummate ambition. We all know that he is, politically speaking, fairly ruthless, and we all know too that last year an article appeared in "The Sunday Mail" written by David Berry, a very responsible journalist, in which it was frankly, openly and brutally stated that after this election "the feudingest" man in the Labour Party, the Treasurer, would throw his hat into the ring for the Deputy Premiership. We all know David Berry and we all know that as a responsible journalist he would not even contemplate writing such an article unless he had either the Treasurer's approval or connivance to write it. Yet what happened when the figures went up after the election and when the Caucus assembled? Did the Treasurer carry out his boast to contest the Deputy Premiership against the present occupant of the office? Not on your life. He counted heads and saw that he did not have the Bolter's chance. After the recent brawl between the Q.C.E. and the members of the Parliamentary Labour Party I should say that his chances are even slimmer now. As a matter of fact, he appears to be as popular with the rank and file of the Parliamentary Labour Party as a typhoid-carrier.

So that he knew that he had no chance of defeating the present deputy leader of the Parliamentary Labour Party. We know also that he wants to control Queensland and we know that he wants to become a dictator in Queensland. Failing to become a dictator through the Parliamentary Labour Party and to rule Queensland from the front benches of this Parliament, I can only come to the conclusion that he is joined with Bukowski so as to become the political dictator of Queensland in order to rule Queensland from Dunstan House.

Mr. Walsh: More flattery.

Mr. AIKENS: If any member of the Labour Party or anyone interested in the Labour Party studied the circumstances that led up to this impasse I feel confident that he would come to no other conclusion than the one that I have reached. Already Bukowski has set up a dictatorship of his own within the A.W.U. and now, with the honourable the Treasurer, he wants to set up a political dictatorship of Queensland from Dunstan House. He wants to make the members of the Parliamentary Labour Party merely the marionettes dancing to the strings pulled by Walsh and Bukowski from Dunstan House.

Mr. Walsh: I will have your speeches printed and circulated in the Bundaberg district.

Mr. AIKENS: I wish the hon. gentleman would. I want to make the position of the North Queensland Labour Party perfectly clear. We do not want to see the Labour Party in this House replaced on the Treasury benches by the Liberal-Country Party. That is the last thing we desire to see. We have always tried, right from the very start, and we will eventually succeed—make no mistake about that—to purify the Labour Party, and if necessary disinfect it and put in its place a

dinkie-die Labour Party pledged to the genuine platform and policy of Labour. If necessary we will do as Christ did in the temple. We will scourge the temple of Labour, of the money-lenders, of the grafters, the ticket-snatchers, the Johnny-come-latelies and what have you, and reconstitute it anew.

I say to the members of the Australian Labour Party throughout Queensland who are now being inveigled into asking for a special Labour-in-Politics Convention to take care, and to them and to the members of the affiliated unions I say, in the words of Peter Clarke in his broadcast, "Think it over." If the Labour-in-Politics Convention is to be convened on the same lines as the last Labour-in-Politics Convention in Rockhampton, it will merely be a Bukowski show from beginning to end. It is about time the Labour Party took stock of its position, and it is about time it decided, if there is going to be a Government of Queensland then the Government should be here on the front benches of Parliament House, elected by the people and responsible only to the people.

As I happen to be in a mood of absolute frankness, let me say this: with regard to the suggested rise of £400 a year overall in salaries and allowances, I will not hesitate to take it, because I know the people of Mundingburra and the members of the North Queensland Labour Party and I will consider I am underpaid at the salary suggested. I know there are several quite conscientious members of this House on both sides who would be underpaid at the suggested salary. I know also there are dopes and drones and dills in this Chamber on both sides, but those men are the responsibility—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not in order in referring to other hon. members in the terms he has used. I ask him to withdraw that remark.

Mr. AIKENS: Very well. I will withdraw the remark. I haven't got round to you yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WALSH: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member's remarks were obviously disorderly, and when called to order he made the remark that he was getting round to refer to yourself in the same category.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear that. I ask the hon. member for Mundingburra to withdraw that reflection on the Chair.

Mr. AIKENS: Very well; I withdraw it; I want to continue with this speech.

There are some members on both sides who do not measure up to the standard of other members, either in intelligence or the way in which they conduct the affairs of their constituents. These men are the responsibility of the political executives who endorse them and the fools in their electorates who vote for them. But to gauge a good man's salary on the performance of a bad man is stupid and unjust. I believe every member of Parliament should do as I do and at the conclusion of every session go on the public

platform in his electorate and tell the people how he voted and why he voted on the various measures that came before the House, and invite criticism or questions on his action. Every member of Parliament should be prepared to go into his electorate and justify the payment of every penny he receives as salary or allowance or both. I can do it; and I am not afraid to do it. I know that even if this Parliament, in a moment of genuine assessment of value, were to grant me £5,000 a year, the people of Mundingburra would consider me underpaid at that amount. But I know I cannot expect Parliament to move the same rate of pay for some other members as I suggest they might move for me. I suggest they might at least try to strike what is called a happy medium or mean. I think the suggested £400 rise in salary and allowance would be a happy mean or medium at the present time and in present circumstances.

Mr. Walsh: Didn't you oppose an increase for electricians at Townsville?

Mr. AIKENS: That interjection is so stupid I won't waste my time on it.

I want to deal with the hon. member for Toowoong, who referred to the agitation for a new State in North Queensland. As a genuine North Queenslander who lives there and knows what the people want and knows what they are talking about and agitating for, I can find not the slightest evidence in North Queensland, with the exception of a few little groups, that the people of North Queensland want a new State. The Northern New State Movement, as I know it in Townsville at any rate, concerns a group of four or five men gathered round Dr. Bill Chapman. He is an ophthalmic surgeon. He is a very fine fellow and I suppose one of the most deservedly popular men in Townsville. It is his hobby, and a very expensive hobby, but that is his business. I can find no move in North Queensland for a new State but will say, however, that the Liberal-Country Party has been for some time, and still is, trying to use the New State Movement in North Queensland, such as it is, as a political front or veneer. We in North Queensland are beginning to object to either the Liberal-Country Party or the Labour Party using North Queensland and its needs as a political football. What the people of North Queensland want is a new deal, not a new State. They know that if they are to get a new deal first of all they must force on this Parliament and on the Commonwealth Parliament the realisation of the obvious truth that the development and populating of Northern Queensland is not only a matter for the North Queensland people themselves but for the whole of the people of Queensland and of Australia. If we had a new State in North Queensland today and could develop and populate North Queensland only to the extent of our own resources, we should be infinitely worse off than we are at the present time; and that is saying something.

We have the New State Movement for North Queensland very vociferous in its attacks on the State Labour Party for its neglect of North Queensland. I agree that

these attacks are justified and warranted. But the New State Movement never attacks the Federal Liberal-Country Party for its share of the neglect of North Queensland. The people of the North are wide awake to that gross discrimination. We in North Queensland believe and know from bitter experience that we have been both deserted and neglected by both the State Labour Government and the Federal Liberal-Country Party Government. What the North Queensland Labour Party is aiming for, and what we are beginning to convince the people is absolutely necessary—and the figures at the last State election will demonstrate it, and I am going to deal with our party and its returns at the last State election in a speech at some future time—is not a new State in North Queensland but that the 16 northern seats, that is, the 13 coastal seats from Mackay to Cape York, and the three western seats of Charters Towers, Flinders and Carpentaria, should return to this Parliament 16 genuine northerners who are pledged to the development and populating of North Queensland, 16 genuine northerners unattached either to the Liberal-Country Party or the Labour Party, who will hold the balance of power in this Parliament and force the Queensland Government to face their responsibilities for developing and populating the North.

I am very pleased to see and to hear in this Chamber from time to time hon. members such as the hon. member for Bremer, the Leader of the Opposition, and others on both sides of the House in the last year or so beginning to become interested, even with their tongues only, in the development and populating of North Queensland. As a matter of fact, they are actually repeating some of the sentences and phrases I have used in this Chamber in years gone by. The hon. member for Bremer only yesterday used the phrase that I used in this House some years ago, that we need have no fear of an invasion of penguins from the Antarctic. Our threat comes from the North: let us make no mistake about that. We all desire international peace and we all hope to live to see the day when the nations and the peoples of the world will live in complete amity with each other. But let us be realists and face facts. Let us keep our feet on the ground and let us keep our minds clear: we must admit the only threat to Australia comes from the North.

We have to admit also, if we are honest, that it is the duty and responsibility of all the people of Australia, not only the people of Northern Queensland, to close the northern gateway against the invader. So that while we thank those members of Parliament who are now beginning to talk about the need to develop and populate Northern Queensland for their kind words, let me say on behalf of the genuine North Queenslanders that we doubt their sincerity and that we should like to see their fine words transformed into concrete actions.

I was going to deal with the propagandist of the New State Party in the North, Mr. Archie Hooper, who is, I suppose, the greatest political contortionist of all time, and what I say about him in that regard is only what

I said to him in Townsville the other day. He is a man who has been in six political parties in five months, and that beats even the record of some members on the Labour side of this House. During the progress of this session I shall have quite a few pertinent comments to make about the continued neglect by the State Labour Government of Northern Queensland, but let me give some idea now of what the Liberal-Country Party does in its desire to neglect Northern Queensland. Irrespective of whether we believe in the National Training Scheme, let us admit that the Federal Liberal-Country Party Government, by bringing all the northern military trainees down to Wacol, are doing more to accelerate and accentuate the drift from the country to the cities than any other single thing we know. They bring the northern boys from Northern Queensland to Wacol when they are at their most impressionable age. When these lads are on leave, they get a touch of the bright lights of the city, consequently, when their period of training is ended and they go back to Northern Queensland, their first thought is to come back to Brisbane, get a job and work in Brisbane. The result of this is that we lose from Northern Queensland many good young men who otherwise would stay in the North.

(Time expired.)

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (3.23 p.m.): After listening to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply, I am certain all hon. members will agree that they spoke on their subjects with a confidence born of knowledge and that in future we shall have two very creditable hon. members who will do much to help in the development of Queensland.

Of all the new hon. members of this Assembly, I should like most to congratulate the hon. member for Condamine who, by coming to this Assembly, has visited upon the Liberal-Country Party of Queensland the greatest defeat it has suffered for years. There can be no doubt that by his own personal capacity and his own personality he has helped this party to obtain the great majority that it enjoys.

Congratulations must be extended to all those new hon. members who have come here as elected representatives of the people, and I do not exclude from these congratulations the new hon. member of the Opposition who, if we are to judge him on the speech he has delivered already, will be a greater credit to this Assembly than some of those former hon. members of the Opposition who were defeated at the last State election.

The Government are to be congratulated particularly on the programme of work they have given this Assembly through His Excellency's Speech. The position at the moment is as it has been for over 12 months. The curtailment of loan money and other financial assistance that the States have received from Commonwealth Governments is restricting our programmes. We are tied to a great extent to the apron strings of the Commonwealth so far as all development work is concerned, and this fact should give hon. members some concern. It is my firm

belief that over the years the Commonwealth Constitution has failed in its original intention to maintain the sovereignty of the whole of the Federation. It has failed because it was the original intention of the Constitution of Australia to establish seven independent Governments. There was to be an independent Government in each State, with a Federal Government, in which all of the States were to be united in one.

The Australian Constitution recites, in the preamble the fact that the people of the six States have agreed to unite in one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth under one Federal Government. The meaning of that was that each State would be a unit completely self-sufficient and co-ordinating with the Commonwealth Government. That purpose has failed. The failure is a double-edged one, firstly because of the failure to maintain the financial independence of the States and secondly because it has failed to ensure that the Commonwealth of Australia shall be a populated and developed nation. It is over 50 years since Federation took place and still Australia is under-developed and under-populated; the fault of that can only lie with the failure of the Constitution to maintain the financial independence of the States.

It is interesting to note that in 1902 Alfred Deakin prophesied that this would occur. He said—

“Rights of self-government of the States have been fondly safeguarded by the Constitution. It has left them legally free but financially bound to the chariot wheels of the Commonwealth.”

There can be no question that that position has been brought about and there is no doubt that the framers of the Constitution at the convention that preceded the drawing up of the Federal Constitution, definitely intended that the State Governments should be financially independent.

We should consider several sections of the Constitution, which have had an effect that the framers did not intend when they were unwittingly placed in the Constitution. In the Constitution there are sections dealing with the power of the Commonwealth to make laws in regard to all forms of taxation but those powers override the State Governments' powers to levy taxation because the very fact that the Commonwealth Government have power to impose a high rate of taxation forces the various State Governments out of that field of income. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has actually occurred under the system of uniform taxation. Because of that particular section in the Constitution the Commonwealth Government were able to survive in the appeal to the High Court. They are able to impose sufficiently high taxation to prevent the State Governments from entering the income-tax field.

It was the intention of the Constitution that the State Governments should have a permanent assured income of their own and be financially independent. The Constitution as framed stated that for the first 10 years of Federation the State Governments were to

receive from the Commonwealth Government 75 per cent. of the taxation received by the Commonwealth by way of customs and excise duties. At that time customs and excise taxation was the highest form of taxation, income tax being second to it.

I have said that the framers of the Constitution stated that it was necessary for the States to be financially independent in order to carry on developmental works, land settlement, housing and education, and the other numerous activities undertaken by State Governments. We find, however, that within a very short time after the founding of the Commonwealth of Australia, the first attack was made upon the financial independence of the States. In 1908, in respect of Section 94 of the Constitution, which authorised the payment of surplus revenue to the State Governments, which was another way in which the framers of the Constitution hoped to bring about the financial independence of the States, the Commonwealth Government was able to survive an appeal by the State Governments. The case in question dealt with coast defence and the Appropriation Bill for old-age pensions. By the means then adopted all surplus revenue of the Commonwealth Government was placed in a trust account to enable all payments to be made in respect of those two purposes. The State Governments appealed against the Commonwealth Government's placing of the surplus revenue of the Commonwealth in that trust account, but the High Court ruled against the States and this, the first action taken against the financial independence of the States, was successful.

Later, in 1910, after a 10-year period of Federation had elapsed, action was taken in respect of Section 87, which assured an income to the States for 10 years by providing that 75 per cent. of customs and excise duties should be refunded to the States. The Commonwealth Government decided that instead of that, there should be a rebate to the States of 25s. a head of the population.

Then we come to the 1927 Financial Agreement, which was brought about for several reasons, one of which was that the State Governments were informed that the payment to the States of 25s. per capita was to be abolished. It was found also that with the State Governments competing on the loan markets overseas and at home, the interest rate had increased to 6 and 6½ per cent. As a result, it was necessary for the State Governments to enter into this financial agreement with the Commonwealth Government. That, too, had an adverse effect on the financial independence of the States.

Finally, in 1942 there was the Uniform Tax Case, and again we find that although the provisions of the Constitution were originally intended to secure a permanently assured income to the States, and financial independence to the States, that financial independence has been completely destroyed. This is something that I think has escaped the majority of hon. members opposite. With respect to all financial agreements entered into between the States and the Commonwealth, hon. members opposite have argued

that the Commonwealth Government are entitled to impose conditions upon the lending of finance to the States to carry out certain works. However, it was never intended by the Constitution that there should be any interference with the general powers or jurisdiction of the State Governments over those matters that come within their ambit.

I think it will be admitted that whilst we have legislative power over all these matters, there is complete independence generally of the State Governments, and immediately any Commonwealth Government, by way of an agreement, impose conditions upon any grant made to a State Government, they are acting outside the Constitution of Australia. There have been numerous such agreements, and they have all been devised by the Commonwealth Government in an attempt to get round the Australian Constitution and to rob the State Governments of their independence. I believe there have been five of them:—The War-Service Land Settlement Agreement, the Housing Agreement, the Joint Coal Board Agreement, the Hospitals Agreement, and the Rail Standardisation Agreement.

Under the Constitution the Commonwealth Government, regardless of their political affiliations, must accept the financial responsibility of helping the State Governments to administer the affairs over which they have control. It is admitted that the Commonwealth Government have the legal right arbitrarily to pass legislation in regard to these matters, but because of the very fact that the Commonwealth Government have taken from the States the right to impose any great form of taxation the Commonwealth must assume the obligation of helping the States financially, and having done that they must not attempt to impose conditions upon the State Governments for the granting of that finance.

There are numerous constitutional authorities on this subject and I am certain that the majority of them will agree with that view. There is for instance the statement by a former Chief Justice of the High Court, Sir John Latham, which appears in "Finance and Taxation" by A. J. Hannan a former Crown Solicitor in South Australia. Latham C. J. said—

"It is perhaps not out of place to point out that the scheme which the Commonwealth has applied to income tax of imposing rates so high as practically to exclude State taxation could be applied to other taxes so as to make the States almost completely dependent, financially and therefore generally, upon the Commonwealth. If the Commonwealth Parliament, in a Grants Act, simply provided for the payment of moneys to States without attaching any conditions whatever, none of the legislation could be challenged by any of the arguments submitted to the Court in these cases. The amount of the grants could be determined in fact by the satisfaction of the Commonwealth with the policies, legislative or other, of the respective States, no reference being made to such matters in any

Commonwealth statute. Thus, if the Commonwealth Parliament were prepared to pass such legislation, all State powers would be controlled by the Commonwealth—a result which would mean the end of the political independence of the States. Such a result cannot be prevented by any legal decision. The determination of the propriety of any such policy must rest with the Commonwealth Parliament and ultimately with the people. The remedy for alleged abuse of power or for the use of power to promote what are thought to be improper objects is to be found in the political arena and not in the Courts."

There is one sound opinion, expressed by the former Chief Justice of Australia. He pointed out that under the Constitution the Commonwealth could force the State Governments out of every field of taxation by the high taxation that they levied in that sphere. There could be nothing worse, so far as Federation is concerned, than having the State Governments completely dependent not only financially but generally also upon the Commonwealth, because by this practice the Commonwealth Government can impose their own political policy and their own political platform upon the individual State Governments, regardless of the electoral wishes of the people concerned. For instance, if a State Government are elected by a majority of the electors, in the case of Queensland a Labour Government, the electors have approved of the policy and the platform put before them by the Labour Party. Therefore it is certainly not right that the Commonwealth Government, for their own political purposes, should attempt to foist their own political policies upon that or any other individual State Government.

Yet we find in the history of the last Hospitals Agreement, which was successfully concluded in accordance with the wishes of the State Government, an instance where an attempt was made to force the political policy of the Federal Government upon the people of Queensland, who had elected a Labour Government to legislate on matters such as hospitalisation.

Mr. Chalk: You will make yourself believe that.

Mr. LLOYD: It is not a matter of making myself believe it. I believe it because it is right. The contents of this constitutional essay are borne out by other men who have studied the Constitution of Australia. I suggest to the hon. member that he do a bit of studying of these matters and he also might believe it.

Mr. Hannan had a few remarks to make on the statement made by the Chief Justice. It is in regard to the important questions raised by hon. members in regard to war-service land settlement that I wish to make this point. Remarking upon the quotation that I read a couple of minutes ago, Mr. Hannan had this to say, on page 277—

"If, however, the High Court had to consider six Grants Acts passed by the Commonwealth Parliament in the same

session, three of which made grants of several million each to New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland and grants of £5,000 each to South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania, and it appeared that the three former States had Governments and policies of the same political complexion as the Commonwealth Government, and its Parliamentary majority and the three latter States different and opposed policies, it is respectfully suggested that the High Court, having regard to the scheme of the legislation and its pith and substance, would hold that the legislation was not really for the purpose of giving financial aid to the States, but for the purpose of aiding the implementation of Commonwealth policies and of putting an end to the States' political independence, and that the Commonwealth Parliament has no power to enact such legislation, because of the federal nature of the Constitution."

I think Mr. Hannan in that paragraph made it quite clear that his view of the matter was that if in such an instance the Commonwealth Government under the Commonwealth Grants Act made grants of a certain amount to individual States because they agreed with the policy of the Commonwealth and did not do so to the States that did not agree with their policy, the High Court would rule against the Commonwealth Government.

Let us deal now with the War-Service Land Settlement Agreement, which was made between the States and the Commonwealth. One condition of the agreement was that the State Government should transfer the ownership of the land that was required for war-service land settlement to the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Government. If the Commonwealth Government demand that their own policy be implemented in regard to a subject matter over which the State Government have full jurisdiction, as they have done so far under the War-Service Land Settlement Scheme and as they attempted to do under the Hospitals Agreement, I submit they are going outside the Constitution and outside the original intention of an indissoluble Federal Government, whereby each State Government have complete authority over the matters they have to administer; and the State Government, by implementing the policy of the Federal Government, would be going beyond the wishes of the electors of the State concerned.

During the last session I spoke on war-service land settlement and attempted to show that this was integral with our closer settlement scheme and that it had played an important part in the opening up of new lands within the State and was playing a large part in its development. I mentioned at the time that Queensland became a principal State, refusing to accept the dictation of the Commonwealth Government in the implementation of its own land policy, and that we thus maintained our constitutional rights to exercise our own jurisdiction over this matter by insisting on retaining the ownership of the land. It is necessary to point out that 93 per cent. of the land in Queensland is on leasehold tenure, that is, owned by the

Crown as trustees for the people, and the Government of Queensland as trustees for the people must ensure that land is correctly used. The correct use of land is an important part of the modern development of our country, and it is necessary that some form of control be placed by the Crown on the use of the land, by its tenants, and of course in turn the people decide whether that form of control is correct. An attempt is being made to belittle the efforts of the State Government so far as war-service land settlement is concerned, and it must be met by emphasising the fact that we have retained the general independence of Queensland as a sovereign State under the Constitution. At the same time we have obtained from the loan moneys made available to us by the Commonwealth Government from time to time, as much as we could possibly get to enable the ex-service men of Queensland to be settled on the land in Queensland. We have done a very fine job. As I outlined on the last occasion, it is not a matter of £1,000,000 or £2,000,000 that the State Government have made available to ex-service men in Queensland, but from other sources comes an amount of more than £8,000,000, which has been lent to ex-service men throughout the State in order that we may carry out our undertakings given under the War Service Land Settlement Agreement.

It was found that the cost of settlement in Queensland was becoming out of all proportion to the amount that it had cost some 10 or 15 years ago. At that time I said it would cost approximately £15,000 to settle one ex-service man on a good property. The Minister now remarks to me that that has virtually doubled within the space of a few years. That position is met with not only in Queensland but in all the States of the Commonwealth at the present time. In many instances the other Australian States have been able to operate in the position of agent States, the Commonwealth Government agreeing to pay for the whole of the costs of resumption of land and all the expenditure entailed in the settlement of ex-service men on that land. It was found, however, that a State that was a principal State was paying approximately £10 to £12 for every £1 that was being put at its disposal by the Commonwealth. The stage was reached at which loan money was curtailed and the State Government were unable to carry on their undertaking as they had done in the past. That was because of the wording of the War Service Land Settlement Agreement.

I have already placed my contention before the House and here is another instance where by an additional clause to the agreement the Commonwealth Government are again outside the Constitution of Australia and it is necessary for us, as a State Government, to protect the rights of the people.

In March of this year this Government put before the Commonwealth Government a compromise scheme under which war-service land settlement could be carried out successfully. Under it the State Government would retain ownership of the land and would pay all costs of acquisition, whether by resumption

or agreement, on condition that the Commonwealth Government would undertake to make available the finance necessary to establish ex-service men on the land in Queensland. They were the only terms upon which this State Government could attempt to carry out war-service land settlement with any hope of success. That offer was rejected, on the ground that the Loan Council had already met, that the Commonwealth Government's commitments had already been decided for the year, and that under those circumstances the scheme would have to wait for decision until 1953-54.

We have been accused by the Opposition of letting down the ex-service men in this State, yet in March of this year the Commonwealth Government rejected a proposal that would have enabled us to carry on with the settlement of ex-service men! We gave the Commonwealth Government an opportunity of proving that they were willing to meet their obligations to the ex-service men of Queensland and to honour the agreement they had made. They let the ex-service men down! We asked them to expend money that we had been asked to spend in previous years and which we had expended willingly, but they refused.

The number of ex-service men settled in Queensland is an important factor to consider and it is interesting to note that this State Government have settled more ex-service men than any other State Government in the Commonwealth. Under all schemes, we have settled 649 ex-service men, the number of landless men settled by ballot alone being 429. Again, we are the only State in Australia to make available to 3,000 ex-service men settlers £5,500,000 free of interest and redemption over a period. We certainly have nothing to be ashamed of in our war-service land settlement policy. No other State in the Commonwealth can claim to have done anything equal to what we have done. Now we are asking the Commonwealth Government to agree to what we suggest is a reasonable proposal but the Commonwealth Government say they cannot accept it because they have already decided upon their commitments for this year.

There is only one other matter to which I want to refer, and it is a subject that has been mentioned casually by hon. members opposite. I refer to the question of starting-price betting. The policy that has been put before the people by the Government within the last 12 months is a wise one; it is for the people themselves to decide what shall be done. I am not a betting man; there are numerous other ways in which I can spend my money. I have seen betting-shops in the country; they always produce the undesirable element and in their wake follow unhappiness, murder, suicide, and all the other crimes in the Criminal Code. I do not agree that starting-price betting should be allowed in any part of the State but I most certainly do not think it should be introduced into the metropolitan area. I am certain that the people living in the metropolitan area will reject it if there is a referendum on the subject.

Hon. members opposite have on occasion, with smugness and self-satisfaction, mentioned the question of raising parliamentary salaries and allowances. A controversy is raging round this question in the newspapers; much doubt has been created in the minds of the people. This controversy is going on just before a Federal election and the newspapers and their political allies, the Liberal and Country Parties, have been so completely bankrupt of subjects upon which to attack Labour that they are endeavouring to mislead the people of Queensland into believing that we on this side of the House are nothing but money-grabbers.

I do not intend to deal at great length with the rights or the wrongs of this question. Suffice it to say that a great number of people do not realise that there are metropolitan electorates of 90 square miles, coming down in area to the smaller electorates in Brisbane. Those electorates are just as arduous and as costly to represent as are some of the country electorates. It is necessary for a metropolitan member to be in the city at all times; he is as he should be, at the beck and call of his people and it is necessary for him to spend considerably more money at certain times of the year than it is for country members. There is complete justification in my mind for allowances ranging up to £200. However, Opposition parties are attempting to use this question as a lever to create disunity within the ranks of the Labour Party but I believe that party in Queensland is big enough to withstand any criticism and it is strong enough to bind itself together in a time of crisis. As has happened in the past, the Queensland branch of the Australian Labour Party will become more solid and more united in any disagreement or crisis. Let us go back to 1891, for instance, when the Australian Labour Party in this State was born.

Mr. Aikens: So was I.

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member for Mundingburra was born in a very good year. However, I do not know whether, in the years since then, he has grown in the same way, or as creditably to the people of Queensland, as has the Labour Party.

At that time the industrial struggle for freedom against the system of contract began, and round about that year there was the infamous Queensland National Bank scandal. Those are the things from which the Labour Party was born and since then it has continued to struggle against all forms of corruption. Its members fought on occasions at great disadvantage to themselves against the dictatorial attitude adopted by the Government of that day and they have succeeded in building up within Queensland a party that has won the confidence of the people for 38 years, and will continue to hold the confidence of the people.

I assure hon. members opposite that the Labour Party is big enough to withstand any criticism. I am certain that there will be no disunity within its ranks in Queensland, and

that the crisis that hon. members opposite talk about, and that their newspapers talk about, will be settled without any disunity and with great credit to the party in this State.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah) (4.2 p.m.): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I consider it my duty to compliment you and the members of your party on your return to office as the Government of this State. You have been returned with a substantial majority, but that of course does not add to the easiness of the task that confronts you and your colleagues, particularly as the post-war boom period has passed and economic conditions and things generally are settling down into more normal channels. We can see this in the activities of the various departments of the Government, which are curtailing their activities along certain avenues. We see, for instance, the banning of overtime in the Railway Department and the dismissal of large numbers of men who previously found employment under contracts let by this Government for the erection of homes.

All these things point to the need for the individual to realise that there are a responsibility and an obligation upon him to curtail all unnecessary spending if he wishes to maintain the present standard of living in the community. At the same time, there is a tremendous obligation on the Government to encourage people to conserve their funds to meet present-day conditions. That is why I have always condemned and criticised this Government, in that they have rather encouraged the people to dissipate many millions of pounds of the working man's money. They hold up before the people the hollow and the empty sham that if they contribute to the Golden Casket they will help to finance the hospitals of Queensland and at the same time stand a big chance of winning a large sum of money. A Government who use such immoral avenues to raise their finances have sunk to the lowest levels, and nothing will ever convince me that it is not one of the greatest blots on our community life. It was instituted, and is still sponsored, by the Queensland Labour Government, and if this Government are sincere in their oft-repeated concern for the welfare of the people, they should take action to abolish this evil, which helps to destroy the incomes of countless thousands of people.

The Government continue to take the view that they can extract enormous sums of money from the many and give them to the few. Over £5,500,000 has been contributed from the people's earnings towards the Golden Casket during the last 12 months. Then the Government talk against capitalism and about the emancipation of working people, the ordinary men and women in the community. How contradictory are the words of the Government on the one hand and their actions on the other!

While this moral issue confronts the Government and has confronted it in the past there is also the low moral responsibility on the Government in respect of the universal

practice of S.P. betting. We have a well-organised and efficient Police Force and if the Government realised their responsibilities and had faced up to them they could have dealt with this matter instead of allowing it to develop to the extent that it has today.

Mr. Aikens: Do you believe that every person who engages in S.P. betting is low and immoral?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is not in the best interests of the community. Through the Golden Casket and in other ways the Government have fostered the idea in the minds of countless people of the State that they can get something for nothing, failing to realise that that is impossible unless they get it at the expense of someone else. That is the attitude that has been allowed to permeate our State, until it has largely become part and parcel of the outlook of certain sections of our community. Their claims for wages and conditions are somewhat along the same lines, they are always striving to get something for nothing.

Mr. Aikens: Then why does your party accept donations from S.P. bookmakers?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am not aware of that.

Let us consider some of the benefits and some of the conditions that are granted in industry. I speak now about the men who work on the wharves, whose attitude must be described as a downright despicable attitude. In fact, it can be described as a criminal attitude in relation to other sections of the community, because they totally and utterly disregard the welfare of the individual in the community so far as costs and other aspects of our economy are concerned. Much the same can be said about many men who work at the abattoirs. Their attitude over the years has cost the State an incalculable amount. A month ago I met a grazier who had 200 head of fat bullocks ready for marketing, but because of the uncertainty of industrial conditions and the tactics of the men at the abattoirs he held them back and the subsequent drought has compelled him to keep them for another 12 months. I met another grazier who because of the tactics of the men at the abattoirs decided to spay five hundred of his breeders—another great loss. He had no alternative. All this is the result of the Government's continued policy through the avenues that I have mentioned, and in other ways, of always letting the people think that they are entitled to something for nothing, that they can get these benefits and that industry can continue to bear the strain.

We observe how the Government's policy is gathering momentum amongst the people generally. Last year, at the behest of the unions, the Government introduced legislation to provide for long-service leave. This was another considerable concession and no doubt a worthy one for men who work faithfully in industry. But here again we have repercussions in many directions, first of all in industry that was called upon unexpectedly to bear another burden. Then there was repercussion among union leaders in

particular that no sooner had they got this concession than they were demanding it for men who worked a shorter period than that already prescribed and, indeed, long-service leave for men who work here and men who work there.

I say it is time the Government adopted a realistic attitude and faced up to the position. Now we have the spectacle of the Australian Council of Trade Unions seeking, not three months but six months every 20 years retrospective long-service leave throughout Australia. Although this application is made under a Federal award—it will affect 80,000 workers in Queensland—it is an indication of the drift that things are taking; and if granted it will send up our costs. I am one who believes that with the holidays and annual leave enjoyed by all in industry—not primary producers—are all that could be desired but we cannot keep on continually granting additional concessions if we are to face up in a realistic way to maintaining our standards of living and meeting our costs. And speaking of costs, we have Japan buying large quantities of our commodities and aiming at being allowed to market her goods here. How can we hope to meet that position?

The Government and the unions, through their constant demands for something for nothing, are doing nothing more nor less than building up a fool's paradise. Since the introduction of the 40-hour week, together with other concessions and benefits granted by the Government, we have had the spiralling of costs, and we have now reached the position where you can almost say that wages and conditions are getting out of proportion to the services rendered.

A Government Member: You are doing well.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am not an advocate of lower wages; I believe in good wages: and I definitely believe in a fair day's work also. That is the only way in which we are going to meet costs and compete with overseas commodities. I maintain that the Government cannot go on indefinitely granting further concessions as demanded if we are to hope to meet the conditions that confront us now and that will confront us in the immediate future. I go further and say that the unions are in the near future going to prove to be the biggest enemy the worker has to contend with because of the impossible position they are creating in industry as far as labour and services are concerned.

We know that the various union leaders, in an endeavour to justify their positions and hold power over the rank and file—

A Government Member: You do not like them.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I have nothing against them. They are doing the people an injustice because of the hopeless position they are creating, and by demanding more concessions and benefits—something for nothing—they are virtually creating a position that will place us and the Australian people generally in a very difficult and

dangerous plight. There must be some semblance of balance between what is granted and services rendered. I speak with considerable experience and knowledge. In recent years primary industry has had to face overseas competition more and more. How can primary industry hope to do that and meet high prices for machinery, petrol and spare parts that are manufactured in Australia under Australian conditions?

Indeed the position becomes such that it is wellnigh impossible to meet competition because of the continued tendency for more concessions and more benefits to be given, in other words, as I have said, of getting something for nothing without creating additional output in return.

Recently the Acting Premier spoke on the problem that is before our primary producers of meeting overseas competition. Of course, as all hon. members well know, our primary products are the backbone of our national wealth. I was very sorry indeed that the hon. gentleman omitted to make any reference to the basic reason for this difficulty. Our primary producers work the hardest of any section in the community. The Acting Premier said nothing of the alarming costs of freight for our primary products on his railways which are conducted on a 40-hour week basis. There came to my mind the statement made by the hon. member for Nash in his speech, that the 40-hour week never cost this State anything. It was immediately obvious to me that the hon. member had never attempted to run a business on his own and made a success of it but that obviously he had always been on the receiving end so far as remuneration is concerned.

I maintain that the primary producers are doing an extraordinary job, considering all the aspects and angles that confront them today, and the increase in fares and freights is nothing more nor less than an additional tax imposed on all inland wealth-producing activities. The recent increase in fares and freights is extremely drastic, particularly those in relation to livestock. I suggest that the hon. gentleman should never again make a public utterance about the need for primary producers to market their commodities and goods on the competitive basis. His own department is one of the worst offenders in preventing the realisation of the very thing he wishes to be achieved. I know the Acting Premier could say that he is running the railways on an economic basis. I commend him for that. Of course, he will say that he is faced with adjustments for increased wages but I can assure him there is a great need and a possibility of meeting the position rather from the angle of greater efficiency than that of increased freights. The hon. member for Nash spoke of meeting present-day costs with greater efficiency. A colleague of mine sitting next to me whispered that he wondered whether the hon. member was referring to the railways of the Minister for Transport. I felt that he had something like that in his thoughts because there is

plenty of scope for greater organised efficiency. The tragedy is that today politics, as it is played, prevents the Acting Premier from taking the step suggested. Politics today no doubt prevents the Acting Premier from making any reference to the 40-hour week and its effect on the position. Being an astute man he realises this and the important part it has played in present-day costs.

I frequently wonder, too, whether the Minister for Transport realises the sense of injustice and the resentment with which the country man views certain phases of his department, for instance the State Transport tax, whereby he is burdened with an additional tax not borne by city interests. This is hitting the people and penalising them when they are already penalised by distance from and lack of amenities. The Minister for Transport does not realise how his policy tends to destroy rather than build up the inland areas.

One of the many illustrations I could give of the way in which this policy retards progress and development is to be found in the fact that out near my place, about 7 miles from Kingaroy, there is a great stack of split ironbark fence-posts. About 18 months or two years ago a western man came in and ordered them. When they were split, he came over to transport them out west but the local sergeant would not give him a permit. He said they would have to be transported by the Kingaroy-Bell licensed motor-transport service and then railed to Dalby and on to their destination. Had they been transported by those methods, those posts would have cost almost as much as gold posts and the result was that they have been left lying where they are today. Of course, the Minister will tell us that he has to have money to build and maintain our roads, but the tragedy of it is that we get so little work for the money we pay. Prices of iron, steel, and other things needed for road construction are so high that the moneys available seem to go comparatively nowhere. The Government call out continually for more and more money, but rarely do we hear them urging that we should have more for the money we pay. Why do they not start a campaign of endeavouring to get more for the money paid?

Mr. Muller: And they should make better use of what they have got.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: They certainly should. I see that the Secretary for Labour and Industry is in the Chamber, and while I have the greatest respect for him I do hope that he realises what further impact the granting of additional long-service leave benefits for shorter periods and other concessions demanded by unions will have on our economy and the cost of things in general. Of course, we know the position the Government are in when it comes to standing up to demands made by the unions. Recently we had the spectacle of seeing the Q.C.E. taking unto itself the right to direct this Government in relation to salaries and allowances of members of this Parliament

and aldermen of the Brisbane City Council. At first I thought that the Q.C.E. was going to ask the Government to set up an entirely independent tribunal, and I should have agreed with that, and again I appeal to the Acting Premier and the Government, even at this late stage, to consider the position that we are in with relation to the public on this issue.

Mr. Sparkes: It would be better to appeal to the Q.C.E. than to the Government.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: It would seem so. This is just another outstanding example of how the Government are run and by whom they are run, and it is time the people of the State realised the methods by which many of our laws are made. It is time they realised that the decisions are made not by the elected representatives of the people but by certain men who, by virtue of the position they hold and the number of votes they control, can direct the Government. That is why we on this side have always claimed that this Government are not working in the interests of the people at all. It is obvious that they are union-controlled and for that reason we shall never have the progress and development that is necessary to bring this State to full prosperity. No-one on the Government side can deny that they are union-controlled and we all know that unions think and act only along the one line. They have no regard for costs. They are always striving to get something for nothing, and a great State like this cannot be built on that foundation.

Mr. A. Jones: And the employer on the other hand is trying to get labour as cheaply as he can.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I realise that is an angle also.

We have reached the stage at which unions have created an impossible position in the matter of meeting outside competition on our great export markets, and it is time the Government took a firm stand in regard to granting further concessions to members of unions. I am not opposed to unionism as such but we have the position today that it is compulsory for a man who is not Labour-minded to pay into union funds. Furthermore, we have A.L.P. branches resorting for the raising of funds to the use of chocolate wheels with cash prizes. That practice is making the branches sink to a low ebb morally. I do not know whether the Attorney-General grants permits for running these chocolate wheels but it is showing a supposedly great organisation in a very poor light indeed morally.

Unions are not interested in costs but excessive costs are having a detrimental effect upon the community and it is high time that a Government came into power who were not bound hand and foot to unions. At union request the Government introduced a 40-hour week and at the time of its introduction the late Premier painted a very rosy picture of happy homes amid plenty and prosperity. Apart from the aspect of increased cost the measure has given the opportunity to many

people to while away their time in hotels, and today we have the unthinkable figure of £146,000,000 being spent in Australia in the consumption of liquor, a sum virtually equivalent to what is spent on social services throughout the Commonwealth.

I was amazed to read an article in the Press that the Secretary for Labour and Industry intended to bring down an amendment to the law to prevent people, on being granted three months' long-service leave, from utilising their time profitably. I should be happy if the Minister would contradict that statement but according to the article these persons have to spend their holiday doing nothing, yet we were told that the granting of long-service was supposed to be in the interests of the people. If that is so nothing is further from the truth.

Mr. Burrows: They are supposed to have three months' rest.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Many people could not afford to be idle for so long. One can imagine a man after three months' doing nothing losing contact with his work, and that is the position he will be in when he is again re-employed. I say that if these people wish to work they should be allowed to do so. Australia is a young nation and there are avenues for those who are prepared to work and put their shoulders to the wheel.

I say to the Secretary for Public Instruction that the construction of school residences in country areas is a matter of great urgency. I think he realises it, but he should use his endeavours with his colleagues to bring it about. When one thinks of all the homes the Government are building for people in and about the cities one is shocked to think of the schools in country areas without residences. I was informed that in the whole of the Murgon shire there was only one school residence, that at Murgon itself. We have, for example, several closely-settled districts in my electorate, Cloyna and Fairdale included, and in one instance the teacher has to travel many miles to live in an old, dilapidated farm residence that nobody else will live in. He has been doing that for years. Surely, when the Government are building State homes in the various country towns, at least some of them could be allotted to schools?

I have sought to summarise the present-day position as I see it, by showing how the trend of events to come is evident in the actions of the Government themselves in curtailing expenditure in different avenues, how the Government in many respects are insincere in helping the public to meet the present-day trends by failing to encourage them to economise, but rather are helping them to squander their money, not in hundreds of thousands of pounds but in millions of pounds, through the Golden Casket, how they are tragically lacking in their responsibility to curb S.P. betting, which has reached alarming dimensions, and how this gambling spirit the Government have fostered has encouraged the people to think always in terms of getting something for nothing, getting more concessions or more

benefits without offering anything in return. I have sought to point out to the Government that the stage has long since been reached where it is impossible to keep on giving into the demands the unions continually place before the Government. The Government must face up to the position regarding home markets and overseas markets in the future.

Mr. A Jones: You will have to talk to Mr. McEwen about that.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: That is a different angle from the one along which I am speaking.

Costs are now so high that it is well-nigh impossible to compete with overseas prices for the great export commodities on which our economic welfare depends. I have brought before the Government's notice the fact that, through their railways and the increases that have recently been made, they have further greatly aggravated the position, and how I believe that much of the need for further increases could have been met by greater efficiency throughout the service.

I have urged upon the Minister for Transport, whom I respect—he extends all the courtesy and help that he can—that the State Transport Act particularly should be reviewed in an endeavour to remove some of the burden on country people.

I have reminded the House, although I know it is unnecessary, how the Q.C.E. largely runs this Government and is the power behind the scenes. The people of this State must eventually realise that this is not in their interests.

With the alarming drink bill of our State and Commonwealth, these are issues to which the Government should give careful thought and consideration. There is much that they can and should do to overcome the problems to which I have referred.

Debate, on motion of Mr. J. R. Taylor, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 4.35 p.m.