

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 1 SEPTEMBER 1953

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

under any other policy or policies on the same life to the wife) exceed £750, and (b) that the provision covering this Statutory limit of £750 was introduced more than 20 years ago when the value of the £1 was substantially different from its value to-day?

"2. Will he consider the desirability of increasing this Statutory limit from £750 to something in the vicinity of £2,000?"

Hon. E. J. WALSH (Bundaberg) replied—

"1. Because of the honourable member's wide experience in matters of this nature, associated as they are with his business activities, he is well aware that the position as set out by him is the law. He may not, however, be aware of the fact that the amendment to the law which is responsible for the position as outlined was introduced by the Moore Government in December, 1931, following the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Overell v. Commissioner of Stamp Duties*. It is interesting to note that the amendment of the Act was proceeded with by the then Government before the appeal to the Full Court had been decided. The reasons for such action were set out in a statement attributed to the then Premier, Hon. A. E. Moore, which may be sighted on page 2616, Parliamentary Debates, Volume CLX., 1931.

"2. I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that because of the amendment to the law introduced by the Labour Government last year which increased the Statutory exemption from £500 to £1,500, an estate of £2,250, including the £750 referred to, is free of Succession Duties where the wife and children of the deceased person succeed thereto."

CAIRNS-BRISBANE RAIL TIMETABLE.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) asked the Minister for Transport—

"For what reasons, if any, was the timetable of the Cairns-Brisbane mail train altered to the present schedule which inflicts the maximum amount of inconvenience on North Queensland passengers and people?"

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

"The alteration of the Cairns to Brisbane mail train has reduced the time of the journey from Cairns to Brisbane by four hours. It is necessary to arrange the timetable having regard to all circumstances and in such a way as to, as far as possible, suit all principal centres of population en route; also to provide a suitable time of arrival at destination. The best possible has been done to satisfy the many interests involved. As from 19 September, 1953, the Saturday train from Cairns to Townsville will leave Cairns at 9.40 a.m. instead of 2 p.m. and will arrive at Townsville at 6.12 p.m. instead of 10.30 p.m."

TUESDAY, 1 SEPTEMBER, 1953.

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

QUESTIONS.

REVENUE FROM CROWN TIMBER.

Mr. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation—

"For the financial years 1951-1952 and 1952-1953, respectively (a) what was the total revenue derived from Crown timber, and (b) what amount of such revenue was paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund?"

Hon. T. A. FOLEY (Belyando) replied—

"The total revenue derived from Crown Timber was: (a) For year 1951-1952, £2,182,407; (b) for year 1952-1953, £2,541,904. After meeting haulage, marketing, road and other costs, revenue as follows was paid into Consolidated Revenue Fund: (a) For the year 1951-1952, £1,155,235; (b) for year 1952-1953, £1,344,969."

SUCCESSION DUTIES ON LIFE POLICIES.

Mr. MUNRO (Toowong) asked the Treasurer—

"1. Is it true—(a) that, in the case of a policy effected by a wife on the life of her husband where the wife is the person beneficially entitled to the policy moneys and where she *bona fide* paid out of her own moneys all the premiums on the policy, the proceeds would be subject to Succession Duty on the death of the husband if the moneys payable under the policy (together with the moneys payable

NEW HOTEL, SURFERS PARADISE.

Mr. GAVEN (Southport) asked the Attorney-General—

“In reference to the statement of the Licensing Commission that a modern tourist hotel is badly needed in the vicinity of Surfers Paradise, will he kindly discuss with the Commission the desirability of obviating any further delay in this matter by formulating the specifications of such a hotel, including the area required, and calling public tenders as soon as practicable with regard to its licensing and construction?”

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona) replied—

“The Licensing Commission advise that investigations are being made to determine the claim of the South Coast area for additional hotel accommodation.”

TEACHERS' RESIDENCES; FEMALE TEACHERS.

Mr. PIZZEY (Isis) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

“1. (a) How many married male teachers are in charge of schools in Queensland? (b) How many of such teachers are supplied with official residences? (c) How many official residences for head teachers were erected in 1950-1951, 1951-1952, and 1952-1953, respectively?

“2. How many married female teachers were in the employ of the department on 30 June, 1953, (a) widows, (b) with husbands who are also employed in the department, and (c) others?”

Hon. G. H. DEVRIES (Gregory) replied—

“1. (a) Married male teachers in charge of schools, 1,005; (b) official residences supplied, 662; (c) as the Department of Public Works is the constructing authority for this Department and as information relative to construction of official residences is furnished in the annual report of the Secretary for Public Works and Housing the question might be addressed to him.

“2. (a) Widows, 90; (b) married teachers with husbands in Department, 33; (c) Other married female teachers, 695; total 818.”

MARKETING OF NORTH QUEENSLAND POTATOES.

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin) asked the Attorney-General—

“In reference to his reply on 26 August, to the hon. member for Mundingburra that the North Queensland crop of 3,000 tons of potatoes could be absorbed in North Queensland, approximately what quantity of such crop has been marketed (a) in North Queensland, (b) by the Potato Marketing Board in Southern Queensland, and (c) outside Queensland?”

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona) replied—

“The hon. member should address his request for this information to the Potato Marketing Board.”

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Auditor-General under the Supreme Court Funds Act of 1895 for the year 1952-1953.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Regulation under the Apprentices and Minors Acts, 1929 to 1948.

By-law No. 637 under the Railways Acts, 1914 to 1951.

SHEEPSKINS (DRAFT ALLOWANCES ABOLITION) BILL.

INITIATION.

Mr. H. H. COLLINS (Tablelands—Secretary for Agriculture and Stock): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the desirableness of introducing a Bill relating to certain deductions known as draft allowance in connection with the sale of sheepskins.”

Motion agreed to.

REVIEW OF VALUATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

Bill, on motion of Mr. Hilton, read a third time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—THIRD ALLOTTED DAY.

Debate resumed from 27 August, (see p. 181) on Mr. Diplock's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. H. B. TAYLOR (Clayfield) (11.12 a.m.): Mr. Speaker, this morning I propose to discuss three subjects. First I should like to explain for the benefit of the Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation what he has described as my slant towards Government policy. Then I should like to say something as a Federal councillor of the Library Association that is favourable towards the extension of our library facilities in Queensland and something about a subject of which I feel rather ashamed when I meet my fellow councillors in Sydney at the full council meeting. Then, as an old soldier, I am very anxious to say something in reply to the attack made by the hon. member for North Toowoomba on our defence expenditure.

First of all, before touching on those subjects I should like to follow the example of the hon. member for Bremer and express my appreciation to the electors of Clayfield for having returned me to this House for a third term unopposed. I do appreciate that action. Although it may be considered a blue-ribbon seat I would remind the House

that only twice previously in the past 60 years has this blue-ribbon seat returned its member unopposed; that was when the late Andrew Petrie was returned unopposed in 1896 and 1908. So for a very long time there has been a contest, and I feel that it is a very high compliment to be returned unopposed after serving only two terms.

It may be remembered that I followed into this House that estimable citizen of Brisbane, Sir John Chandler; and I have always endeavoured to follow the ideals that he set out when he represented Hamilton in this Parliament. In view of many things that may be said I think that I should make my position very clear by saying that I believe in what Sir John Chandler expressed in a presidential address he gave to the party he founded on 7 November, 1946. Sir John Chandler used these words:

“My short experience in Parliament has led me to believe that the position of Parliamentary representative is not a part-time job; it is not a job that can be taken up and set down at will.”

With those views I am in full accord and have endeavoured to make my representation of my electorate comply with those views.

I also congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your re-election to your honourable office. We on this side appreciate very fully the dignity with which you conduct the affairs of this House and the directness of your decisions. We feel sure that the members of your party paid you a high compliment in re-electing you to that position and the House joins with them.

And, too, I should like to congratulate the mover and seconder of this motion on the Address in Reply to His Excellency that is now being debated. The House, I am sure, was greatly impressed by the sincerity of the words uttered by both the mover and seconder. It would appear, almost, that the mover, in pressing for better educational facilities for the children of this State, particularly those in the far western areas, was advocating views that have been put forward by members of the Opposition. The spontaneous expressions and the sincere belief of the hon. member for Nash were something to which we too on this side of the House would entirely subscribe. It appeared to me that both hon. members were completely uninfluenced by the consideration of party reactions and gave their firm and honest beliefs on what was necessary in the particular spheres they discussed for the betterment of the people of the State. We sincerely hope that they will continue to speak in a forthright manner and will not be fettered by the party machine and retract the views they expressed here but which so many others in the party condemned.

In recent weeks public men have been rather dispirited by the controversy that has taken place. It is the duty of Parliament to maintain its dignity and whether people generally agree or disagree, they must feel that this is a House in which public affairs are discussed by men who sincerely believe in what they say and earnestly give attention to

that duty. There are times when it is necessary for us to draw public attention—and I prefer to call them parliamentarians rather than politicians—to what has been said in favour of parliamentarians. At the weekend I was reading a book written by a very eminent author at the beginning of this century, Frederick Scott Oliver, who was a contemporary of the famous John Buchan. He has written one or two books to be found in the Parliamentary Library, “Ordeal of Battle,” and “The Life of Alexander Hamilton,” which I recommend all hon. members to read. He wrote in three volumes a work that he left unfinished called “The Endless Adventure,” in which there is a chapter in praise of politicians. I feel that the following paragraph from page 111 in this book is worth quoting—

“If we eventually escape from our present perplexities, it will not be because theorists have discovered some fine new principle of salvation: or because newspapers have scolded and pointed angry fingers at this and that: or because we, their readers, have become excited and have demanded that ‘something must be done.’ It will be because those decent, hard-working, cheerful, valiant, knockabout politicians, whose mysterious business it is to manage our affairs by breaking one another’s heads, shall have carried on with their work as if nothing extraordinary was happening and shall have ‘jumbled something’ out of their contentions that will be of advantage to their country. The notion that we can save ourselves without their help is an illusion: for politics is not one of those crafts that can be learned by the light of nature without an apprenticeship.”

I believe that quotation is just as deserving of publicity as the bitter antagonism that has been displayed over the last few weeks.

I want to deal now with the first subject I mentioned, the statement by the Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation, that I had a wrong slant on the Government’s irrigation policy, and I want to do it in a most friendly manner because I think the Minister appreciates that I am just as anxious as he is to see our irrigation projects developed. My claim, of course, is that first consideration should be given to the building of weirs in the streams already flowing through agricultural country, in preference to large expenditure on major long-range projects.

The main purpose of storing water is to get greater production in the shortest possible time, and we know perfectly well that with our growing population greater production for our own people is a matter of urgency. In “The Sunday Mail” of 20 August, the Minister is reported as having said at a gathering he attended that he forecast a serious food shortage by 1960 if fire and subsequent soil erosion were allowed to go unchecked. That is another reason why this subject of greater production of food in the shortest possible time should have our consideration. We have the evidence given us by His Excellency the Governor-General at a recent parliamentary dinner when he told us that this Australia of ours, with a population

of little more than 8,000,000 people and with so many of us frequently talking about our empty spaces, is very closely watched by 1,200,000,000 north of us who wonder how long these empty spaces will remain empty. The answer to all this, of course, is the greater production of food in the shortest possible time. Just as a bishop coined the word "awareness," I heard an eminent visiting scholar the other night on the wireless coin the word "immediateness" and I think that is appropriate. It is the immediateness of the production of food that will help solve the problems of this country.

I can call to mind an illustration of this in the Nanango area, where we have a large area of agricultural land already producing food. There are streams flowing through that land and the people of Nanango say that if the Government will put down another weir on Barker's Creek to help that country, which is already producing food, it will provide us with a good example of how we may get a greater supply of food in the shortest possible time. That story could be repeated in many places. For instance, I know that my friends on the South Coast would like to see a greater number of weirs on the creeks down there.

Turning to the other aspect of the question, I want to see major dams in this country just as much as the Minister does. I want to see the Burdekin developed but I do not know whether the development of the Mareeba-Dimbulah area for the growing of tobacco is going to help solve the food problems of the world. I should like to see the Dawson too developed at a greater rate; it is an area concerning which we have already all the data we need in order to get on with its development, but what prospect is there of the immediate production of a greater supply of food to give to the world? The Burdekin, at the rate at which we are going, is obviously a 100 years programme or more, and not until we get to the stage when water flows there by gravitation will it be possible for the Burdekin to produce food in reasonable quantities.

Mr. Foley: Why do you say 100 years?

Mr. H. B. TAYLOR: If the Minister will take the amount spent each year and work out how long it will take to spend £70,000,000, he will see that it will be more than 100 years.

Mr. Foley: If you hastened some of your colleagues in the South we might do it more quickly.

Mr. H. B. TAYLOR: I fully expected that remark. All I hope is that the Government will spend on developmental projects all the money given to them. The point I am trying to emphasise is that the Government's programme of long-range construction does not meet the immediate demands of the peoples of the world for a greater production of food from this country and, as His Excellency the Governor-General of Australia said, there are 1,200,000,000 people watching for our greater production of food to help feed them. I have spent as much time as I can afford to spend on that subject but I hope that the Minister will appreciate the point I have made. I do

not quarrel with him at all on the ultimate construction of these major projects but they should be taken in easy stages whilst we get on with the building of water-storage schemes in places where we have land already producing food.

Mr. Foley: We have been doing that.

Mr. H. B. TAYLOR: But not doing it to the greatest possible extent.

Mr. Foley: Tinaroo was the first big project we tackled.

Mr. H. B. TAYLOR: The Minister has said that Tinaroo was the first big project tackled but for 20 years the Government have had all the information they needed about the Dawson, and it is not to grow tobacco but to grow food. It is food that we want produced in this vast country of ours, with its tremendous potentialities.

I wish the hon. member for North Toowoomba would come into the Chamber, as I want to deal now with his subject. However, he is not here and I would rather speak about it when he returns. I am pleased that the Secretary for Public Instruction, who has many important duties to attend to, has remained in the House, but I will leave the subject of defence for the last 10 minutes that I have and deal for the moment with public libraries.

I feel very honoured to be able to represent this State on the Federal Council of the Libraries Association of Australia. That association aims at raising the standard of the profession of librarian to a very high level, and it requires its students to take the Senior University Examination before they can sit for the preliminary certificate. The result is that when the students pass the qualifying examination, they have attained a very high standard of education. That association, which upholds the high standard of the profession, is very keen to see that in each State of the Commonwealth there is rapid development of library facilities for the people.

Since 1947 we have made splendid progress. In that year we appointed a trained librarian as the State Librarian, and to that gentleman I give tremendous credit for the excellent advancement of our library facilities, particularly in country districts. As an illustration of the advance we have made, I produce two photographs that can be passed round the House. The first is a picture of the school of arts in Ingham as it was a year or so ago, a dilapidated wreck of a building, but because there is an enterprising council in Ingham they now have that splendid J. L. Kelly Memorial Public Library, shown in the second photograph, the whole top floor of which is devoted to a library.

Mr. Devries: The Government helped them too.

Mr. H. B. TAYLOR: The Government subsidised them, but if they had not an active librarian who sold the council the idea that it was its responsibility to take care of the reading facilities for the people and inspired

it to build in Ingham a suitable building worthy of that township, the Government would not have been called upon to pay the subsidy.

Mr. Collins: That is the idea of the subsidy, to encourage that sort of thing.

Mr. H. B. TAYLOR: The increasing vote each year by the Government to the Library Board has come about because a greater number of bodies are seeking subsidies and are showing local initiative. However, I do not want to get into an argument as to why the subsidy is paid. What I am glad to see is that the municipalities and the shires of Queensland are realising that library facilities in the country districts are their responsibility. We like to encourage local schools of arts and there is no finer one in Queensland than that at Maryborough. It remains a school of arts chiefly because of the enthusiasm of one celebrated citizen, Mr. Strong, an excellent fellow.

It must be appreciated by the general public and by hon. members that members of committees who have the responsibility of developing the libraries in various parts of the State ultimately grow old and are unable to continue their good work, whereas if there was an authority in perpetuity, such as a council it would not matter who was the guiding light for the time being because the library institution would be carried on from year to year and its administration would not vary. Our State Librarian has done a remarkable job over the past few years in encouraging country cities and towns to establish municipal libraries and we on the Federal council recognise that Queensland is gradually reaching the stage of improved library facilities for the people, particularly the children. It is delightful to see municipal libraries in the various towns providing free libraries for the children. The administrative costs are borne by the respective councils and the Government pay a subsidy of £1 for £1 on books and buildings.

Mr. Aikens: And you want to tell them what they should read unless you have altered your opinion from that of last year.

Mr. H. B. TAYLOR: I shall always encourage the people to read books that will improve their education and I shall always encourage the public to read more and more non-fictional books because they will gain knowledge from them. It is delightful to see that the municipalities are establishing free libraries in country cities and towns because it encourages the child to go to the public library for books. When their school days are over they will continue to go to the public library for books.

Mr. Devries: We have some very useful libraries in the State schools too.

Mr. H. B. TAYLOR: I know. There is a very fine one in a school in my own electorate and I was glad to see that the Wilston State School was setting out on a big project in connection with school libraries. School libraries tend to make the children feel that a school is a place where they go for books

but when they leave school they do not care to go back to the school for their books to read and so they are encouraged to go to the municipal children's library. While I am all for school libraries I say let those libraries continue to supply the books that will help the children with their lessons.

Here is something that I want the Minister to listen to, something of which I am rather ashamed. When I meet the members of the Federal council in Sydney we not only talk about public libraries and municipal libraries but we talk about historical libraries as well. Every time I go to Sydney I go through the Mitchell Library. On the last occasion when I was down there, just after Easter, I was invited to attend a meeting at which the American Consul was handing to the New South Wales Public Library some gifts in recognition of the service rendered to the United States during the war and there for the first time in my life I met the Hon. Dr. Evatt, who happens to be chairman of the New South Wales Public Library Trust. Over a cup of tea we discussed politics. He thinks we have an excellent number of young men from Queensland in the Federal House, but on that subject we differed; he thought they were on the wrong side, and I thought they were on the right side.

I repeat that I never fail to go through the Mitchell Library. I have investigated that library and I have found that Queenslanders are sending historical documents to that library in preference to our own Oxley Library. So I have been to our Oxley Library once again, I venture to say that 50 per cent. of members in this House do not even know where it is. The Oxley Library is in a room 35 ft. by 17 feet on the second floor of the Public Library. It contains some very valuable historical papers and documents, but is just crammed full, with no opportunity for the student even to make reasonable research. Here are some of the valuable things it contains: it has three volumes of "Birds of Australia" by John Gould, valued at £900. It has the L'Estrange stamp collection, which was a gift, valued at over £2,000; but it cannot be displayed because the library has not the facilities for displaying anything. It has the irreplaceable two convict registers and Superintendent Spicer's diary of the early days, log books of Captain Bligh, and Leslie letters, which are of great historical value to this country. It has many other valuable records that cannot be displayed. I am ashamed—actually ashamed—of the neglect of the Government in establishing this Oxley Library in proper premises. Remember that we are nearly 100 years old and today we have a tremendous lot of valuable historical data. Students of the future will want to know something about Queensland. Students want to make constant research into historical things; and it is to such a library that they will go. When I was in Rockhampton the other day the Archer family had their centenary and the Archer papers are going to the Mitchell Library, because it is a better place for them to be displayed than the Oxley Library, and because that is where they may be quickly gathered together if they are

required. The people of Queensland do not get the opportunity of knowing something of this great family that established Central Queensland.

Mr. Aikens: If they want to know the history of their own State they have to go to Sydney.

Mr. H. B. TAYLOR: Here is something that possibly the hon. member for Mundingburra does not know—and that would be unique: there is stored in the Mitchell Library in Sydney the actual charter signed by Queen Victoria for the establishment of the Colony of North Queensland. How many members know that Queen Victoria and Gladstone established that colony of North Queensland and gave a commission to Lieut.-Colonel George Barney as Lieut.-Governor? They have down there also the revocation of that charter. Those are things that should be available to Queensland.

Mr. Devries: Unfortunately we have not benefactors, as the other States.

Mr. H. B. TAYLOR: That is where my plea comes in.

Mr. Devries: Show us how he can.

Mr. H. B. TAYLOR: I agree with the Minister in his interjection. If there are men in Australia such as David Scott Mitchell who provided for the foundation of the Mitchell Library, on one condition, that the New South Wales Government should erect a suitable building, surely there are men in Queensland who could endow this historical library in Queensland on the condition that the Queensland Government sets it up in a suitable building? That is a very important factor.

Mr. Devries: You do not need to go past the University; we are not getting many benefactors there.

Mr. H. B. TAYLOR: At the moment I am concerned with the Oxley Memorial Library. It is a valuable institution in the history of this State.

I have dwelt too long on that subject, and I must now deal with the hon. member for North Toowoomba who, in his extraordinary speech showed a colossal ignorance of the defence of this country. He asked the question: is Australia receiving £215,000,000 benefit from this defence expenditure? And then he gave the House his answer. He did not leave us to answer his question. His answer was that if searching inquiry is made into the way in which our Defence vote is spent we shall find that without reducing the efficiency of our services we could save enough money to give to the States some money they want for development. What is his evidence? The only evidence the hon. member offered here was some comment made by one trainee. The hon. member's statement is a serious reflection on the highest-trained general staff in the Commonwealth. What would gentlemen like His Excellency, trained all his life in the defence of this country, think of such criticism? To give the hon.

member a little information I would inform him that only £91,000,000 of that £215,000,000 is spent on the Army.

I know that my colleague, the hon. member for Chermside, will deal with this subject, but there is one aspect with which I will deal, that of the indirect value to this country of the training of the youth of the country. I have heard the Secretary for Public Lands tell us about the indirect value of the Dajarra-Newcastle Waters railway, which we know will be run at a loss. No revenue comes out of defence, but we are training the youth of this country, by their three months' compulsory training in camp, firstly to respect authority. We are training them in the discipline of duty and in the knowledge that they must be prepared, as men of this country, to defend this country.

Time does not permit of my developing this argument of putting into the field 82,000 men that would be available for the defence of Australia. I take my mind back to Coronation Day in Victoria Park when 5,000 young Queenslanders stood on parade as a tribute to their Queen. I stood there with a number of old soldiers and we felt proud of that parade, and when the announcing officer gave the orders, "Hats Off" and "Hip, hip" we tried to join in the response of the parade. But our voices did not come: tears came to our eyes, unashamedly, tears of joy and pride, joy that in serving our country in the field we were serving in the only way that we were able to. They were tears of joy at the fact that because of a courageous Government, the country had lined up 5,000 men trained and training to fight for their country. When the rangers on the street corner bawl out during the next Federal election, "What has Menzies done?" they have their answer there. That is what the Menzies Government and a wise Army Minister have done. Through a wise defence plan, they have produced in this country trained men who are available in the event of attack and who know what to do, in the event of attack, to defend this country. That is the answer, and anybody who dares to criticise the Defence vote of Australia is not only showing colossal ignorance but also showing a disregard of the value of having the younger generation grow up with a respect for seniors, respect for authority and an understanding that discipline means duty.

Hon. T. A. FOLEY (Belyando—Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation) (11.51 a.m.): Mr. Speaker, I join with other hon. members in congratulating you upon your reappointment to the position of Speaker of this House. I congratulate also the hon. member for Fitzroy upon his elevation to the position of Chairman of Committees and I feel confident that we can look forward to excellent guidance from you both during the whole of this Parliament.

I regret the passing of the former Chairman of Committees, the late Mr. David Farrell. I had a good deal to do with him and found him to be a really good mate. He was fair and impartial and I am confident that not only I but other hon. members will

miss him from this Chamber. His service to his electorate was such that I feel that he will be greatly missed there. I am certain too, that had he been able to foresee that his death would have occurred when it did his slogan to his mates in the Australian Labour movement would have been not to mourn over his passing but to keep on organising and I know that his mates in the movement will continue to organise to hold Maryborough as one of Labour's strongholds. Attempts will be made between now and the by-election to discredit Labour. Already the Press has run hot for a number of weeks in an endeavour to cause us loss of prestige in the eyes of the people, but I feel sure that their efforts have been of no avail. Of course, the by-election results will show exactly how effective those efforts have been.

The hon. member for Clayfield has referred to an interjection I made that he often had a wrong slant on some irrigation problems. I did not make that interjection from any spirit of bitterness but because of his criticism of what had happened at the Bonshaw weir on the border of this State and New South Wales. Notwithstanding the efforts of our engineers to organise that job in such a way that they would be able to beat the floods, a flood eventually beat them and as a result a good deal of their effort was wasted and the piles driven right across the river at that point were eventually smashed and many of them sent many miles downstream. I took the opportunity of interjecting on that occasion when he was criticising the expenditure on that project that whilst he was very interested in irrigation matters generally he very often took the wrong slant on them. I think he has adopted a similar attitude in his advocacy that we should continue only with a policy of construction of small weirs on many of our rivers—

Mr. H. B. Taylor: Not to continue only but primarily.

Mr. FOLEY: I would point out that we have not abandoned the policy of building small weirs on some of our small streams throughout the State and I refer the hon. member to what we have been doing over a number of years. For instance, on the Walsh River we have the Bruce Weir, which is a very fine job.

Mr. H. B. Taylor: Is it producing any food?

Mr. FOLEY: The land about it is producing food and it is producing another very essential commodity, in tobacco, which is saving us dollars to the extent of many hundreds of thousands of pounds. And then there is the Leafgold Weir, Solanum Weir, Emerald Creek Weir, Dulbil Weir, Granite Creek Weir, Marian Weir, Orange Creek Weir, Moura Weir, Theodore Weir, Bingera Weir, and of more recent times the Mundubera Weir across the Burnett River, which is not only stabilising the area but protecting the already existing irrigators. It provides sufficient acre-feet to enable us to go in for further irrigation. The hon. member for

Clayfield referred to the Nanango Weir; and then there are the Aratula Weir and the Churchbank Weir, Brightview Weir, and a number of others that have been built in recent years; and so we are conforming to the policy that he advocated.

Recently we made representations to the Federal authorities, who hold the purse-strings of Australia as it were, to join forces with us and help in the construction of two major projects in North Queensland that would be a very great factor in the defence that the hon. member has been speaking about in this debate. For instance, the big project on the Burdekin would mean an increase in population of from 40,000 to 50,000 people, not to mention a wealth increase of anything from £5,000,000 to £6,000,000. And then there is the Tinaroo Falls dam in the North, not quite as large, which commands in the vicinity of 300,000 acre-feet of water, a quantity that would serve 150,000 acres of good land. All that land will not be devoted to tobacco but the growing of citrus fruits, tropical and semi-tropical fruits, as well as tobacco and irrigated pastures. We have five major projects, namely, the Burdekin, Tinaroo Falls, the Dawson, the Nogoa and Comet, and the big scheme in the South, making the sixth. If we had all the help we wanted in the way of cash from the Commonwealth authorities and their help in the way of carrying part of the cost, we could proceed at a faster rate than we are. The result would be that we should be in a better position to produce what the Commonwealth Bureau of Food Statistics has pointed out will be necessary by 1960 if we are to feed our own people and to maintain our export trade in primary products. That bureau has said that in addition to our present production we must produce at least 220,000 tons of beef, 175,000 tons of mutton, 75,000 tons of lamb, hundreds of million dozen eggs and hundreds of millions of gallons of milk.

Let me take only one item as an illustration of the tremendous task that lies ahead of us, that is, the production of beef, of which we shall require at least another 220,000 tons. That means that at least 821,000 head of steers will be required every year. If you go further and examine what is required to turn off 821,000 steers a year, at a rate of 20 per cent of your herds, you will find that we shall need an addition to our stock of just on 4,500,000 head of cattle. However, we are not increasing our herds. That is our problem today. We now have fewer cattle than we had in 1890. What will be the position in 1960?

One way of solving the problem is to carry out some of these larger irrigation projects. Quite apart from the production of other foodstuffs, it is estimated that if we took only half the land that would be watered by these big irrigation projects, we could turn off 1,100,000 fat steers every year, that is, if we could get them from our pasturage areas. That in itself would solve our whole problem, apart altogether from what could be done by improving our pastures in the dry areas. We could solve the

whole problem if we could construct those irrigation projects immediately instead of going along at the present slow rate. Notwithstanding the fact that all the data available to us have been supplied to the Commonwealth authorities, in their effort to deny us any help all they say in their replies is, "That matter is still under consideration." That sort of thing has gone on for many years. However, let us hope that as time goes on better sense will prevail and that we shall have a change to a Government consisting of men with a broader outlook than those who are in power at the present time.

I hope that my remarks on this subject will reassure the hon. member for Clayfield that we have not abandoned the small-weir policy. Now that we have an increased staff of engineers and technicians, we are combining the policy of building small weirs with that of building the bigger projects that are essential to the needs of the future.

During the course of this debate a number of speakers have deplored the deferring of war-service land settlement activities in this State. None of them, however, referred to the basic cause that has brought about such a position. All that hon. members opposite have done has been to get up and, by petty criticism, attempt as it were to cast a slur upon the department and upon the Government for the action that has been taken.

I assure the House that my colleagues in the Cabinet and in the party, as well as myself, deplore the fact that we have had to defer activities with regard to war-service land settlement. Not one hon. member opposite has mentioned the fact that it was because of a deliberate policy—I say that in all seriousness—on the part of the Commonwealth Government to make everybody, including State Governments, poorer than they were before that has brought this about. The Commonwealth Government adopted a deflationary policy with that deliberate idea in mind and I do not think that any hon. member opposite would question what I say. Such a policy caused a crisis, not only with regard to war-service land settlement but also in respect of housing and road-making throughout the Commonwealth. It retarded the developmental programmes then in hand in spite of the fact that because of increased population and the consequent increased demands from the people, there is need for greater development year by year and greater production of foodstuffs and materials.

What was the first move by the Federal Government? If you remember, when they introduced their first Budget they pointed out how they were going to tackle runaway prices and so keep costs down. They were going to put value back into the £1 and they were to have the help of Professor Copland who was to show them how it could be done. The then Treasurer, Mr. Fadden, included Professor Copland's plan in his Budget. The theory was to reduce the purchasing power in the hands of the people to a point where it balanced with the quantity of goods on the market and in the opinion of Professor

Copland and others of the same economic school the theory was that that would bring about equilibrium in prices and costs.

The first effect of the policy was to withdraw millions of pounds of purchasing power in the hands of the people by giving the Government increased revenue through the wool tax, but the pressure of the graziers to that tax was so great that after a while it had to be repealed. The Government also increased indirect taxes. They increased the sales tax. They increased income tax and social-service contributions, all with the deliberate idea of reducing the purchasing power of the community. They increased excise duties and collections. They raised taxation to 30 per cent. of the national income, whereas economists throughout the world had advised that once you increased taxation to a level that was 25 per cent. of the national income you reached the danger point.

Mr. Nicklin: It was done during Dr. Evatt's period.

Mr. FOLEY: No, not during Dr. Evatt's period. It was 23 per cent. in his period, but efforts had been made in Mr. Chifley's time and later by Dr. Evatt to reduce the percentage.

To cap the whole lot and to hamstring the activities of State Governments, the Commonwealth Government adopt a policy of reduction of loan funds. In other words, they said, "The amount cannot be raised." That means that every Premier and every Government have not as much loan funds as they require. After analysis, it can be described as a deliberate policy of impoverishing the nation.

Let us see where this policy has brought us. I have gone to the trouble to look into the statistical figures that are supplied in the Commonwealth Year Book and the labour bulletins. We find that when a Labour Government were in power in 1943 John Curtin attempted to stabilise prices. He knew what it was going to cost the Commonwealth if prices were allowed to run away. The index figure was 1123 at the time he adopted the stabilisation policy, and after three years it had increased to 1134, a rise of eleven points in the All Items "C" Series Index for the six capital cities of Australia. The rise was equivalent to 1s. increase in the basic wage, which rose from 96s. to 97s. Now we have as a comparison the policy of impoverishing the community in an endeavour to bring about a check in costs and rising prices. I say that the Federal Government, who adopted this policy, have failed miserably. We find that at the end of 1946 the index figure was 1134 and in 1953, for the March period of which I am speaking, it stands at 2268; in other words, an increase of 777 points, over 100 per cent.

An Opposition Member: You are pulling your own leg.

Mr. FOLEY: I am not pulling anybody's leg. The figures are taken from the All Items "C" Series Index over the period. I am taking the first four-year period as against Curtin's three-year period. It rose

370 points. In other words, the basic wage had to be jumped 39s. to 135s. a week. Take the next three years. We find the basic wage had to be jumped from 135s. to 234s. in 1953. That is an indication of what a miserable failure their policy has been. Prices have continued to run away till it has been necessary to lift the basic wage by 137s. a week to enable the average worker to live. The percentage rise in the cost of living since 1946 is 100 per cent. and the basic wage has had to be increased by 141 per cent. Prices have affected costs in practically every sphere of industry in the Commonwealth, and in connection with war-service land settlement, to which I began to refer, our costs have been doubled. A little while ago we could place a man on the land at much less a price than we can today.

First let me explain that there are two systems of war-service land settlement in operation. One of them is under the method known as the principal States and the other is the method of agent States. Under the principal States arrangement, the State Government have to find the whole of the money required to carry out the terms of the agreement, and under the other system the Commonwealth Government find the funds and the State Government act as their agent and carry out the work of placing the men on the land.

Because it desired to retain control of its land, rents and tenures in the early stages of this system, the then Premier, the late F. A. Cooper, adopted what is known as the principal State system. We have faithfully carried out to the last letter all the terms and conditions laid down in the agreement but we have reached a point, as I have said, as a result of the deflationary policy adopted by the Federal Government, at which the cost of establishing a war-service settler on the land has been doubled, making it impossible for us to carry on and do a good job by the ex-service men. I would ask: How is it possible to help the war-service settler to a reasonable stage of production, as is provided in the agreement, if we have not funds to do it?

That is the actual position. If the funds are not available, naturally we cannot carry out the terms of the agreement. In the earlier stages of war-service land settlement we were able to establish a settler for approximately £5,000. That amount was believed to be and in fact proved to be sufficient in the earlier stages. On 14 February, 1952, a War-Service Land Settlement Committee, consisting of officers of the Commonwealth and State Departments of Agriculture and Stock, officers of the Department of Public Lands, and officers from the Agricultural Bank conferred for three days on this very important question of rising costs. They deliberated on the changed position and eventually advised me as the Minister in charge of the Department of Public Lands on the necessity of greater advances being made to returned men. They said that to comply with the terms of the agreement dairymen would require to have advances from the Agricultural Bank to the

sum of £10,130. This is quite apart from cost of building roads or acquiring the land. A grain-grower, combining agriculture with beef production, for which the Wandoan lands were suitable, would require to have an advance of £13,080 for an area of 1,300 acres. They gave me a list of the items required and I might point out to this House that in the original stages of war-service land settlement, when the matter was discussed by the Premiers, it was expected that there would be prepared farms ready for the settler to go on to. However, that proved to be not quite practicable and we have adopted the system of making advances to the settler to enable him to develop to what is called a reasonable stage of production. To meet the agreement this committee of which I speak said it would require the following sums:—

Estimated Establishment Costs.

Item.	Cost for Dairying plus Beef Production.	Cost for Grain-growing plus Beef Production.
	(a)	(b)
	£	£
Dwelling	1,200	1,200
Barn and Machinery Shed	300	300
Bails	250	..
Yards (includes facilities for hand spray for ticks)	300	300
Equipped Water Point	1,500	1,500
Second Water Point	1,000	1,000
Fencing—		
Boundary, 5 miles		
Internal, 3 miles		
(about £120 per mile)	1,000	1,000
Ringbarking (area to be brought up to 600 acres)	600	600
Clearing for cultivation	300	1,200
	(100 ac.)	(400 ac.)
Plant and Machinery	1,480	4,500
Milking Machines	420	..
Stock	1,030	1,030
Refrigeration	300	..
Truck	350	350
Miscellaneous	100	100
Totals	£10,130	£13,080

In all, the amount set down as being required for a dairyman was £10,130 and for the grain-grower £13,080. It would cost a great deal more today and I emphasise that these figures represent only the advances that would have to be made by the Agricultural Bank. The cost of acquisition and road-construction would have to be added to that. It will be seen that the total for these essential items exceeded the £7,500 limit placed on advances made by the Agricultural Bank. Recognising this, I made representations to the Commonwealth Government who were urging us to speed up production all the time. The Commonwealth agreed to the higher expenditure for the grain-grower and beef-raiser and although not at first approving dairying, later agreed that it should be worked on a dairying basis with advances also to those who desired to engage in beef-raising and grain-growing. I suggested to the Commonwealth Government that they might agree to make up the difference between the Agricultural Bank's limit of £7,500 and the £10,000. I suggested that they could take some of the responsibility

by providing water facilities and ring-barking and clearing. I also pointed out how they could reimburse themselves over a period. I emphasised that this was to be a loan to be made in conjunction with the loan advanced by the State, but Mr. Kent Hughes would not agree to our representations.

Because of this position there was a definite lag in placing men on war-service blocks in this State and when commenting on the matter, Mr. Kent Hughes, as Minister for the Interior and Minister in charge of war-service land settlement, is reported in "The Rockhampton Bulletin" of 11 November, 1952, as having said that as the States were not pushing war-service land settlement with the necessary vigour the Commonwealth was prepared to offer them the opportunity to operate from the next financial year on the same basis as the agent States of South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania.

Mr. Hiley: Did you accept that offer?

Mr. FOLEY: Yes. In July, 1952, on the occasion of the Premiers' Conference and the Loan Council meeting, I, in company with the War Service Land Settlement Director of Queensland, discussed the whole question with Mr. Kent Hughes. I asked for more generous accommodation. I discussed the question of his taking over certain of the loans and how he could recoup himself, and I sounded him on the question whether they would consider Queensland's coming under the agent-States system. The result was that he gave us no encouragement, at that date. At the invitation of the Queensland Premier I addressed the Premiers' Conference, outlining the position as to costs and the funds we had available, and suggested more generous help. The then expenditure, I might mention, was in the ratio of £10 by the State to every £1 expended by the Commonwealth. The actual figures under the principal-State arrangement show that the Commonwealth has expended since the very inception of war-service land settlement in this State to 30 June, 1953, £318,668 and the State Government, by means of advances through the Agricultural Bank, land acquisition, road construction, developmental work, remission of interest £3,727,636.

Mr. Morris: Which the Federal Government gave to you for that purpose.

Mr. FOLEY: In the form of a loan. I made a special plea to the Prime Minister, as chairman of the Premiers' Conference on that occasion that if the Commonwealth would not help the State to a greater extent than at present the State would not be able to continue with the programme at the pace maintained until recently and I said that the point to be resolved was whether the matter was to be regarded as a national one and a greater contribution was to be made by the Commonwealth towards the capital cost. The result was that the matter was brushed aside and referred to the Loan Council meeting. What happened at the Loan Council meeting on the day after the Premiers' Conference is now history. Our Premier came back with £18,500,000 when he required £30,000,000, as

the bare minimum to carry on the development of this State, and that sum included war-service land settlement. The expenditure of every department of State was cut, including that on war-service land settlement, and it was impossible to carry on under the terms of the agreement we had entered into.

As my time is virtually exhausted, let me say that when it was evident that a good job could not be done on reduced loan funds a definite proposal was made at the conference presided over by Sir Philip McBride, who was deputising for Mr. Kent Hughes, on 31 March, 1953. The proposal made by the Queensland Government through me was that we adopt the agent-State system with a slight amendment so that the State could retain sovereignty over the land.

Mr. Morris: An impossible amendment.

Mr. FOLEY: Not impossible, as I will explain. The State was prepared to buy the land necessary and make it available for war-service land settlement and in view of the fact that we were prepared to buy the land ourselves and make it available there was no need for insisting upon the section in the Act under which the Commonwealth collected all rents and decided the form of tenure. Once the State was prepared to carry out the necessary expenditure there was no further need for that to be brought about and consequently there was no justification for the Commonwealth's retaining control of State land rents. The modification could not at that stage be accepted by Sir Philip, who was merely deputising, but he finally agreed to have his officers examine the proposal in greater detail. Cabinet recently reaffirmed the agent-State proposal and submitted it officially to the Commonwealth Government, and this is the reply that we received, written on 17 July, 1953—

"My Government has considered the proposals submitted on behalf of your Government by the Minister for Lands of your State, and has decided that, as the Loan Council has determined the 1953-54 allocation of loan moneys, the amendments proposed by you should not be considered for the year 1953-54."

That was just a courteous "wipe-off"; in other words, "There is nothing doing."

On receiving that letter, Cabinet reconsidered the whole position and, after taking everything into consideration, decided that all action in respect of war-service land settlement was to be deferred pending further favourable advice from the Commonwealth Government regarding this State's proposals in respect of agent States. In the meantime, it was decided that any land available as farms would be offered for selection under what is known as the group conditions of our Lands Acts, so that eligible returned men and others would have an equal opportunity of competing.

(Time, on motion of Mr. Marsden, extended.)

Mr. FOLEY: I had almost completed what I wished to say on that subject. In view of the distortion engaged in by hon. members opposite, I thought it wise to make it quite clear why the Government had to adopt the attitude they did adopt and what representations have been made to the Commonwealth Government. In justice to Mr. Kent Hughes, I want to say that I am of the opinion that had it not been for his unfortunate illness the whole matter would have been straightened out. Unfortunately it had to be left to his deputy, who had no power to make a decision, and consequently the whole thing is still in the air. I can only point out, as I have already done, that no Minister could conduct war-service land settlement in this State effectively and comply strictly with the agreement entered into years ago, unless he had the funds to do it. We have not sufficient funds, and consequently cannot make the advances that are necessary to settle men on the land at the standard required under the agreement. It is possible, of course, that we could have carried on by making smaller advances, but that would have meant a struggle for many years by the individual settlers, and many of them might finally have gone bankrupt.

Hon. members can rest assured that virtually none of the settlers who have so far been placed on the land under this scheme will fail. We have conducted soil surveys of almost every foot of land contained in the areas we have acquired for this purpose, and if any of the settlers fail it will not be because of any shortcomings in the productivity of the soil. A selector may fail because of his own inability to make a success but there will always be a good farm waiting for someone to carry it on.

The figures available so far indicate that soldier settlement has been a positive success. For instance, I am informed by the Director of War Service Land Settlement that the pre-settlement production from land taken over and allotted for war-service land settlement, estimated on a 1952 basis, was £176,696 and that in 1952 the production had increased to £1,117,451 and that long before the farms had been developed to their maximum production capacity.

Before concluding I should like to refer to the statement made by the hon. member for Mundingburra that in the matter of Government expenditure the cities were favoured as against country areas, particularly the North. He complained that the North was starved of Government expenditure, while the cities were favoured, and so there were congregations of people in the cities while the country suffered.

I happened to be born in the North quite a number of years ago, when I saw it in its pioneering stage. I did some of the pioneering work in scrub-felling and mining for various metals. I have worked on construction jobs; I have helped to build some of the railway lines in the North and I know something of the conditions that prevailed in those days. On the construction job you

had to buy your own shovel and your own tent and supply your own accommodation—quite different from the position that prevails today. Even in my lifetime I have seen the North developed from the bag and bark humpy, as the condition that existed when I was a boy round Charters Towers and other mining fields, until today 71 per cent. of the workers in the State own their own homes. I have seen a road system developed in the North when bitumen was at a high price per ton, while our own people in the West were patiently waiting for a few tins of bitumen to spread over the surface of some of the gravel roads in the West. Both the hon. member for Gregory and the hon. member for Barcoo will confirm what I say in that respect. The North was favoured with bitumen roads, while the West had had to wait. I have seen all-weather roads built from Innisfail to the Atherton Tableland. I well remember the days when in the rainy season you could not get from Innisfail to Babinda or Tully with a packhorse but today you can travel in all kinds of weather, if the streams are not flooded and the bridges not under water.

I have seen the sugar industry developed from the day when the sugar-grower had to accept 11s. a ton for his cane to a price that now ensures him a proper standard of living. Those improvements have been brought about by successive Labour Governments, not only through their cane-prices legislation but also with the help of the various sugar agreements between the State and the Commonwealth. I remember the time when the C.S.R. Company was a real Czar in the areas it controlled; it could ruin a farmer or make him successful. Today as a result of cane-prices legislation, the sugar-farming industry in the North has been built up. We have built sugar-mills and handed them over to co-operative bodies of farmers who were prepared to carry them on.

In the last few years successive Labour Governments have opened and developed the North by means of railways. I remember the days of the missing link. You came to Rockhampton and then broke your journey and then you went a little further and had to break your journey again. Those conditions operated only a few years ago, and it is only since successive Labour Governments have been in power that the change has been brought about. We now have a network of railways that have opened up the country. I remember when Ravenshoe was known as the 100-mile peg and there was no town there. I put in the last railway culvert on that line. In less than a man's lifetime I have seen Millaa Millaa grow up and I have seen Ravenshoe grow up into a big town. I have seen other towns established throughout the North. These did not grow up by chance. It all happened because the Labour Government made the land available and advanced money to the settlers to enable them to carry on. From then on the North developed. Yet we have the hon. member for Mundingburra getting up here and trying to induce the people to believe

that the Government have done nothing for North Queensland or some of our country areas.

The same applies to the timber industry. At one time, before Labour got into power, because of lack of organisation, silky oak, maple and cedar trees were felled and burnt, whereas today they are harvested. That is made possible because the railways are there and we have a timber organisation that has been built up by the Sub-department of Forestry from funds made available by the Government. I can remember when Innisfail was a struggling town. I can also remember when Tully was in the pioneering stages. Today people refer to Innisfail as the £2,000,000 town. That has not happened by chance but as a result of help given in many directions and the building of the railway. Tully, Gordonyale and other districts throughout the North have shown the same development. There are many projects still under way—projects that the pioneers thought an utter impossibility. While the rest of the State is waiting its turn, the Tinaroo Falls dam is being constructed and just on 200 men are going full steam ahead. That project will eventually be valuable from a defence, a State, and a national point of view, and will help in increasing the production in this State. We have also the Burdekin project. The start is small and it is a big project and as we are getting no help from the Commonwealth Government it will take a period to complete the project. The point is it has been started. The job is going ahead. We are just nearing completion of one of the diversion dams, that is, the gorge dam at the site of the big dam. In fact, they are pouring the last few bags of cement into that project and the result will be that we shall be able to help to a greater degree the establishment of more farmers on what is known as Clare and Millaroo. Another project of very great importance is the Tully hydro-electric scheme. It is a tremendous project and one need only visit the site and see the work that is going on to realise the gigantic engineering project we are undertaking there. That of course will mean further development of the North.

I have mentioned some of the things that have occurred in my lifetime but I can support my contentions by present-day figures, which show that in governmental expenditure on capital works and development, we are not favouring the city areas as against the country. I asked the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works for figures and find that in 1948-1949 the average expenditure for the Southern, Central and Northern Divisions was £9.86 a head of population, as against £6.1 for the metropolitan area or a percentage of the total expenditure of 73.87 in the Southern, Central and Northern Divisions. For the year 1949-1950 the percentage of total expenditure for those three divisions was 81.97 per cent. and per head of population £13.17, compared with expenditure per head of population in the metropolitan area of £4.9. It will be seen that country districts have the big end of the stick. In 1950-1951 again a similar picture is to be seen, £17.67 expended per head

of population as against £11.3 in the metropolitan area, percentage of total expenditure 75.1 per cent. as against 24.9 per cent in the metropolitan area. For 1951-1952 the total expenditure from all funds was £26,255,932, and the expenditure per head of population works out at £10.3 in the metropolitan division and £28.7 in the country districts. On the percentage basis the figures are 17.6 per cent. and 82.4 per cent. These figures give the lie direct to the hon. member for Mundingburra, who is endeavouring to mislead the House and the people with regard to Government policy in the expenditure of public moneys. This policy of expenditure has extended over a number of years and will continue, because of Labour's representation throughout the electorates of this State. It is well represented in the Northern, Central and Southern Divisions and it is only natural that those members will insist that a fair quota of the total expenditure is allotted to the various parts of the States. One important factor is the urgency of the needs of some districts compared with others, and the Co-ordinator-General keeps his eye on that when making his recommendations.

In conclusion I repeat that we have not abandoned our policy of building small weirs; we are combining small weirs with bigger projects because we have a greater number of staff now than we had a few years ago. I and the Government regret that war-service land settlement has been deferred in this State, but we cannot meet the requirements of the Commonwealth-States War Service Land Settlement Agreement without funds. Hon. members know that at the 1952 Loan Council Meeting our Premier was not able to obtain enough money to carry out the programme of works essential to the development of this State and that our Deputy Premier and Treasurer returned from the last Premiers' Conference and Loan Council meeting with too little to meet the requirements of this State. The result is that we have had to pare our loan expenditure and even defer some projects. This in turn means that men who have been in employment have had to be dismissed. When we realise that the Commonwealth Government finance the bulk of their capital expenditure out of revenue derived from taxation levied in the various States we think that a greater proportion of money should be coming to the State. I believe that the Commonwealth should finance these works out of loan moneys, just as the States are required to do. If it did this the States would be able to obtain more funds not only to carry out necessary development work but also to pay the cost of ordinary administrative functions of the State.

Mr. LOW (Cooroora) (12.54 p.m.): I am pleased to be back in this Chamber and I extend my sincere thanks to the electors of Cooroora for returning me with such a splendid majority.

I should like also to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your re-election to the position of Speaker of this House. Since I have been a member of this Assembly you have not only been fair to me in every

way but you have shown me every courtesy in and around the House, and this has been very helpful indeed.

I join with other hon. members in pledging my loyalty to our most gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. The recent Coronation was a great uplift to each and every one of us and I am pleased to know that the Leader of the Opposition and his good wife, together with the Premier and Mrs. Gair, were able to be present at the actual ceremony itself. We are all looking forward to next year when Her Majesty and the Duke of Edinburgh will visit this State on their tour of the Commonwealth and I am sure that everyone will join in extending to the royal couple a very warm welcome. I particularly hope that the Parliament of Queensland will leave no stone unturned in giving them a right royal welcome.

I also pay a tribute to the work of His Excellency Sir John Lavarack and I join with other hon. members in saying how much we appreciate the fact that Her Majesty's representative in Queensland moves amongst the people. As a matter of fact, I go so far as to say that I think Sir John is one of the most-travelled Governors this State has ever had. From this morning's Press we find that Sir John is undertaking a tour of an area very seldom if ever before visited by a State Governor. It is pleasing to know that Sir John is going all over the State inspiring the people, as he does, to carry on their work. I also pay a tribute to the work done by Lady Lavarack, who is the president of the Queensland Branch of the Red Cross. I am associated with that worthy organisation and it is pleasing indeed to know that a lady so busy with State affairs is able to give of her time to this charitable and christian work. The people of the State are glad that she is able to help in the great work of this organisation, which operates in peace as well as in war. She is also actively connected with the Blood Bank, section of that organisation which is doing outstanding work.

Getting back to State affairs of concern to each and every one of us, I hope that in the life of this Parliament steps will be taken to make some improvements round Parliament House itself. I once again emphatically state that lifts should be installed in the House, not necessarily for the convenience of members only but for the use of the public and House staff. Every member of this Assembly should endeavour to get as many of the public to come along and listen to debates in the House with a view to creating a better understanding of the work of Parliament. The public would avail themselves of the opportunity to listen to the debates if they could go to the galleries by means of a lift instead of having to climb winding stairs. It is bad enough to have to climb the steps but the coming down is worse and constitutes perhaps a greater danger to old people or people who are ill. I make a plea to you, Mr. Speaker, and the Parliamentary Buildings Committee that favourable consideration be given to the installation of lifts in the House. I can assure you that we are

very much behind times in not having given the matter attention before.

The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has painted a very black picture regarding the funds available to Queensland by the Commonwealth Government. I conscientiously think that the people of Queensland are just about fed up with all the political buck-passing associated with the financing of undertakings in this State. The time has arrived when taxing powers should be returned to the States. I believe that the States have greater sovereign powers than the Commonwealth, and if taxing powers were returned to them they would be able to implement their works programmes and carry out projects of which they approve from time to time. It must be very disheartening to the Commonwealth Government, when they hand over to the States sufficient moneys to carry out reasonable works programmes, to receive nothing but abuse in return. If taxing powers were returned to the States, as has been suggested by the Prime Minister, the States could then decide what projects they would undertake and they would be able to estimate the amount of money required for them.

I believe, too, that the temporary transfer of taxation rights to the Commonwealth Government during the war period to a very great extent destroyed the prestige and limited the importance of State Parliaments. The Prime Minister has on quite a number of occasions indicated to the States the conditions under which taxation rights would be returned, and I hope that after the Budget has been presented in the Commonwealth Parliament next week, the State Premiers and the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer will get down to business and work out a suitable formula for the return of taxing powers to the States. No State Government or local-government body can be regarded as a responsible body unless it raises the money it proposes to spend. It is quite easy to spend money that somebody else has to raise, but if a Government are trusted with the responsibility of raising the money they propose to spend, I feel quite sure that they will be a better Government than they otherwise would be.

I notice that the Secretary for Public Instruction is in the House, so I propose to have something to say about educational matters. I am somewhat concerned with the Government's failure to get on with the job of providing increased accommodation in our schools, not only in my own electorate but throughout Queensland. During the past 18 months I have noticed with a good deal of interest that very large school-building programmes have been embarked upon by church organisations throughout this State, and when one compares the school-building programmes of those church organisations that are interested in education with the efforts of this State Government, all one can say is that the Government's efforts have been poor, miserable, and disgusting. We also see huge commercial buildings being erected at considerable expense, yet in every town in Queensland of any importance—and even in some of the

smaller towns—we find that children are crowded into classrooms large enough to accommodate only half the number jammed into them. Nobody knows it better than the Minister himself, and he is concerned about it too. However, there is not much use my making an appeal to the Minister when all the time he is being told by the Minister of Public Works that on account of the shortage of money these urgent works must stand in abeyance.

Mr. Jesson: Do you not think that there is a shortage of money?

Mr. Low: If one continues to look for excuses in order to avoid doing one's duty that must inevitably lead to a defeatist attitude. For years we were told that work could not be done because of the shortage of manpower and materials and we accepted that as a reason up to a point, realising that a war was on and that in the post-war period conditions had to be adjusted, but now the excuse given to us is the shortage of money. All I can say is that if commercial houses can undertake the construction of big buildings and church organisations can build expensive schools the State should be in a position with all the resources at its disposal to provide adequate schooling accommodation for the children attending State schools throughout Queensland.

Mr. Devries: Apparently you have not seen the fine big schools that we have built.

Mr. Chalk: In Labour electorates.

Mr. Devries: Not at all.

Mr. Low: Even the fine big school buildings that have been built are only a flea-bite compared with the ultimate educational needs of the State. The construction of school buildings should receive a high priority and I appeal to the Premier and his Ministers to do everything possible to treat the matter as urgent and provide proper schooling accommodation for the children.

Many more teachers' residences are required as well and we should endeavour to speed up the building of them where settlement has been expanded and where the people will remain for a considerable time. We should provide a type of teacher's residence that will enable the teacher to take his wife and family into the community in which he teaches and live on the same standard as other people enjoy. A great many teachers are sent to remote areas and eventually have to be content to live in shacks that nobody else wants. These conditions are responsible to some extent for the teacher shortage throughout the State and I venture the opinion that if the married women who have returned to the teaching service were withdrawn the teaching system of Queensland would be in a hopeless and chaotic condition. We must do something immediately to recruit young people for this noble profession.

Another matter that concerns the Department of Public Instruction and the Department of Public Works is the cementing and asphaltting of the floors under school buildings. A survey of the State would no doubt disclose that the underneath part of many

schools was used either as a playshed or as a lunch-room for the children. Where a separate playshed is not built the work of cementing or asphaltting the floor under the schools should be treated as urgent. Why should we not give the children the same conditions as we give people engaged in industrial undertakings? I think that if it is good enough to provide increased amenities for workers in industry we should provide the same conditions for the children who attend at the various schools so that they will be able to eat their lunch in healthy surroundings.

I wish to refer to another matter associated with the Department of Public Instruction. I make a further appeal that free travel be granted for children attending secondary schools in Queensland who use bus transport. As I have stated previously, the children who have passed the scholarship examination and who live on the railway get a free rail pass to the nearest secondary school, but children who live off the railway in a district that is serviced by a bus are called upon to pay their fares. It is apparent that these children and their parents are at a great disadvantage. For six years this matter has been brought before this House and we have been assured by the Minister on a number of occasions that this matter was receiving his attention.

Mr. Devries: You want to travel a little away from Nambour for a while and get out in the bush somewhere and then you may realise what you are getting.

Mr. Low: This affects not only the district I represent, but many districts throughout the State. I hope the Minister will look at it in that light and not from a parochial point of view.

There are also other school children who should receive help in their transport difficulties and that a subsidy should be paid to parents who live more than three miles from a school and who can use the existing road passenger service to send their children to the most convenient State school. Under the school transport service, if there are a sufficient number of children over the three-mile limit, 12 in all, the service will be established, but if there are families living on the roadside where a public transport service is operating—there need not be 12, there may only be half-a-dozen—some form of subsidy should be paid to transport those children to the nearest school. That would not necessitate the establishment of a new service; they would use the existing transport approved by the State Transport Commission under the State Transport Facilities Acts.

Mr. Devries: Are you referring to the kiddies over three miles?

Mr. Low: Yes. Those on a regular licensed service.

Mr. Devries: Have you ever made an application?

Mr. Low: I did make an application some time ago.

Mr. Devries: I should like to have a look at that one.

Mr. LOW: That is very important and very encouraging. The case put forward does not necessarily affect my own area; it affects a considerable number of other areas. I shall be pleased to submit a further application for the hon. gentleman's consideration.

There is another matter in connection with school work to which I draw the attention of the Minister. I believe he should give further consideration to paying the cost of installing electric light and power in school buildings instead of saddling school committees with that responsibility. It is hard enough to get electricity extended to an area, especially a rural area, without having the school committee called on to pay these installation costs. That is asking school committees to go a little bit too far and the Minister should give favourable consideration to this request. It would be appreciated by all school committees.

Mr. Devries: Have you any idea of the cost?

Mr. LOW: It is not a matter of cost but a matter of giving the service.

Mr. Devries: It is very easy for you to talk when you have not to pay for it.

Mr. LOW: I can assure the Minister that hon. members on this side have never "jacked up" on the educational vote. As a matter of fact we have always stressed the need for an increased allowance for educational purposes.

Mr. Devries: It is very easy for you to talk.

Mr. LOW: When the Government get their taxing powers back they will be able to state how much money they want and then probably raise it.

Some time ago domestic science and manual training were eliminated from the compulsory subjects in the Scholarship examination.

Mr. Devries: And no apology for it either.

Mr. LOW: This is undermining the domestic-science and manual-training classes in country centres.

Mr. Devries: You do not know what you are talking about. „You are talking silly now.

Mr. LOW: I am not talking silly. These subjects are not included in the list of compulsory subjects for the Scholarship examination and consequently there will be the tendency for children not to take these subjects but to concentrate on those that will give them a pass in the examination. In many country centres it is highly important to have these subjects included.

Mr. Devries: Leading educationalists are against you on that point. I do not know whether they are wrong or you are right.

Mr. LOW: I am not always led by anybody else. Usually I use my own judgment and I believe my statement today is quite correct. From my own observation it is very

important that these subjects be included because it is necessary to ensure that every girl shall receive a certain amount of domestic-science training and every boy manual training and where possible agricultural training as well.

Mr. Devries: You do not know whether it is possible.

Mr. LOW: It is not a compulsory subject in the Scholarship examination and they take up only those subjects necessary for passing that examination.

Mr. Devries: Under the new syllabus they are compelled to take one of these subjects.

Mr. LOW: But it is not a compulsory subject for the Scholarship examination.

Mr. Devries: Of course it is.

Mr. LOW: No. The hon. gentleman will find on investigation that he is definitely wrong. The approved subjects in the Scholarship examination will get greater consideration.

I now come to matters affecting local authorities and the Main Roads Department. The Main Roads Department is starved for funds to carry out the road developmental programme urgently required throughout the State.

Mr. Devries: You are squealing as chairman of a shire council.

Mr. LOW: I am not squealing at all. We run our business very ably and I make no apologies for what we do. The Government are starving the Main Roads Department of funds because under the State Transport Facilities Act and the Traffic Act the Government collect £1,000,000 in taxation, from heavy vehicle operators and not one penny of which finds its way to the Main Roads Department for the construction or maintenance of roads. The money collected under these two Acts is definitely not used for road purposes but is put into Consolidated Revenue to make up for losses in other departments such as the railways. Today I stress that the money collected under these two Acts should go to the Main Roads Department for the construction of additional roads and the maintenance of existing roads. If the Government of Queensland will do that I will join with them in asking the Commonwealth Government for more of the moneys collected by way of the petrol tax. That is a fair enough offer. I do not want to be political about this but fair and decent. I know perfectly well that the Queensland Government have not given sufficient priority to the construction of roads in the State. I have made a thorough study of the financing of various projects and I hope to make contributions to debates in this Chamber from time to time that will not only impress the Ministers concerned but also enlighten back-benchers as to what is going on.

Another point of extreme importance to local authorities—most of them are progressive today—is that after buying heavy

machinery to carry out permanent works they have the utmost difficulty in getting efficient operators for it. It is not easy to obtain skilled operators of the heavy plant that is now being bought by local authorities and the Main Roads Department. Most of these machines cost anything from £5,000 to £12,000, and if efficient operators are not obtainable we cannot hope to obtain the best results from them or the best return for the money expended and I suggest that the Minister for Transport give early and favourable consideration to the establishment of a school for operators of heavy road-making machinery and that refresher courses be conducted for operators. If such a school was established under the control of the Commissioner of Main Roads I am certain that local authorities would be only too happy to contribute something annually towards the cost of upkeep for the benefit of being able to obtain efficient operators of the heavy equipment they have been buying. The Commissioner of Main Roads himself has been experiencing difficulty in obtaining operators. That being so, I suggest that he would be the most suitable man to place in control of such a school.

I suggest also that the time has arrived for relieving local authorities of responsibility for the cost of treating infectious-diseases cases. The Department of Health and Home Affairs offers all sorts of health services to the people but as yet has not given any serious thought to taking over responsibility for people suffering from infectious diseases. It has been the policy of the department to close the infectious-diseases wards at hospitals in many districts with the result that sufferers from these complaints are treated at base hospitals in the large cities. The cost to local authorities could be staggering if a serious epidemic broke out. Seeing that a great noise was made recently in connection with what the Department of Health and Home Affairs was doing I think the department should accept some extra responsibility and relieve local authorities of this burden entirely. It has been said in this House from time to time that when a hospital is established, the local authority concerned makes no contribution towards its upkeep; as a matter of fact, it has only one representative on the hospitals board as a listening post. I am sorry that the Minister responsible is not in the House to hear what I am saying.

I know that I am speaking on behalf of all local authorities in this State when I say that the time has arrived for a review of the amounts contributed by local authorities, insurance companies, and the State Government for the upkeep of town fire brigades throughout the State, and I repeat the suggestion I made in this House on previous occasions, that local authorities should pay one-seventh of the cost instead of two-sevenths, the State Government two-sevenths, and the insurance companies the remaining four-sevenths, instead of the three-sevenths they are now asked to pay. The insurance companies get the benefit from the establishment of a fire brigade in a town, and I say that the

precept associated with the upkeep of a town fire brigade has become a big drain on local authority funds, and it is time we took stock of the position and brought about some relief.

Mr. Aikens: Why should not the insurance companies pay the lot?

Mr. LOW: If we can get a little bit of relief at a time it would make the position easier.

I now refer to subsidies paid to local authorities and say that the extension of street-lighting facilities throughout the State is an amenity that local governing bodies are being required to provide to a greater extent each week in each year. This is becoming a big financial burden on them and people living within the area do not receive all the benefit. If it is convenient for the Government to make subsidies available for seaside improvements and other improvements not of actual benefit to the local people, would it not be fair to ask the Government to make an annual contribution towards street-lighting costs throughout the various towns and cities of this State? It would lead to the extension of street lighting. We have very popular seaside and mountain resorts on the near North Coast and I am repeatedly being written to by visitors who come from the north, south, east and west asking for additional street lighting, particularly in the seaside and mountain areas where people go for holidays. Much as we should like to extend this amenity—and we do the best we can and will continue to do so—there is still room for improvement and if the Government made a contribution towards the extension of street-lighting facilities throughout the State, especially in the tourist areas, they would be making a contribution of benefit to those people who are not resident in these areas but are ratepayers elsewhere.

Mr. Aikens: Have you any electric light in your shire?

Mr. LOW: I cannot understand what the hon. member is driving at. Most areas in Queensland have some form of electrical activity going on.

Mr. Aikens: That is exactly the question I asked.

Mr. LOW: I am pleased that I have been of some help to the hon. member. I thought he would have known that. He should go out more at night and have a look round.

A Government Member: Who gets the profits out of those activities?

Mr. LOW: The Southern Electric Authority which is now a public authority, but it is not a matter of who gets the profits. It is a public service and a very necessary amenity.

Let me quote and refer to the conditions under which the Department of Main Roads constructs and maintains its roads. It takes into consideration the amount of local and through traffic using the various roads and makes a suitable contribution towards their construction and upkeep. When an amenity such as street lighting is provided for the benefit of not only the people living in an

area but of great numbers of people who come from outside that area, I think there is some merit in asking that the cost of street lighting should be subsidised by the State Government. The payment of such a subsidy would help local authorities to extend their lighting systems for the benefit of visitors who come from all parts of the State and from other States.

I had intended to deal with other important matters, but as my time has almost expired I will leave them until the debate on the Budget. However, I should like to deal with an important matter associated with the work of the Department of Agriculture and Stock, that is, the compensation payable in respect of condemned T.B. cattle. The amount of compensation at present granted to a farmer for each condemned beast is only £6, and is not recoverable from the department until the beast is replaced by the purchase of another animal or from the farmer's own herd, by a heifer in the case of a cow, or a young bull in the case of a bull. Quite a number of dairying organisations have drawn my attention to the fact that the amount of £6 is too little and they have suggested at least a 100-per cent. increase for the replacement of a condemned beast, in other words that the amount of compensation should be at least £12.

Mr. Nicklin: The fund is in a very healthy condition at present.

Mr. LOW: Yes. The fund is in a very healthy condition. With the drive that is being made by the department throughout Queensland today and the number of beasts that are being condemned, I think that £12 would be little enough.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this appeal is made on behalf of dairymen throughout the State. I have received quite a number of requests from organisations within my electorate and from State-wide reports of divisional meetings dairy farmers have complained about the meagre amount of compensation that is paid to them for the replacement of condemned beasts. I hope that the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock will read my remarks and that he and his departmental officers will give some consideration to increasing the amount, especially as the fund is in a very healthy condition and could, without detriment, stand an increase.

I shall leave any further comments I have to make till the debate on the Budget.

Mr. TURNER (Kelvin Grove) (2.50 p.m.): I desire at the outset to express my appreciation to the electors of Kelvin Grove on returning me to Parliament with an increased majority.

I listened with great interest to the speech with which His Excellency was pleased to open the present session of Parliament. However, before I proceed to comment on it I should like to refer to the attitude adopted by the hon. member for Mundingburra on the day that Parliament met to elect its Speaker. I do not know that any other hon. member would have taken

the mean and contemptible advantage of the Clerk of the Parliament that the hon. member did that day.

Mr. Aikens: You have not heard anything yet. You wait till you hear the next barrel.

Mr. TURNER: If the hon. member can say anything worse than he said on that occasion or can act more contemptuously than he did then I have no hesitation in saying that he is not fit to be in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TURNER: It does not say much for him when he took advantage of the Clerk of the Parliament to the extent that he did and made the attack on you, Mr. Speaker. I think the least said about it the better.

Mr. Aikens: Then why do you not knock off? You are only making an ass of yourself.

Mr. TURNER: There is the old saying—
“Never tell them what you were once upon a time

The men you spent your money with will turn away and say

It makes no difference what you were, it's what you are today.”

That aptly applies to you, Mr. Speaker, because you have filled your position with dignity and you have succeeded in lifting the standard of the House. Since your appointment as Speaker the conduct of the House has improved and it is a much better place than it was previously. You were able to do that because you had the co-operation of the majority of the members, but some members are not prepared to extend co-operation to you nor are they prepared to respect the authority of the House and you as the custodian of it. The hon. member for Mundingburra is a case in point. I have always believed, and have never varied from the belief that there is a little bit of good in the worst of us and a little bit of bad in the best of us. If a person attempts to make good then we should not hound him but on the contrary extend the helping hand so that he might rise above his past. Unfortunately, some people do not view matters in that way.

I come now to His Excellency's Speech and it is pleasing to know that some hon. members opposite have eulogised him for what he said in it. It records the work of successive Governments over the years and refers amongst other things to soil erosion, water-conservation, and irrigation. These are three vital problems for this State. His Excellency made reference to the work of the last Labour Government and by implication to the work of Labour Governments of the past. I was particularly impressed by his remarks about the conservation of soil, and it must be gratifying to every Queenslander to know that through the efforts of the Government and their officers thousands of farmers have received assistance and advice on the preservation of soil and as a result it is estimated that between 80,000 and 100,000 acres of land formerly subject to erosion have been saved by contour ploughing and in other ways. That is a very important

step in the conservation of our resources, especially as much of our valuable land was destroyed by soil erosion in the past. The light soils were washed down from the high ridges by the heavy rains and much soil has been lost in the western country especially as a result of the action of the heavy winds.

I was pleased to note the splendid recovery the dairy industry has made. Much of the decline in the industry in the past was due to the fact that the dairymen would not be advised by departmental officers and officers of the various organisations set up by their own bodies. Both the department and the various organisations spent much time in research work in an endeavour to help the industry. I wish to repeat my praise of the Queensland Butter Board for its work in helping the dairymen to increase their production, which has been of tremendous value not only to the dairy farmer but the State of Queensland as a whole. I can never understand why our milk production per cow is so much lower than it is in the other States. The fact that we can breed dairy cattle of high quality was evidenced by the fact that at the recent National Exhibition the Queensland cow broke the Australian record for milk and butter production. We know that large numbers of dairy farmers left the land because they were not able to make ends meet because of low prices for milk and butter in the past.

I was pleased to read Mr. Solomon's remarks about increased beef production, which during last season almost reached the previous record. This is particularly gratifying because in the last couple of years we were alarmed at the decrease that had taken place. Our population is increasing and we need more beef in this country; and the great populations overseas also need our beef to maintain good health.

I was also pleased to see reference in the Governor's Speech to the increase in the number of irrigated farms. Sixty-eight irrigated farms have been opened to date at Clare for settlement by ex-service men. I listened to the hon. member for Clayfield, who attempted to discredit the Government's effort at Clare and maintained that it was a waste of money and time. These ex-service men are satisfied with what the Government have done for them. In the Millaroo area the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission has prepared subdivision of the area for 62 farms. Irrigation works will be completed early in the current financial year to permit the opening of 20 of these farms with irrigation. We are constantly being told that the Government and the department are not doing anything to help the man on the land in Queensland. Here I anticipate a similar interjection to the one I got the last time I was speaking in this Chamber on water conservation and irrigation, "How much will it cost?" My reply is that irrespective of the cost we should concentrate on it because the State will never be the success it can be without the conservation of water and making irrigation available to every possible area where there is soil that will produce.

When visiting Melbourne in January I went to inspect the Werribee sewage farm. Last session when I spoke on this matter it was only from information I had received but in January I made it my business to get in touch with the appropriate organisation and make a personal visit so that in future I would know what it was like. I can assure hon. members that it is one of the most amazing things I have ever seen. Previously I have suggested that our authorities should give consideration to taking over the whole of the low-lying country between the Serpentine and Nudgee nearly all of which is not used. This land could be drained and grasses planted, and irrigated from our sewerage system as has been done on the Werribee sewage farm, and the result would be a great increase in both our sheep and cattle population.

The Werribee sewage farm comprises 24,940 acres, which was some of the worst land in Victoria. When on it I saw a new area being prepared and I was amazed that any country like that could ever grow anything, much less good legumes and grass. They assured me that the land I saw being prepared for planting was similar to the natural state of the land now producing pastures. The work was being done with a large drag implement that ploughed down 2 feet 6 inches into the subsoil and the land was being prepared for flooding from the sewerage system. All the 24,940 acres is not yet under cultivation but notwithstanding that stock population is 70,000 sheep, 10,000 cattle and from 2,000 to 3,000 horses—all agisting. This is amazing when we find in Queensland average properties carrying one sheep to three acres. That area of 24,000 acres here, at 3 sheep to the acre, would carry only 8,000 sheep. These figures will impress hon. members with the tremendous advantage that irrigation, properly designed, can be to the land. Paddocks of 20 acres had different varieties of fodder growing in each. The day I went to the Werribee sewage farm I saw in one paddock clover 15 inches high. Stooping I picked up two strands of clover, one white and the other strawberry, each of which was 18 inches long. I wrapped these strands round my finger and put them in an envelope. These are the strands. They have a beautiful smell and are wholesome fodder. There they breed some of the most beautiful cattle one could wish to see. The leaflet that the commissioner in charge of the farm gave me explains how the land is prepared for the water and how the water is put over it. It contains also photographs of some of the cattle.

When the scheme was first introduced there was a great deal of antagonism from prejudiced butchers and wealthy pastoralists who spread the rumour that some of the cattle raised there were suffering from beef measles. As a result of the outcry that followed, the authorities prohibited the sending of cattle from this area to the market for human consumption. Experts were then brought in from America and other places, and these, after a thorough investigation, satisfied the people of Victoria that the beef from these cattle was free from any contamination and today cattle from there are

bringing the highest prices paid for beef cattle on the Victorian market. As nothing over two years old is marketed from this area, the people of Victoria have the benefit of eating the primest beef in the world. They do not have to put up with trying to chew old cows that are slaughtered for beef after having had six or seven calves. Last year the organisation showed a profit of £42,000 and this year expects to make in the vicinity of £60,000. As a result of its operations, the people of Victoria are able to enjoy water and sewerage services at a much cheaper rate than would otherwise be possible. All the sewage of Victoria, with the exception of that from one small area, drains into this scheme. The annual rainfall of the locality is comparatively low for Victoria, being only 18 inches, and evaporation is as high as approximately 45 inches a year.

This farm possesses all the factors essential for satisfactory purification of sewage by land treatment. After the sewage has been put over the land, after it has been filtered and evaporation takes place, it passes through further processes, then empties into the sea over a frontage 14 miles wide, and the water flowing into the sea is so pure that one can drink it with perfect safety.

If this can be done in Victoria I am sure that similar schemes could be adopted in many country areas of Queensland with success. The excuse that there is no sea or river into which the effluent can be drained is not tenable because the whole of the sewage is passed over vacant land and is so beneficial to the soil that it can be used with profit for the raising of cattle and sheep and for the production of vegetables. By adopting such a scheme, country areas would benefit both by having cheap sewerage installations and economic production of high-class beef, mutton, and vegetables.

I visited Quilpie some three or four years ago, a place that has been described to me as the last place on God's earth, but I was really amazed to see it blazing with electric light in every home, its own water supply and each of the 129 houses, no matter how far it was from the next, had sewerage. If a place like Quilpie can be so successful, what has been accomplished there is possible of accomplishment anywhere and everywhere. I should like to see legislation brought down by the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs to bring about such a state of affairs in every part of the State. The excuse that there is nowhere to treat the sewage is eliminated when we know the circumstances of the sewage farm in Victoria. With water conservation and irrigation there is no telling what this State is capable of producing—not only beef and mutton but all the other commodities needed by everyone.

In their efforts to provide irrigation the Government, through the responsible department, have built 31 weirs with an aggregate storage capacity of 41,390 acre-feet. During the past year the construction of six weirs, with a storage capacity of 8,960 acre-feet, was completed. Five weirs are under construction to provide a further storage of 8,650 acre-feet. If one reads the Speech

delivered by His Excellency the Governor at the opening of this session one finds that Queensland is well on the way to making herself a great State and Australia a great nation, because we all pride ourselves on the fact that Queensland is the Queen State of the Commonwealth and it will be so as the years go by, judging by the development that is taking place in every part of the State, not only the metropolitan area. It has been glibly stated from time to time in this House and elsewhere that everything is being done in and around Brisbane, but one has only to travel the State to see what has been done elsewhere.

I was privileged last October to visit Bullamon Plains and see the work done by Mr. K. B. Cameron. What he has done by his own efforts is an object lesson to any man on the land. When he went onto his property many years ago it was overrun with prickly-pear. He was one of the pioneers who fought the prickly-pear menace; he has now a beautiful property of 80,000 acres. The only thing wrong with it was a lack of water. He sought the advice and help of officers of the department; they went out there and advised him. I was shown over the property and I saw 16 earth tanks and 40 miles of canal connecting one tank to another. He was advised in the planning of the scheme and it was so carried out that if there was a fresh or rain there would not be too strong a flow along the canals to wash the banks away. If I remember rightly the fall in the canals was only 3 inches to the mile. There was a gradual flow of water along them. He has made himself secure. I was talking to him during Exhibition week and he told me that he was 68 years old and that he wished he had his life over again to see what could be done out there, and what he could do with that place if he was able to start off where he is today. He is going in for wheat-growing. He is quite satisfied that the country out there will grow wheat and other grains. Even though he is sorely afflicted with rheumatoid arthritis, he has the heart of a lion and intends to irrigate those pastures and prove that grain can be grown there even though the country looks as if it would not grow even grass.

Mr. Cameron's system of flooding is an ingenious idea of his own. He can open the locks and let the water flow to his heart's content, and he can just as easily shut it off when he wants to. He told me that he was amazed at the legumes that have come up on the area he has been flooding.

Mr. Cameron has assured me that there are now legumes growing on his property that he has never seen there before. The cattle and the sheep relish them, as they make luscious feed.

Mr. Cameron paid a great tribute to the hon. member for Balonne, Mr. Jack Taylor, who has been of considerable assistance to Mr. Cameron. To show his appreciation of what the hon. member for Balonne has done for him, Mr. Cameron named his weir the J. R. Taylor Weir. It is a great compliment to any representative of the people that a man who has done the work Mr. Cameron

has done honours him in the way that Mr. Cameron has honoured the hon. member for Balonne.

Mr. Cameron is quite happy in the knowledge that he has done something for Queensland and for his son, who is taking over the place. It is a pity for Queensland that there are not a few more people with large areas who will do what this man has done. The Moonie River that runs through his property is little more than a trickle for 9 or 10 months of the year, and what he has done has not only improved his own property, but people on the banks of the river for 10 miles back are now getting an abundance of water. If people 9 or 10 miles back are getting an abundance of water it must mean that people many miles upstream are now enjoying a benefit that they would not be enjoying if it were not for what Mr. Cameron has done. He has done something not only for himself and his immediate neighbours but for people miles up the river.

I am delighted to be able to stand up here and repeat the Governor's references to what this Government and the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply have done in locking the streams of Queensland and providing irrigation for many thousands of acres of land, thus bringing about much greater production.

During the recess, when water restrictions were applied in Brisbane, I made myself busy in endeavouring to find whether there was any other suitable source of water supply. If Brisbane grows in the future as it has during the last five years, in another 10 years Somerset Dam will not supply nearly sufficient water to meet the needs of Greater Brisbane alone. I went out to the back of Petrie, because I have always believed that from the Pine River large quantities of excellent water could be obtained. I followed the Pine River back to Kobbie Creek, where I found what I believe to be an ideal place to build a weir for the conservation of water for the residents of Redcliffe, Sandgate, Caboolture, and the shire of Pine, which is now developing into a suburb of Brisbane. I am sure that the residents of these places will require enormous quantities of water in another 10 years.

It is an ideal place for a water supply. The very day that I was there I observed a lorry from the Postmaster-General's Department taking in water and upon inquiries I was told by the driver that the water was some of the purest in Queensland and that it was used by the Postmaster-General's Department for battery purposes. Here is an abundance of good water in a good rainfall area and many thousands of acre-feet of it could be impounded. Redcliffe is a thriving and developing township; indeed in the last ten years it has expanded more than any other part of Queensland within the same distance of the metropolis.

The building of the Australian paper mill at Petrie and the electrification of the railway system between Northgate and Petrie will mean that in another ten years or perhaps less another ideal suburb will be added to the city of Brisbane. People will

be able to reach it in half an hour in the electric train. It embraces some attractive and fertile land and when one travels in the southern States and observes how far the suburbs are developed from the metropolises there one realises the tremendous possibilities there are in new suburbs on the outskirts of the great city of Brisbane.

I could speak on this subject for some time but I should like to devote part of the time remaining to me to a reference to some of the remarks by hon. members opposite. I had intended to express my appreciation of the remarks of the hon. member for Toowong on the opening day of this session when that unseemly scene took place. The hon. member suggested that there should be a revision of the Standing Orders so that a repetition of such an incident could not occur in the House. I appreciate his thought in that direction.

However, I deplore the remarks of the hon. member for Mirani who tried to discredit the Government in their attempt to sell the right to work the Blair Athol coalfield to a young man who was here with all the authority necessary to link Queensland with the Empire in the supply of coal. Unfortunately it was found later on that he did not have the money required to do the work. That contract would have been in operation today had it not been for the action of the Government in tying up conditions so tightly that no-one could exploit the State but the hon. member for Mirani would have us believe that the Government had sold Blair Athol to some oversea organisation. The then Premier, Hon. E. M. Hanlon, and his Government tied up the contract so tightly that the other contracting parties could not comply with it and make money for themselves. That is to the credit of the Government, no-one could exploit the people of the State.

The hon. member also made reference to the alleged dictatorship of the Queensland Central Executive of the Labour Party and the Parliamentary Labour Party but I should like to ask him what difference is there in the Q.C.E.'s taking action against an organisation of the Labour Party, of which it is the highest executive body, and the Liberal Party's taking action against a member of the Opposition? I read in the Press that some hon. members opposite had expressed themselves in favour of an increase in Parliamentary salaries, that others had said the proposed amount was not enough, and others again that the increase was long overdue. Mr. Wanstall, a prominent person in the Liberal movement, told a conference of Young Liberals that they were going to carry a resolution forbidding the members of the Liberal Party in Parliament from taking any increase in salary. If that did not amount to dictation to the members of the Liberal Parliamentary Party I do not know what dictatorship means. On the one hand much publicity is given in the Press to the actions of the Q.C.E. of the Labour Party.

There was a suggestion that certain members of the Q.C.E. should be brought to

the bar of the House. Why was not the same suggestion made in reference to Mr. Wanstall? What right had Mr. Wanstall and the Young Liberals to tell the Liberal Party members that they should not accept the increase in salary any more than Q.C.E. had the right to tell members of this party what to do? I deplore the fact that the hon. member tried to make it appear that there was some ill-feeling between the Honourable the Premier, who is overseas—and who is well able to defend himself, as he will show when he returns—and the Acting Premier. I do not know of any two people who are more closely linked together than the Premier and the Acting Premier. I believe the position of Minister for Transport is a full-time job for any Minister and I know of no previous Minister, whether he represented a Labour Government or a Tory Government, who had more respect from the employees of the railways than the present occupant of that office. We should take our hats off to him for carrying on the duties of Acting Premier in addition to his duties as Minister for Transport, rather than do anything that would embarrass him.

The papers have been trying to discredit every hon. member of this party over the salary rise and they could not even tell the truth about a division. They quoted names of voting for an amendment and also for Cabinet's recommendation. They did not tell the truth because no member on this side voted for a recommendation of the Cabinet. Anybody who knows anything about the rules that govern meetings knows that when an amendment is carried it becomes the motion, so the original motion disappears and nobody has the chance to vote for or against it. Thus it is apparent that the paper did not publish the truth when it said that 25 voted for the increase and 24 voted for Cabinet's recommendation. By bringing this matter up, I hope I will encourage that paper, which professes to be the guiding star of the people and to have their welfare and interests at heart, at least to tell the people the truth. If our people get the facts they are sufficiently educated to think for themselves. "The Courier-Mail" publishes every day what Jefferson said about the freedom of the Press, and I invite them to give the people the truth. If "The Courier-Mail" sets itself up as the Bible of the people, let it give the people the truth and let the people sum up for themselves.

If I had time I should have liked to deal with things that happened before there were Labour men in this House. Briefly I refer to the bank scandal, when the Q.N. Bank went bung in the '90's. I have here a copy of an open letter that was published in the local papers at that time. Some members of Parliament during that time—and they were not Labour men—did not do things as honestly as Labour men have done, and their conduct reflects great shame on them. I have no opportunity to deal fully with it, but that opportunity will come another day.

In conclusion I offer my congratulations to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on your election to the office of Chairman of Committees.

You will hold that office with great credit to yourself and satisfaction to hon. members. Over the years I feel that you must have felt some frustration—you have been 19 years in Parliament—but now you have received your reward.

(Time expired.)

Mr. DEWAR (Chermside) (3.31 p.m.): At this stage I would, as usual, associate myself with the expressions of loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II., and once again offer my congratulations to Mr. Speaker on his election to that high office in this Parliament. I feel that in future, as in the past, he will carry out the job with the dignity and impartiality that we on this side very much appreciate in him.

Before proceeding much further in addressing myself to this motion I have some comments to make in relation to election campaigns in Chermside up to and including the last election. I have been very fortunate in the three election campaigns in my political life in the choice of the candidates put up as opponents against me. Six years ago, for the Nundah electorate, I was opposed by Mr. Frank Roberts, the present hon. member for Nundah. Three years ago Mr. Jim McArthur opposed me in Chermside and three months ago my opponent was Mr. Ken McRae. Never could I have had fairer or more decent chaps to fight against. I record it here that on every occasion they gave me a clean fight and that is exactly what I gave them. However, it does not always follow that because the candidate who opposes you is clean the people who rally round him are of the same type. On the last occasion I had to withstand propaganda that ran into many hundreds of pounds and this issue of a paper that I hold before you is typical of the expenditure of public moneys that was engaged in. That advertisement cost £45. Over £100 was spent in this local rag in relation to this election campaign and the electorate is still cluttered with this muck. It is to be found on telegraph posts all over the Chermside electorate. As usual, the Labour Party never cleans up its dirt, consequently telegraph posts are still cluttered with this type of propaganda.

I wish to draw attention to some of the propaganda found in this noble piece of work. I find that one of the reasons why the electors of Chermside should have elected a Labour man was the number of prominent Labour personalities offering assistance to Ken McRae. The first one is shown as the Hon. A. A. Caldwell. I suppose they meant Calwell. One wonders how the Printing Union, which supplied this advertisement, and the printer involved could make such a mistake. Coming to think of it, I suppose there is some reason for it, because I recall there was a man by the name of Caldwell. He was known as "Killer Caldwell." He is the man who fought in defence of this country in Spitfires, to such effect that he brought fame to himself. There might be some reason for the confusion of the spelling of the names because A. A. Calwell was known as "Kisser Calwell." He is the man who

ran across Australia to kiss the 100,000th baby, or something, when it arrived at Fremantle some years ago.

Then we had the Attorney-General and the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs. I suppose they would be expected to earn a few votes from Labour men, but there was something that gave me quite a shock. When I read this advertisement on the Thursday before the election I began to think it might be good if I lost after all on the Saturday because, after referring to the Minister for Health, it said, "Speaker, Mr. M. Brosnan, M.L.A." I thought, "The writing is on the wall. I shall not be game to open my mouth in Parliament so I might as well get out of it altogether." I thought that the Q.C.E. and the Labour Party had it all tied up already, that things were fixed, and I began to think that perhaps the Speaker whom we are fortunate enough to have now was not going to be Speaker any longer. I am sorry Mr. Speaker is not in the chair at the moment so that I could assure him of the great relief I felt when I found that he was to be our Speaker after all.

Then, of course, in the last place should be Mr. Peter Clark. Imagine such an alarming array of personnel attempting to attract votes for the Labour party in any area like the responsible district of Chermiside!

The point to which I wish to make particular reference is the way in which one member of the Labour campaign worked in the Chermiside electorate. If I remember rightly, he was the campaign director. He was Mr. W. J. Barry, of Campbell Terrace, Nundah, member of the Q.C.E. and stooge of the Prices Branch. He is of the type of men who get on one's street corner when one is away addressing meetings, as one normally does during an election campaign. When one returns home about 9 o'clock one finds one's wife and children in a state of nervous prostration as a result of this man's campaigning. Upon making inquiries one finds that the trouble is caused by your erstwhile opponents who have been 50 yards away from your front door tearing into your character, and that in this they are led by one William J. Barry. This man has been honoured by the Queen with the Queen's Medal. It is a damn disgrace to see political stooges of this kind, who will stoop to any depths to bring about any political stunts of their own, honoured by a Government of so-called responsible people with the medal of Queen Elizabeth II, and I record my disgust at such a gesture. I have knocked over two Scotsmen for them—McArthur and McRae. Make it easy for me next time. These Scotsmen are tough. Give me an Irishman next time. Give me Barry!

An Opposition Member: They might give you Brosnan.

Mr. Brosnan: I will have a go at him.

Mr. DEWAR: I will take on Brosnan without any hesitation. Despite the fact that the Queensland Housing Commission dumped another 2,500 voters into my electorate in the last three years, the Labour Party still could not win the Chermiside seat. And so long as they do not monkey round with boundaries, they never will.

Mr. Brosnan: What was your majority?

Mr. DEWAR: It was enough to put me on this side, not that. I thank the electors of Chermiside, the loyal ones, including those of the number who were put there by the Queensland Housing Commission who had enough brains to wake up to the Labour Party's stunts and to show their confidence in me by returning me to this Chamber with a greater number of votes than I had last time. Despite the fact that the Queensland Housing Commission dumped in about 2,500 more voters, I polled more votes than I did three years ago.

Mr. Brosnan: With a majority of 2,000 less.

Mr. DEWAR: That does not matter. I am still on this side.

Now I wish to make some reference to the interjection I made when we were discussing the Appropriation Bill and the Treasurer had rather glibly tried to prove that pensions were not introduced by the Liberal Government, the Deakin Government of 1909, but that they were introduced as a result of coercion by the Labour Party of that time, who backed the Deakin Government.

I interjected when the Treasurer was speaking about social-service legislation that he knew full well that the committee set up to inquire into social-service legislation was established by the Menzies Government. He pooh-poohed the idea, but I say to him that in the House of Representatives on 26 June, 1941, the Prime Minister announced the membership of a number of committees he intended to set up. One of these, the Standing Committee on Social Security, had the following membership:—

Non-Labour—Mr. J. A. Perkins, Chairman; Mr. R. S. Ryan; Senator W. J. Cooper.

Labour—Senator R. V. Keane, Mr. H. C. Barnard, Mr. M. McG. Blackburn.

On 3 July, 1951, in the Senate and in the House of Representatives ("Hansard," Vol. 167, p. 821 and p. 852 respectively) like motions were introduced and agreed to setting up the committee. The House of Representatives motion by Mr. Menzies reads, *inter alia*—

"1. That a joint committee be appointed to inquire into and, from time to time, report on ways and means of improving social and living conditions in Australia and of rectifying any anomalies in existing legislation.

"2. That the following members of the House of Representatives—Mr. Barnard, Mr. Blackburn, Mr. Perkins and Mr. Ryan, be appointed to serve on such committee."

The remainder of the motion dealt with the powers of the committee in session and like matters.

It is not possible to examine all the recommendations of the committee, but it is fair to say that every one of the post-war developments in social services and health benefits that now appear in the Social Services Consolidation Act and the National Health Bill are modifications, in greater or lesser degree,

of recommendations made by the committee. In view of this it may be said that the Menzies Government, responsible for the setting up of the committee was therefore responsible for the adoption of so many of the committee's recommendations by the Parliament.

The 1946 referendum proposal on social services was supported in the Parliament by all non-Labour members except one, Mr. Archie Cameron. It became necessary because of the doubt cast on the Parliament's constitutional power to legislate for social services other than old-age and invalid pensions. This doubt arose over a High Court decision, in 1945, concerning the validity of the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme. In no way did the carrying of the 1946 referendum mean that it introduced social services, merely that it rendered it of undoubted constitutional validity to introduce them.

The hon. member for Condamine, in moving the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech at the opening of Parliament, made a very good speech; most of it was the Liberal-Country Party policy and so it must have been good. When he was not criticising the Government he said that the education system in this State was so good that it would be well for the other States of the Commonwealth to emulate it. I think that there are one or two things that he should look at so that he will not wildly make that statement continuously. Who in his sane senses would suggest that the Western Australian Government, with their free education system from primary schools to the university, should emulate the Queensland system? He also stated that the textbooks—they were not printed in time although they should have been printed in time and it was accidental that the Government Printer was held up; these things happen—should be printed by the Government Printer rather than by private enterprise. That is typical of the socialist sneers one hears when private enterprise is mentioned, forgetting that it is only because of the efforts of private enterprise that sufficient money is got by income tax to pay for social services. He did not make reference to the fact that Golden Casket result slips printed by the Government Printer are not late in coming out. Do not hold up the Golden Casket, but by all means hold up the textbooks of Queensland's school children! And he has the audacity to suggest that the other States of Australia should emulate Queensland's system of education.

Mr. Devries: There was no delay on the part of the Government Printer.

Mr. DEWAR: I am not suggesting that there was. The hon. member for Condamine said so.

Mr. Devries: I am correcting that statement now.

Mr. DEWAR: It is a bit late to correct it. It is already in "Hansard."

There are other aspects of education that I should have liked to deal with, but I shall not have the time. The hon. member referred

to the education of spastics and ineducable children, but I remind him—and the Secretary for Public Instruction will agree with me on this—that spastic children are being educated to the standard they are today because of the activities of people who form part of this private enterprise that we hear referred to. About six or seven years ago a group of public-spirited people, realising that something must be done for spastic children, raised sufficient money to buy a building at New Farm and set up the necessary facilities. It was not until after they provided the building that the Government made available a subsidy. Being associated with that body, I am grateful for the subsidy given by the Government, but let it be understood that it was private enterprise, and the spirit that is behind private enterprise, that created the facility before the Department of Public Instruction came into it. The move was initiated not by the Queensland Department of Public Instruction but by private enterprise. It is to the credit of no-one to sneer at private enterprise, because all things that make for good in the community emanate from private enterprise. They do not emanate from Governments, irrespective of their political colour.

I did not hear the whole of the speech of the seconder of the Address in Reply, the hon. member for Nash, but I have been informed by my colleagues that it was quite a good speech for a Labour man. I did hear the hon. member say that the Government in Queensland will never change, that they are here forever. If you do not have change, you have decay. We have had no change for a long while and we certainly have decayed in Queensland Government circles. If ever a State was in a state of frustration, this State is. That is mainly because of corruption at the head of affairs. We have decay now and I would rather have change any day of the week. I am inclined to some extent to agree with the hon. member. It would take almost an earthquake to bring about a change in the Government of this State. Because of the Fascist juggling of boundary lines that took place years ago, it would be virtually impossible to unseat the Government without a terrific wave of hysteria against them. That is nothing but Fascism. We have had a sample of Fascism in the dictatorship of the Q.C.E. during the past month. I agree with the Lord Mayor of Brisbane when he says that the domination of the Q.C.E. over the elected representatives of the people, irrespective of how undemocratically they might have been elected, is nothing more nor less than Fascist dictatorship. Now we understand why the Upper House in this State was removed years ago. It was desired to remove the Upper House, which was answerable to the people, and put in its place another upper house, the Q.C.E., which is not answerable to the people. It is an upper house that the people cannot get at.

It is very interesting to see these things going on. They are typically Fascist, so typical of every Socialist country, such as Italy, Germany, Russia and the like.

They all tend that way. In typical form over the past seven elections the Communist vote went to the Labour Party. It always amuses me to hear members of the Government Party talking about their attitude towards Communism but we know darned well that at every election the Communist vote goes to the Labour Party. For instance, of 7,493 votes polled for the Communist candidate at the last Senate elections, 5,415 went to Connellan, the Labour candidate, 955 to Cilento, the Democrat, and 1,123 to Kendall, the Liberal man. And that is the usual ratio, 5 to 1 in favour of the Labour man. You can always depend on it that if there are six Communist votes one will go to the Country-Liberal Party accidentally and the other five to the Labour Party deliberately.

Someone may say that I have a colossal cheek to air something in this House that affects me personally but I could not care less, even though it is said about me or at me or to me by the Labour Party. I can deal with that. I know all that they said about me in the Chermiside electorate but I fought my own campaign and I beat them. And I am not concerned about what happens here. We have seen in this State a system of price-fixing which for an organisation of developed chaos takes the bun. The Federal Government got sick and tired of all the propaganda and mucking about at Premiers' Conferences and withdrew their £102,000, which was necessary to keep this incubus going in Queensland. As a consequence, the State Attorney-General rushed in recklessly and removed many things from price control, amongst them being that important item of food, I suppose, beer. I have never yet heard of anyone having to eat a piece of leather belting to keep himself alive, but leather belting is still controlled. If the Labour Party remain in power much longer we shall have to eat leather belting or bits of anything else we can find, if we are to hold on. The Attorney-General concluded that quite a number of items of foodstuffs that had some relation to the C Series Index should not be controlled but it was necessary to control belting. For crass stupidity I think that takes the bun. Last September the Australian Federation of Belt-makers decided to apply to the Prices Branch in each State with the object of having a uniform price for belting throughout the Commonwealth. That would mean that manufacturers producing at an uneconomic level would get only the price to be paid for those producing at an economic level and this would keep down the cost of belting to a minimum. Ultimately it was decided that 1-inch belting, for instance, could be sold in the other States of Australia for 1s. 4d. per foot but in Queensland it was decided that it should be sold for 1s. 3d. per foot, the reason given no doubt being that the cost of living was so much less in Queensland—laugh, laugh, laugh!—and so the leather belting must be sold a little cheaper in Queensland than elsewhere. It meant that the wholesaler bought the belting at the same price and sold it to the retailer who made a smaller margin of profit.

Now compare the action taken in that case with that taken in the case of 1-inch rubber belting made from imported material, and using the argument of the hon. member for Port Curtis, who talks about black coal—produced by black labour with rubber from the rubber trees. The material is imported into this country, fabricated into rubber belting and the 1-inch belting is sold at 1s. 7d. a foot or 3d. a foot dearer than the leather belting in the other States. The discount on leather belting was cut down in respect to Queensland manufacturers ostensibly to keep down prices, but all that happened was that it has caused country retailers to discontinue selling leather belting. They are allowed to operate on a margin of 17 per cent. on leather but they can buy rubber belting and sell it on a 30 per cent. margin and never less than a 20 per cent. margin. The point is that leather belting is now sold in Queensland at a disadvantage compared with rubber belting, and if there was sufficient demand for the flat belting it could be the means of wiping out the leather-belting industry in this State. The whole of the impetus is behind the selling of rubber belting, which is made from imported rubber, whereas the leather belting that is made from a Queensland product is at a disadvantage. This has occurred as a result of the action of a so-called responsible Government.

Mr. Brosnan: Are you selling out?

Mr. DEWAR: I am giving it away; I have stopped making it.

The hon. member for North Toowoomba made a great deal of reference to Premiers' Conferences and to the money that could be saved by the Federal Government, and he laid emphasis on the Defence vote. He made a remark, to which the hon. member for Clayfield referred, about the spending of £215,000,000 on defence, and not getting a great deal for it, and he felt that cuts could have been made in that vote. I have gone to a good deal of trouble to prepare a concise report on how this money is used. The actual expenditure of the various departments concerned with Commonwealth defence for the year 1952-53 are as follows:—

	£
Navy	47,285,000
Army	91,535,000
Air Force	55,269,000
Defence	670,000
Defence production ..	9,149,000
Supply (including Research and Development) ..	11,388,000
	£215,296,000

I wish it to be understood that I got the impression from the speech of the hon. member for North Toowoomba that the £215,000,000 to which he referred did not cover any research nor did it cover to any great degree the stocking of the Navy and Air Force, but was more or less concerned with the Army and the cost of the war in Korea. The actual figures covered the whole

of the ramifications, including the cost for research and development. In reference to the allocation for the Army it should be noted that the maintenance costs alone for the two battalions of the Royal Australian Regiment and their support in Korea during the year 1952-53 cost £21,661,000. The total expenditure on the Army for 1952-53 also included the pay, maintenance, training and purchase of new equipment for the Australian Regular Army, the Citizen Military Forces, and National Service Training Units. The Australian Regular Army at present has an approximate total strength of 28,500. This represents the largest peacetime permanent force that the Commonwealth has possessed at any time in its history. For the first time in peace the Australian Army is equipped with the latest tanks, in this particular case the Centurion, as well as all other modern weapons of war that research has made available.

For the first time in peace, a regular battalion has been stationed permanently in Queensland, and it is accommodated in one of the most modern camps of its type in the world, especially designed for tropical conditions.

Steady progress is being made with the raising of the two units in Papua-New Guinea, the Papua-New Guinea Volunteer Rifles, which is a C.M.F. part-time unit, and the Pacific Islands Regiment, which is of battalion strength comprising native troops led by officers and N.C.O.s of the A.R.A. These two units are making a valuable contribution towards the protection of Australia's northern approaches and represent a very valuable defence potential that could be rapidly expanded should the occasion arise.

The point I trust the hon. member for North Toowoomba will take particular cognisance of is this: to achieve maximum security for Australia from the Defence vote, in other words to get the greatest value for the money expended, a Defence Business Board comprised of four business men was appointed by the Commonwealth Government. One of the principal aims of this board would be to ensure economy in defence expenditure and to advise the respective defence departments. It will deal with joint-service demands of common interest to the three services or important subjects on which the collective advice of the board is desired.

To provide for competent business advice in each service department at the initial stage of proposals for expenditure, each department also has a business adviser. It is obvious that the Commonwealth Government have taken every step thought advisable to ensure that direct control is kept over the expenditure of money and have appointed men of undoubted business ability to guide service chiefs in this regard. I commend that move. It is a splendid one.

And this is important: the expenditure on Army equipment for 1952-1953 included—armed fighting vehicles, mechanical transport and spare parts, £5,600,000; arms and ammunition, £1,600,000; telecommunications and signals equipment, £1,100,000; engineer

and survey equipment, £1,000,000; clothing, £7,000,000; camp equipment and general stores, maintenance, and general repairs, £3,600,000.

The naval programme is moving steadily towards completion and represents one of the most effective peace-time naval forces Australia has had. It is based on a carrier force of seven ships, comprising two light fleet aircraft carriers, with a protective force of a cruiser and four destroyers. The Navy establishment also comprises an escort force of four ships, mainly for anti-submarine and anti-aircraft duties, a survey group of two vessels, a training squadron of 12 ships, comprising anti-submarine and radar units, mine-sweepers, and general training ships for recruits. Of the total vote of £47,290,000 for 1952-1953, £11,000,000 was allocated for aircraft and aero engines, naval construction and plant for naval establishments and works. Units of the Royal Australian Navy have carried out valuable patrol and escort work in Korean waters during the the past 12 months, proving their efficiency under operational conditions.

Of the £55,830,000 for expenditure on the Royal Australian Air Force for 1952-1953, £27,400,000 was for new planes and equipment. Manufacture in Australia of the British Canberra jet bomber and the United States Sabre jet fighter, plus the building of Rolls-Royce engines, has been achieved with spectacular success. I applaud the results that Australian workmen have achieved through the policy of the present Federal Government in making available sufficient money to build up our defence force to such an extent that we have built aircraft equal to the world's best. The Sabre jet fighter has broken the sound barrier. That is no small achievement for a country as young as we are in industrial progress—building aircraft that can travel at 700 miles an hour and break the sound barrier. Radio-controlled pilotless jet-target aircraft are being built and outstanding progress has been made with the development of the Woomera long-range weapons project. There is no doubt that if I had the time to go through the whole of these particulars I could prove conclusively that Australia is getting value for the money spent on her defence.

Before concluding I draw attention to the following statement made by the Governor-General of Australia, Sir William Slim, at a Parliamentary dinner tendered to him on 17 August—

“The last place you want to fight a war is in your own garden. That, I think, applies to many bigger places than back gardens. You do not want to push down garrisons in various places. What you want is to get a hard striking mobile combined force of all the services trained up to the knocker, well-equipped, and you will not get that for nothing. You will get it only at the cost of a good deal of money and a good deal of personal sacrifice. Because you are really a nation now, and there are certain responsibilities and penalties on nationhood, as there are on growing up, and this is one of them. I was

looking at some of your soldiers today—and I know something about soldiers; I don't know much about politicians—and believe me, they are jolly good. They are worthy successors of the old Anzaes whom I knew nearly 40 years ago and of those Australians who were the first people ever to beat the Japanese."

There is the reply to the hon. member for North Toowoomba and other Australians who think along lines similar to those expressed by him. You can only prepare to defend this country at great personal sacrifice and at great cost and if we can keep the enemy away from the territorial waters of this country it does not matter what it costs. The present method adopted by the Commonwealth Government is the only one. We must spend a percentage of our national income in an offensive effort for our defence. We cannot wait. I certainly do not want to wait until the enemy is in our back garden. We have got to prepare and the only way to prepare is by expending a great deal of money and practising a great deal of personal sacrifice.

Mr. DUFFICY (Warrego) (4.8 p.m.): I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your re-election to the position of Speaker of this House. I also congratulate the hon. member for Fitzroy upon being appointed Chairman of Committees. My congratulations go also to the hon. member for Condamine and the hon. member for Nash for the eloquent manner in which they moved the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech. I think every unbiased hon. member will admit that at least their contributions were excellent, that they were probably the best we have heard from maiden speakers in this Assembly for very many years. I should say I am voicing the opinion of at least the majority of hon. members when I express the hope that they will be long spared to help this Parliament and this State by their eloquence and undoubted ability.

I wish to comment upon only a few things this afternoon but before doing so should like to say that the intemperate and, might I say ridiculous, statements made by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat are, to my way of thinking, one of the chief reasons why we see the tattered remnants of what was once an Opposition spread very sparsely round the Opposition benches today.

This is not the place for intemperate statements, nor is it a place in which to play petty politics, and I sound this note of warning to hon. members opposite: that those members who did play petty party politics in this House during comparatively recent times since I was first elected a member of this House are now no longer with us. I refer to the ex-member for Roma, Mr. Ewan, and—in fairness I say to a lesser extent—to the ex-member for Condamine, Mr. Allpass. I know western conditions fairly well; I know what is required by the people in the western parts of the State. In passing, might I say that I believe that the people of Western Queensland do appreciate a representative in Parliament who is prepared to state a case in this House fairly and honestly on its merits and I want to pay a tribute

to the electors of Warrego and express my appreciation to them because in the first general election in the State for which I nominated as a candidate they paid me the tribute of electing me unopposed. I am not unmindful of the honour conferred upon me at the last election and I believe it was conferred on me because on all occasions in this House I have stated the case for Western Queensland to the best of my ability. I endeavour to face up to every problem confronting this Chamber and express an honest opinion about it.

The gentlemen to whom I have just referred knew, I believe, western conditions better than they indicated by their speeches in this House. We had the sorry spectacle of Mr. Ewan arguing that the Government policy in connection with Noondoo was wrong. I believe that in his heart of hearts that gentleman did not believe that; he was playing the petty game of party politics and the electors of Roma were not unmindful of it. I do not want anyone to accuse me of talking behind his back or for that matter of talking about anyone else in his absence. I think every hon. member will agree that I told Mr. Ewan these things when he was a member of Parliament. I am not saying anything today that I have not previously said to his face.

I am sounding a note of warning to members of the Opposition and I am sorry to see that the hon. member for Chermside is not in the Chamber to listen to what I have to say. A parliamentarian who believes that the electors of Queensland or the electors of his own particular electorate are fools is due for a rude awakening, as members of the Opposition or members who were in the Opposition in the last Parliament have found to their cost. We had Mr. Ewan and Mr. Allpass in this Chamber—

An Opposition Member: Why not leave them alone?

Mr. DUFFICY: I am sounding a note of warning, not for the benefit of the hon. member who has just interjected, but for the benefit of members of the Opposition generally.

We had those gentlemen in this Chamber opposing an amendment to the Lands Act that was introduced for the purpose of implementing closer settlement in that rainfall area of Queensland where closer settlement is desirable. We have heard members of the Opposition speaking about the necessity of increasing food production in Queensland. Only this morning the hon. member for Clayfield mentioned it. The only method of increasing food production in this State is by the subdivision of the intermediate part of Queensland between the coastal belt and the more arid parts in the Far West, the area where there is an annual rainfall of 20 inches or more. Closer settlement there is highly desirable, and it is necessary that this Government should obtain by fair means, as they endeavour to do, land on which people who can and will produce additional food can be gainfully settled.

Yet we had members of the Opposition, and particularly the two gentlemen to whom I have referred, opposing the amendment to the Lands Act that was introduced during the last session of the previous Parliament. I repeat that they were merely playing party politics, and without any vindictiveness at all to those gentlemen I say that the electors of Roma and of Condamine assessed their arguments at their true value, with the result that we have today in this Chamber Mr. Dohring, whose experience of land matters is second to none, in place of Mr. Ewan as the hon. member for Roma, and Mr. Diplock, who so eloquently moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, in place of Mr. Allpass as the hon. member for Condamine. That is because members of the Opposition wish to play party politics.

I have no desire to continue along those lines any further, as there are one or two other matters that I wish to discuss. One matter that I want to mention very briefly this afternoon is the salaries paid to members of Parliament. I am not going to argue the merits of this matter today, but in fairness to the electors who paid me the tribute of electing me to this Chamber unopposed at the last election, I think I should state exactly where I stand.

Let me say at the outset that I shall support any increase in salaries up to the figure that I believe will enable me to give effective representation to the electors and the constituency I represent. Let there be no argument about that. I want to make that statement, and through "Hansard" tell the electors of Warrego exactly what my attitude is.

My electorate has an area of about 82,000 square miles, and by no stretch of the imagination can it be classed as a cabbage patch. During the short time I have had the honour to represent this important constituency I have endeavoured to visit every part of it, no matter how remote, to enable me to give the service I have given to the people there in the past, which I think they are entitled to have. In return for that I think I should get a reasonable salary as a parliamentarian. I am not going to suggest here what the increase should be, nor am I prepared to listen to any stupid questions about whether or not I can live on my present salary. That is not the point. The question is: is my present salary sufficient to enable me to give the service that should be given to this vast area and the people in it? It is an important constituency and the people in it are entitled to the best service they can get. That is the question, not whether I can live on my present salary.

While on the subject let me say that the publicity given to parliamentary salaries in the metropolitan Press over recent weeks has been positively unfair and biased. Has it ever occurred to the writer of the articles that I have a duty as a parliamentarian to Queensland as a whole, that it is my duty to do more than represent the Warrego electorate—although that is my primary duty—to know more of it than mere Queen Street and Parliament House? Surely it is an

important part of my duty as a member of Parliament to know the whole State, seeing that I am charged with the responsibility of helping to legislate for it? Therefore, it is important, if I do not know the whole State, to travel and become conversant with all the problems of the people, all their needs. Will it be suggested, for example, that a member of Parliament who is returned for a metropolitan seat with an area of a couple of square miles, a man returned because of his popularity in the electorate and because of his other qualifications, discharges the whole of his responsibilities when he looks after the interests of that small part of the State and pays no regard to the needs of the State as a whole? He is expected to help to legislate for the whole of the State, and I am pointing out that his responsibility as a parliamentarian does not end when he is elected for, say, some small metropolitan area. He is expected to cast an intelligent vote on all matters submitted to the House for consideration and he is expected to debate intelligently all matters of concern to the welfare of the people as a whole, regardless of where any project is to be carried out. Therefore, when you talk about the expense incurred by a metropolitan member you must have regard for this fact too, that although he is returned to Parliament as the representative for his electorate, he also owes something to the rest of the State.

In order that a member should be able to carry out his duties effectively in the interest not only of his own constituency but the State as a whole he should be conversant with the State for which he legislates. I maintain that on the present salary a member can do nothing—nothing at all—but look after the interests of his own electorate to the best of his ability and disregard the interest of the remainder of the State, to some extent at least. What is the use of talking about the Mareeba-Dimbulah irrigation scheme or the needs of the far South-West of Queensland to people who have never been there, and who, because of the miserly salary they receive will never have the opportunity of going there because they will never be able to afford the expenses incurred in travelling to those outlying portions of the State? If I had the eloquence of a Disraeli combined with the descriptive powers of a Shakespeare I could not adequately explain to members of this House who have never been there the needs of the Far West of Queensland and the conditions under which people live there and what is required to fully develop that part of the State. If I spoke for 12 months they would not understand the position then. I suggest that if they received sufficient money to enable them to visit these outlying parts of the State their services to the State would be of greater value.

I have endeavoured at all times to induce members to visit the Warrego electorate and through the courtesy of Ministers I have been able to get private members of this party to visit that electorate. I believe that as far as that part of South-west Queensland is concerned that policy has paid dividends;

and I believe that principle should be extended. We now have a road from Mitchell to Charleville under construction. My predecessor, the late Mr. O'Shea, and I, advocated the building of such a road for a number of years, but without success; but as the result of a visit by the Premier, who was then Treasurer and who had the opportunity to see things for himself in company with many private members from this party, the road was eventually gazetted.

That supports the argument I have been endeavouring to advance. When we speak about the salary of members do not let us confine the question to his expenses in his particular electorate or the amount that is required by a member of Parliament to maintain a reasonable standard of living; surely there is something more important than that? What is more important is that every member should know the State for which it is his responsibility to legislate. If I was a dictator—and I hope I never shall be—I would make it compulsory for every member of Parliament to travel the length and breadth of this State while the House is in recess in order to become conversant with the problems, not only of his own electorate but of Queensland generally, and the conditions under which the people in the various parts of Queensland live. If all members of Parliament did this I believe our activities on behalf of this State would bear greater fruit.

The metropolitan Press, which plays such a part in moulding public opinion, might be doing a service to this State if it advanced that side of the question rather than descending into the gutter, as some of the weekly journals have done, and condemning members of Parliament as being money-grabbers because they sought to get sufficient money to do their job effectively and well on behalf of the people who put them here to do that job. Personally, I resent any suggestion that I am a money-grabber or that I seek additional money for my own personal benefit. Those who know me best realise that on 22 July last I completed a quarter of a century of official association with the Labour movement. That is a fairly long time, and a big gap out of a man's life. And, again, those who know me best know that I resigned from an official position in the Labour Movement to stand for this Parliament, knowing full well the remuneration I would receive here and that I was making a considerable financial sacrifice by leaving the position I occupied to accept nomination for the Warrego seat. Nobody can charge me or any hon. member on either side of this Parliament with being a money-grabber. I make no apology for what I have done and in concluding this subject I would say to the electors of Warrego that I will support any suggested increase in parliamentary salaries up to the figure that I believe will enable me to give the representation to Warrego that its importance demands and adequate representation to my electors irrespective of how isolated the centres where they live may be. I make no apologies for taking that stand.

My time is running out and I should like to mention briefly one or two matters that affect my electorate and those who live there and in doing so I pay tribute to my friend and colleague, the Secretary for Mines, who through the State Electricity Commission is doing a marvellous job for residents in Western Queensland. In my own electorate the comparatively small towns of Morven and Wyandra will have the benefit of electric light in the very near future and another centre, within 50 miles of Charleville but in the electorate of the Secretary for Public Lands, will also have electricity within a very short time. It is fitting, as the Government are doing such a good job for people living in such isolated centres, that we commend them for their efforts.

There are one or two matters I would draw to the attention of the Government and to the relevant Ministers. On previous occasions in this House I spoke on the necessity of providing houses in the western parts of the State. I am one of those who believe that decentralisation is absolutely necessary. I believe that we should avoid, if possible, the mistakes made in other States. For instance, more than half the population of New South Wales live in the capital city, and a similar position exists in Victoria. In Queensland we have been more fortunate, because only 38 per cent., the lowest percentage in Australia, of our population live in the Brisbane area. But if we continue to build houses in Brisbane to the exclusion of building them in country centres, we are encouraging the growth of population in the metropolitan area and discouraging young people in the outlying parts of the State in particular who are marrying from remaining in the centres where they would like to stay. I know that the Secretary for Public Works and Housing is giving this matter some consideration, and I take this opportunity of expressing my personal thanks to him for acceding to my request to build 14 houses in Charleville. I remind hon. members, however, that for those 14 houses there were something like 186 applicants, which indicates that there is still an acute housing shortage in Charleville as well as many other western towns, as any person who knows the West will agree. We speak a great deal about the drift of population from the country to the city. One way of stimulating that drift is to continue building houses here to the exclusion of country centres, and in my opinion one way that will help in arresting it is to build houses in the country, make accommodation available for the many hundreds of people who require it there, and so decentralise our population to the benefit of the State.

In conclusion I pay tribute to my friend and colleague, the Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation. I believe that this Government's land policy in Western Queensland meets with the complete approval of the vast majority of landholders in the pastoral areas of this State. If any evidence in support of that statement is needed I point out that all the electorates in the pastoral areas of Queensland were not contested by the Opposition at the last State election. Something

like 46 per cent. of the total area of Queensland was not contested by the Opposition and that 46 per cent. included the whole of the pastoral areas of the State. The sitting Labour representatives for those areas were returned unopposed. The two remaining seats in Queensland that could be classed as pastoral, Roma and Condamine, were won by the Labour candidates; and, as I am reminded, to a lesser extent the electorate of Cook. That indicates completely the truth of the statements I have just made. This Government are entitled to be complimented on their land policy and it can be said without doubt that that policy has met with the complete approval and endorsement of the electors on the land, who after all in the last analysis are the best judges.

Mr. Plunkett: What about Peak Downs?

Mr. DUFFICY: We will talk about that later. The hon. member cannot refute the facts I have stated. I pay that tribute to the Government and to my friend and colleague, the Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation, who has so effectively implemented Labour's land policy.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Muller, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 4.43 p.m.