

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 8 OCTOBER 1957

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 8 OCTOBER, 1957.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. A. R. Fletcher, Cunningham) took the chair at 11 a.m.

QUESTIONS.**NEW COMPANIES REGISTERED IN QUEENSLAND.**

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) asked the Attorney-General—

“In respect of the claims made in the ‘News Bulletin’ that 60 new companies had been registered in Queensland since the Country-Liberal Government assumed office,—

1. What are the names of these companies, and the date upon which each company was registered?

2. In what industries are they engaged, and where are their operations located?

3. Which of these companies are companies operating in other States or overseas?

4. How many companies were registered with his department over the same period last year?”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

“(1) to (3) As per attached Schedule.”

“(4) There were 56 companies registered in August, 1956, compared with 58 in August 1957; and 43 companies were registered in September, 1956, compared with 79 in September, 1957.”

Whereupon Mr. Munro laid upon the Table the Schedule referred to.

VISIT OF MR. E. J. GAVEN, M.L.A. TO INDIA.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) asked the Premier—

“Is it a fact that Mr. E. J. Gaven, the hon. member for Southport, will be going to India in the near future to attend some Parliamentary Conference or other, and if so, (a) how long will the hon. member be absent from Queensland, (b) what will be the estimated total cost involved, (c) who will be responsible for such cost and (d) what purpose will be served to Queensland by representation at such conference?”

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough) replied—

“The Honourable Member for Southport (Mr. E. J. Gaven) will be going to India following an invitation from the India-Pakistan-Ceylon Branches of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to send one Member of the Queensland Branch to attend the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference and General Meeting of the Association to be held in New Delhi this year. Mr. Gaven will be absent from Queensland from 8 November to 24 December. The Host Branches will be responsible for his transport to and from India, hotel expenses, internal transport and entertainment. The aim of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is to promote understanding and co-operation for common purposes between those engaged in the Parliamentary Government of the countries of the Commonwealth by the establishment of machinery for the exchange of information and of individual visits and for the organisation of Conferences between Members of the Legislatures of the Commonwealth, and also to promote understanding and co-operation by similar means between those Members and the Members of Legislatures outside the Commonwealth having close political and Parliamentary associations with them. The subjects set down for discussion are as follows:—Economic Relations in the Commonwealth. The problem of the Underdeveloped Territories of the Commonwealth. Social Services in the Commonwealth. The future of the smaller States in the Commonwealth. The role of the English Language in the Commonwealth. The working of the Party System in Parliament. International Affairs and Defence.”

MARGARINE IN PRISON DIETS.

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) asked the Attorney-General—

“1. Is margarine being used in lieu of butter in prison diets?

“2. If so, will he take steps to see that only butter is used in any of the institutions under his control?”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

“(1) Margarine and butter are included in the general prison diet scale which is laid down by the Government Medical Officer who is the visiting surgeon to the prison.”

“(2) There does not appear to be any sound reason for my taking steps to ensure that only butter is used in the Institutions under my control.”

PREVENTION OF FLOOD EROSION, MARY RIVER, MARYBOROUGH.

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

“As the work on the reconstruction of the old wharf on the town reach of the Mary River is now well advanced, will he request the Harbours and Marine Department to prepare plans and estimates of cost for a wall along the river frontage between Wilson Hart's sawmill and Walker's shipyards as this area has suffered severely from erosion as the result of floods?”

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Coorparoo) replied—

“The river frontage between Wilson Hart's sawmill and Walker's shipyards is not subject to really serious erosion and action to provide bank protection is by no means urgent. No provision has been made in the Estimates for 1957-1958 for any work on water-front protection in the town reach of the Mary River, but the matter will be examined prior to the submission of the Department of Harbours and Marine Works Programme for 1958-1959.”

APPEALS FROM MAGISTRATES' DECISIONS.

Mr. POWER (Baroona): I desire to ask the Attorney-General whether he has answers to the following questions, which I addressed to him on 12 September—

“1. How many civil cases were heard and determined by stipendiary magistrates for the three years ending 30 June, 1957?”

“2. How many appeals were lodged against the magistrates' verdicts in these cases?”

“3. How many of such appeals have been heard?”

“4. How many decisions were reserved in such appeals?”

“5. How many appeals against such Magistrates' decisions were upheld?”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

“(1) 2,347.”

“(2) 83.”

“(3) 80.”

“(4) 28.”

“(5) 44.”

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

ADMINISTRATOR OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier): I desire to make a ministerial statement. As hon. members are aware, the term of office as Governor of this State of Sir John Lavarack expired on 30 September, 1957.

As the position of Governor became vacant as from 1 October, 1957, I desire to inform members that the Hon. Alan James Mansfield, Chief Justice of Queensland, pursuant to the provisions of the Dormant Commission dated 29 October, 1900, on 1 October, 1957, took the prescribed oaths before the Hon. Roslyn Foster Bowie Philp, Senior Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Queensland, and issued a Proclamation notifying that he had assumed the administration of the Government of Queensland as from that date.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the "Government Gazette Extraordinary" dated 1 October, 1957, containing a copy of that Proclamation.

In view of the provisions of the Dormant Commission referred to, His Excellency the Honourable Alan James Mansfield will continue to administer the Government of this State until such time as the new Governor assumes office.

His Excellency of course has been performing the duties of Administrator of the Government of this State since 25 January, 1957, due to the regrettable indisposition of Sir John Lavarack. Since that date, His Excellency was confronted with a vital constitutional position and I think all hon. members will agree that His Excellency, during those worrying times, discharged his very onerous duties with ability and with impartiality and has given practical evidence, not only during that period of crisis but during his whole term of office, of his fitness to occupy the high position of Administrator of the Government.

Whereupon the hon. gentleman laid a copy of the "Government Gazette Extraordinary" on the table.

SIR JOHN LAVARACK.

APPRECIATION OF SERVICES AS GOVERNOR OF QUEENSLAND.

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier) (11.6 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That this Parliament places on record its keen appreciation of the great service rendered by Lieutenant-General Sir John Dudley Lavarack, K.C.M.G., K.C.V.O., K.B.E., C.B., D.S.O., as the representative firstly of His Late Majesty King George VI. and secondly of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II., in Queensland over a period of eleven years.

This House acknowledges with gratitude the zeal displayed by Sir John in performing his duties during these years; the encouragement he gave the citizens of the State in promoting development and progress; his visits to many parts of Queensland not only to acquaint himself with the immense potentialities of this great State but also to meet as many of Her Majesty's subjects as possible, irrespective of where they dwelt.

Furthermore, this is mindful of the great contribution made by Lady Lavarack to Sir John's work on behalf of this State and its people.

Parliament expresses sincere thanks to Sir John and Lady Lavarack for their services, hopes that Sir John will soon be restored to good health, and that both he and Lady Lavarack will be long spared to enjoy a retirement they so richly deserve.

That Mr. Speaker be requested to advise Sir John and Lady Lavarack accordingly."

Mr. WOOD (North Toowoomba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.8 a.m.): Having a keen appreciation of the splendid services rendered to the State by Sir John Lavarack and Lady Lavarack I formally second the motion.

Motion (Mr. Nicklin) agreed to.

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Public Service Commissioner for the year 1956-1957.

Report of the Acting Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops for the year 1956-1957.

Balance-sheet &c., of the Public Curator of Queensland for the year 1956-1957.

Report of the State Children Department for the year 1956-1957.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Order in Council under the Elections Acts, 1915 to 1952.

Order in Council under the Maintenance Orders (Facilities for Enforcement) Acts, 1921 to 1956.

Order in Council under the State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1954.

Order in Council under the Southern Electric Authority of Queensland Acts, 1952 to 1954.

Report of the Southern Electric Authority of Queensland for the year 1956-1957.

Order in Council under the Sewerage, Water Supply and Gasfitting Acts, 1949 to 1951.

Regulations under the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1957.

POLICE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

Hon. K. J. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Labour and Industry): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Police Acts, 1937 to 1955, in a certain particular.”

Motion agreed to.

ANIMALS PROTECTION ACTS
AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

Hon. K. J. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Labour and Industry): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Animals Protection Acts, 1925 to 1954, in a certain particular.”

Motion agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE—RESUMPTION OF
DEBATE.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Taylor, Clayfield, in the chair.)

Debate resumed from 25 September (see p. 329) on Mr. Munro's motion—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the law relating to the Department of Justice.”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Attorney-General) (11.22 a.m.): At the adjournment on 25 September last the debate was virtually finished, but the Leader of the Opposition in concluding his speech returned to the attack on a matter that I had regarded as having been disposed of.

Before replying on this particular point, I should like to congratulate the hon. member for North Toowoomba on his speeches in the Chamber as Leader of the Opposition. Generally he has set a commendable example of dignity and restraint. I would expect that from him. This instance, however, appears to be an exception to the general rule.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that in persisting with this matter the hon. member has been influenced by the prospect of placing me in the position of having to express an opinion which would embarrass either the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt or the magistrates. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that I would not do that in either case.

First, referring to the magistrates, I have no hesitation in saying that I have confidence in them and am appreciative of the arduous and important services they give to the State, but I repeat my previous statement that I shall not enter into a public discussion of their personal qualifications or capacity unless I think it is in the public interest to do so.

Second, I point out that the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt, with all other hon. members in this Chamber has the full right to express his opinion. It is, of course, scarcely necessary for me to remind hon. members that expressions of opinion in Parliament by a private member should not be taken as an indication of the views of the Government or as Government policy.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) (11.24 a.m.): I want to clear up one point. Some comments were expressed to me after my last speech. It was wrongly construed in some quarters as an attack on the members of the legal profession. At one time the Australian Labour Party, which was then a great, glorious, combined party, seriously considered barring lawyers from membership of the party.

They did that because they considered that a lawyer thinks what he is paid to think by his client and advances arguments that his client wants him to advance. In effect, the lawyer says, “You find the dough and I will find the argument.” I shall tell hon. members what probably precipitated the consideration of this matter by the A.L.P. It concerned a case in which Mr. Isaac Isaacs who later became Governor-General of Australia appeared for the plaintiff in the Supreme Court. He won the case hands down. The case went on appeal to the Full Court and Isaac Isaacs again appeared for the plaintiff on the appeal and won a unanimous decision. The case then went on appeal to the High Court and the plaintiff considering he had already had two good wins by Isaac Isaacs in the two inferior courts and that Isaac Isaacs was an expensive barrister, did not brief him in the High Court appeal. They briefed a cheaper barrister naturally thinking that their barrister would go before the High Court and repeat and enlarge on the arguments advanced by Isaac Isaacs in the Supreme Court and the Full Court. The other side then hopped in and briefed Isaac Isaacs. He went into the High Court representing the respondent and completely ripped to shreds all the arguments he had advanced in the Supreme Court and the Full Court and won the case for the respondent in the High Court as convincingly as he had won the case for the plaintiff in the Supreme Court and the Full Court. As a result of that amazing, shall we say, legal gyration, on the part of Isaac Isaacs, and on the part of the other barristers and members of the legal profession the A.L.P. considered that it was not a matter of academic training and the number of letters after a man's name that the elector looked

for but honesty and simple sincerity. In the hon. member for Toowong, the present Attorney-General, until the Bill is passed, we have a man of simple honesty and simple sincerity. He has not got the remarkable facility of mind enjoyed by members of the legal profession. The hon. member looks at a point from the view point of the ordinary citizen and he reaches his decision on it in that light. In my opinion, by their training, members of the legal profession, with few exceptions, particularly those in the top bracket, such as barristers are unfitted to exercise an unbiassed approach to any popular subject as required of a member of Parliament.

Mr. POWER (Baroona) (11.28 a.m.): In my previous speech I replied to the remarks of the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt in reference to the knowledge of law possessed by magistrates in dealing with civil cases. I propose to give the Committee figures to show that what I said on that occasion has been substantially borne out. Over the three years ended 30 June, 1957, 2,347 civil cases were heard by magistrates. There were 83 appeals against decisions in those cases, 80 have been heard, and in only 44 cases were the appeals upheld. That destroys the argument advanced by the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt and supported by the hon. member for Kurilpa that magistrates are not capable of dealing with civil cases.

The evidence was quite plain. When the matters went before the Supreme Court and were dealt with by the judges, decisions were reserved in 28 cases to enable the judges to examine the law and make themselves conversant with all the matters before them. As appellants from decisions of stipendiary magistrates were successful in only 44 cases out of 2,347, I think hon. members will agree that that justifies my attitude and supports my contention that the magistrates are capable of dealing with the many matters that are referred to them.

I have already asked some questions dealing with appeals from the decisions of Supreme Court judges. At a later stage in the Budget debate I shall have something further to say about that matter. I suggest that the figures I have quoted destroy the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt and the hon. member for Kurilpa about the inability of magistrates to understand the law and give correct decisions.

Mr. HART (Mt. Gravatt) (11.32 a.m.): Replying to the remarks that have just been made by the former Attorney-General, in my opinion the number of appeals is quite irrelevant. The hon. member for Baroona is entirely unaware of this, but every barrister who has appeared in these cases knows that the ordinary person who has his case dealt with in the magistrates court does not want to take his case on appeal, and up till recently the jurisdiction was only up to £200.

The ordinary person is prepared to accept the decision of the magistrates simply because he cannot afford to go any further.

I would, having made my public protest, have allowed this matter to drop but the Opposition are determined to keep it going.

Mr. Dufficy: Why could not they afford to go further?

Mr. HART: Because the ordinary person cannot afford extended litigation.

Mr. Dufficy: Cannot afford the barrister's fees.

Mr. HART: Barristers do not make big incomes. Only a few barristers would make as much as the hon. member gets for being out at Cunnamulla half his time.

Mr. Dufficy: The good ones do.

Mr. HART: There is also the fact that magistrates do not have to sum up the law to a jury or study the law as do the Supreme Court judges. From a magistrate's finding of fact there is very often insufficient material on which to appeal. As I said, the number of appeals is utterly irrelevant.

Mr. Power: No it is not.

Mr. HART: I am merely replying to the hon. member at the moment. I say that the number of successful appeals is irrelevant to the consideration of this matter.

Mr. Power: It is relevant all right.

Mr. HART: I do not know whether the hon. member for Mundingburra made an attack on our profession in general, but I remind the Committee that the duty of lawyers is the administration of justice. The State has two main functions. It must protect itself externally, and it must provide internal law for the country. The members of the legal profession, at the Bar, the solicitors, and the judges, are engaged in the administration of internal order. They are absolutely necessary to the country. I do not know whether or not the hon. member for Mundingburra intends to impugn the honour of all members of the legal profession or only of some of them when he says that generally they are not fitted to come into this House. I remind the hon. member that every judge on the bench is and has been a member of the legal profession and that their standards of honour and conduct are very high indeed. That is recognised throughout the Empire and throughout the world. His remarks are an insult to the judges of this country when he says that the members of the legal profession have not the simple honesty necessary to come into this House. I think he will find that at the Bar there is the very highest standard of conduct to be found anywhere in the community.

Motion (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Munro, read a first time.

ACTS INTERPRETATION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Taylor, Clayfield, in the chair.)

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Attorney-General) (11.38 a.m.): I move—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Acts Interpretation Act of 1954 in certain particulars.”

This Bill is a short one. Its principal object is to make clear the identity of the Minister who is empowered to administer an Act. It is sometimes specifically provided in an Act that a designated Minister is to administer it. The Bill provides that where, by administrative arrangements, another Minister of the Crown named in such arrangements is to administer an Act, then he has all the powers of the Minister under that Act. This particular provision is subject to the provisions of another Bill, the Department of Justice Bill. It deals particularly with the subject of the Minister for Justice performing the duties of the Attorney-General.

It has been decided that in future Ministers of the Crown will be known as Ministers. This is the title by which they are popularly known. Some Acts call a Minister “a Secretary”; some describe him as “a Minister.” Instances of the Minister bearing the title of Secretary are the cases of the Secretary for Public Works, the Secretary for Public Lands, and the Secretary for Public Instruction. The last-mentioned title is the subject of a separate Bill. These changes will avoid confusion as to the correct title of the Minister.

The Bill further provides that, where in any Act the word “Secretary” is used in defining or referring to a ministerial office, the definition or reference may be read so as to apply to the Ministers under their new titles.

There are ancillary provisions of the Bill providing for judicial notice being taken of administrative arrangements and extending the meaning of the word “Act” to cover subordinate legislation. If the Bill is passed it will put beyond all doubt the authority of a Minister to administer a particular Act and will make for the more businesslike government of the country. The Bill will have retrospective operation to the date of appointment of the present Ministry.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (11.41 a.m.): There is nothing in the Bill that we can argue with. The Government have decided to call

the official Secretaries “Ministers” and the Bill merely consolidates the titles of Ministers under the Acts Interpretation Act.

Let me take the opportunity to mention consolidation generally; it has been mentioned in previous Committees. The need for consolidation was strikingly brought to my notice last year when I asked for housing legislation from Sydney. I received a pile of amendment Bills which would have taken a layman like myself perhaps months to struggle through. To a great extent we have the same difficulty in Queensland. Annotated tables are distributed annually but usually the tables and the indexing are rather vague. It is very difficult to study and analyse the legislation. There has been no consolidation of Queensland laws since 1936. There has been no real attempt to make existing legislation more easily understandable to the ordinary citizen.

In New South Wales they have what they call a cumulative supplement of New South Wales Statutes which is issued each year by the Law Book Company, paid for by subscribers. It gives a more-easily followed list of amendments, including some definition of the actual amendments brought in from time to time. It is not altogether satisfactory from the point of view of consolidation. One difficulty in Queensland is that reprints are not allowable in courts of law. Whilst reprints are one method by which we can consolidate legislation we must give the legal fraternity a more accessible form of consolidation that will be acceptable in courts of law. I consider that South Australia has an excellent method. Under its Amendments Incorporation Act of 1937 reprints of existing legislation are issued in an annual volume. Section 6 of the Act provides—

“Any Act reprinted pursuant to this Act shall in the courts and by all tribunals by its presence be judicially noticed and deemed for all purposes to be an Act of Parliament of South Australia.”

It gives legal sanction to all reprints issued under that particular legislation. I suggest to the Attorney-General that if it is not possible to issue a full consolidation of Queensland legislation quickly that consideration be given to the introduction of legislation similar to the South Australian Act. It would be of great advantage to the legal fraternity. Together with a cumulative supplement with greater detail in the indexing of annual volumes it would enable the layman to study and follow legislation.

Mr. POWER (Barooka) (11.44 a.m.): I see no reason why we should oppose the Bill. The Act was previously known as the Acts Shortening Act. It was introduced for interpretation purposes and the Bill is now brought in because of the change of designation from “Secretary” to “Minister”

and to clarify the position about the Minister for Justice and the Attorney-General. The Bill is purely of a machinery nature.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Attorney-General) (11.45 a.m.): I wish to reply briefly to the hon. member for Kedron. I was very interested in the hon. member's suggestion about the consolidation of the laws and that some action be taken to make our statutes generally more simple and accessible to the people who need to refer to them. Similar suggestions have been put to me by other persons, particularly by members of the legal profession on this side of the House. I know that the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt, the hon. member for Kurilpa and the hon. member for Windsor are very interested in this question. I can assure all hon. members that the matter has received my attention up to a certain stage and it will receive much more detailed attention when I am able to get round to it.

The previous Government left us so many financial, economic and administrative problems that it is necessary to clean them up first, before we deal with the not so urgent matter of law reform.

Motion (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Munro, read a first time.

CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Taylor, Clayfield, in the chair.)

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier) (11.51 a.m.): I move—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Constitution of Queensland by amending the Constitution Acts Amendment Act of 1953, in a certain particular, and by further amending the Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1896 and the Officials in Parliament Acts, 1896 to 1953, each in certain particulars.”

The Bill removes from the Constitution of Queensland the formula for determining ministerial and parliamentary salaries which was introduced by the Labour Government in 1953. Under that formula ministerial and parliamentary salaries were tied to the classification under the Public Service Award—State, which the then Labour Government regarded as most comparable to the increased salaries provided in the 1953 Act for hon. members.

This particular classification happened to be applicable in 1953 to the position of Under-Secretary, but I want to make it clear that the tie was to the classification, as distinct from Under-Secretaries' salaries.

I mention as a matter of interest that subsequently the Industrial Court removed Under-Secretaries to a substantially increased classification, but left in the award the classification to which ministerial and parliamentary salaries were tied in 1953. At that time the Country and Liberal Parties formed the Opposition. Members of those parties strenuously opposed the measure, to the limit of their parliamentary power, stating that the time was entirely inopportune. In fact, the objections on that occasion stung the then Acting Premier so much that he added to this wrongful legislation by way of amendment a most unjust rider requiring members to notify in writing their acceptance of the monetary increase provided in the legislation.

Any hon. member who did not give that notice within 28 days after the legislation was passed did not get the monetary increase. It was a remarkable provision, because, if an hon. member is entitled to a certain salary, why should it be necessary for him to apply to the Clerk of Parliament before the salary can be paid to him.

The Leader of the Queensland Labour Party who at that time was Premier, on his return from overseas, had to apply in writing to the Clerk of Parliament for the increased salary approved by Parliament. What a travesty of justice! What would have been the reaction if the Acting Premier at that time had written a similar provision into the industrial legislation of this State?

The effect of the amendment was that three of my Parliamentary colleagues and myself did not receive the increase because we would not, in principle, apply for it. I have been legally advised that the deprivation no longer applies to three Ministers but the hon. member for Aubigny is still adversely affected. I thought at the time and I still think that the then Government added iniquity to wrong and we propose to repeal that provision by the Bill I am introducing. The removal of the formula whereby Ministerial and Parliamentary salaries were tied to the Public Service involves an amendment to two Acts, the Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1896 and the Officials in Parliament Acts, 1896 to 1953. The tie was effected by a provision put in those Acts in 1953. It was entirely wrong in principle; it should never have been enacted and we are taking this step of repealing it.

We agree entirely with the Public Service Unions that the tying of Ministerial and Parliamentary salaries to the Public Service Award of the State was unfair to the Public Service.

Mr. Aikens: And most unfair to Parliamentarians.

Mr. NICKLIN: We were of that opinion in 1953 and we are still of the opinion that Ministerial and Parliamentary salaries should be adjusted, as warranted, from time to time,

by an independent tribunal specifically appointed for the purpose. No special legislation is required to set up such a tribunal and presently the matter of salaries does not warrant such a tribunal. Salaries are to be allowed to stand as at present adjusted under the 1953 legislation. The Bill makes provision for this. This puts members of this House in quite a favoured position compared with members in other Australian Parliaments. For example, the salary of a member of the Queensland House is and will continue to be £2,501 10s. a year. The comparative salaries of the Commonwealth and other State Parliamentarians are—

Commonwealth ..	£2,350 per annum
New South Wales ..	£1,975 per annum
Victoria	£1,600 per annum
South Australia ..	£1,900, £1,950 and £1,975
according to distance the member lives from the Adelaide G.P.O.	
Western Australia .	£2,100 per annum
Tasmania	£1,382 per annum (Basic salary)

Those salaries, of course, are exclusive of allowances. The allowance in Queensland, until recently adjusted, ranged from £100 to £275 an electorate, but they now range from £65 to £400 an electorate. The new scale of allowances was arrived at by taking three factors into account, the distance of the electorate from the metropolitan area, the area of the electorate and the number of electors concerned.

I think hon. members will agree that the new basis will give justice.

Mr. Power: Did you finally determine the new basis?

Mr. NICKLIN: Yes.

Mr. Power: You have never notified members of it.

Mr. NICKLIN: Hon. members will be notified in the near future. Hon. members will agree that under the new arrangement taking those factors into consideration, those representing the far North and western electorates will get their dues in regard to the allowances paid. However, when we compare the allowances paid to hon. members in Queensland we find that they are very much below those paid to hon. members in other Parliaments of Australia.

For example, the members of the House of Representatives receive an allowance of £600 or £800 per annum, depending on whether the seat is an urban or rural one. New South Wales electoral allowances range from £500 to £800 per annum. In Victoria the electoral allowances are divided into four classes: metropolitan, £400 per annum; urban, £600 per annum; inner-country, £700 per annum; outer-country, £800 per annum. In Western Australia, members whose electorates are distant more than 50 miles from the metropolitan area receive an extra payment

of £50. Other allowances are payable in Western Australia but I could not get the information in time for the introduction of this Bill. The Tasmanian basic salary is adjustable quarterly in accordance with the fluctuations in the cost of living. Members are also paid electorate allowances ranging from £650 to £800 per annum.

Mr. Aikens: And in Canberra members get over £3 a day for every day that they attend in Canberra.

Mr. NICKLIN: We are not concerned with what they get in Canberra; we are concerned with what we are responsible for in this State.

Briefly, the purpose of this Bill is to peg parliamentary salaries at the existing level. Any alteration in the scale of parliamentary salaries will require fresh legislation. In accordance with the policy of my Government, no alteration in parliamentary salaries will be made until after a report is furnished by an independent tribunal appointed to consider the matters. At the moment, the Government are of the opinion that the parliamentary salary now pegged by this Bill is adequate for members in this Chamber.

Mr. Wood: Can you tell us the type of tribunal that you have in mind, or the personnel of the tribunal?

Mr. NICKLIN: The Government have not given consideration to that, but, without committing myself or the Government, I should say that it would be along the lines of the tribunal appointed in Victoria a number of years ago to investigate parliamentary salaries there. Upon the basis of that report, the first adjustment of salaries was made by the hon. member for South Brisbane, and that adjustment was considered by every section of the community to be very fair at that time. I think that justice will be done to members by a determination of that tribunal and the public of Queensland will appreciate that some basis was used to adjust parliamentary salaries.

Mr. Gair: Mr. Justice Matthew's services were made available to the Tasmanian Government for the same purpose.

Mr. NICKLIN: Yes. I repeat that this Government are of opinion that an independent tribunal should be appointed to give an opinion to the Government on the quantum before any alteration is made in parliamentary salaries.

Mr. WOOD (North Toowoomba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.5 p.m.): The Premier has given us a brief outline of the contents of the Bill. I shall reserve most of my comments until I have seen it, but there is something that I want to say now.

Firstly, as this is not a Bill to alter the salaries but simply to establish them at their present level, it should not produce the

unfortunate wrangling that seems to develop every time a measure comes into any Parliament in the Commonwealth to increase the salaries of parliamentarians. We have seen that happen here on so many occasions before. Many of the arguments used in the Chamber by hon. members in opposing measures have been in direct contradistinction to the opinions expressed privately by some of them. I make no apology for saying that. Many hon. members moved around the corridors of the House when we were the Government and pulled our coat-tails, saying, "Whatever you do, do not let anybody change your opinion," and some of those very same hon. members made directly opposite statements in the Chamber.

Mr. Gair: They wanted the increase but not the odium.

Mr. WOOD: That is correct. They wanted the increase but did not want the responsibility for bringing it in. Hon. members now sitting in the Chamber know that what I am saying is perfectly true.

Mr. Gaven: I am not one of them.

Mr. WOOD: I entirely absolve the hon. member for Southport, among others. It would not be right for me to mention any particular name but hon. members on both sides know that what I am saying is true and that some of those who helped to create the unseemly wrangles were most vociferous privately in urging members of the Government to stand firm against all opposition. Naturally the onus is always on the Government. It does not matter whether they do it themselves or appoint a tribunal. Parliament cannot escape its responsibility whatever system it introduces to determine parliamentary salaries.

The attitude of the Opposition is clear. If Parliament decides to abolish the measure introduced by the previous Government whereby salaries were tied to comparable Public Service salaries and to appoint a tribunal, we would have no objection. But I very much fear that the setting up of a tribunal is just the easy way out. It is an easy way for a Government to pass responsibility on to somebody else. No matter what a tribunal may recommend, it is still the responsibility of the Government to state their attitude towards the recommendation. We have seen in the Commonwealth Parliament and in other Parliaments where tribunals have been set up and recommendations received and then the eyes picked out of those recommendations by the Parliaments. They have accepted those pleasing to them and overlooked those with which they have disagreed. No matter how they go about it, the Government cannot escape the responsibility of deciding. I do not condone in any circumstances in any Parliament the tendency for the Government to escape their own responsibilities. The Parliament of the State has the final say. While it

may appoint a tribunal—and we will not object to it if the other provisions are altered—I believe the Government will not have finally solved the problem of the determination of parliamentary salaries.

The Premier spoke of the clause that was written into the previous Act at the last minute advising hon. members that they must apply for increases. Every hon. member knows that it was written in because of provocation by an hon. member now sitting opposite. The hon. member for Aubigny interjected and asked the then Acting Premier why he did not write the clause in. If it had not been for that provocation, the clause would not have been written in.

Mr. Munro: Do you think that an interjection justified the Acting Premier in putting it in?

Mr. WOOD: Whether it did or not has nothing to do with it. Hon. members opposite must still accept their share of the responsibility when they were members of a party that suggested that the then Acting Premier should write it in.

The tying of ministerial and parliamentary salaries to comparable Public Service salaries was a genuine attempt to end for all time the sordid and unsavoury wrangles we have had in the Chamber from time to time whenever salaries were discussed. The then Government endeavoured to establish a fair basis for payment. If comparable Public Service salaries went up parliamentary salaries were to follow automatically. Do not forget that there is no guarantee that in a week, a year, or five years there could not be a decrease equally as steep as the increases. Within a short period there were two sharp increases but we have no guarantee that there will not be a sharp decrease. We should be prepared to take the bad with the good. Having established a basis and equated the value of our work with that of a certain public servant, we should be prepared to accept a move in either direction. Mark my words, if there is a downward move it will be just as steep.

The 1953 Bill should have settled for all time the interminable discussion on payments to be made to Ministers and private members of Parliament. Once that basis is upset the whole question is reopened. Every time a tribunal is appointed we come back into the Chamber to decide what alterations have to be made. We decide, not the tribunal. Briefly, that is the attitude of the Opposition. We believe that no good purpose would be served by breaking the tie between parliamentary and public service salaries. If it is decided that the tie shall be removed, while not recognising that the tribunal is an end to all the troubles, we do not say that it will do much good, and we do not say that it will do great harm because it does not take any responsibility away from Parliament.

As to allowances, naturally we cannot express an opinion because so far we have had only the general statement that allowances will be paid on the basis of distance, area, and population. I hope we do not see the position develop where an hon. member from the country who has to live away from home for a greater part of the week finds himself reduced—

Mr. Aikens: Some of us are here for weeks at a time.

Mr. WOOD: That is correct, but the hon. gentleman did say that hon. members from northern and western areas would receive substantial increases. That is where big increases are needed. If hon. members from electorates like Cairns, Mourilyan, Cook and Carpentaria are doing their jobs conscientiously when Parliament is sitting they see very little of their families. Obviously until we have seen the scale of allowances we can offer no criticism. The Bill contains two major provisions—the first, the pegging of existing salaries, and the second, the cessation of the system whereby salaries are tied to comparable public-service salaries. I reserve further comment until I have seen the Bill.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) (12.16 p.m.): Let us get down to facts and truth—things with which I am very closely associated. The section of the Act that will be repealed by the Bill was framed as a result of a compromise between the Labour Party and Joe Bukowski. We remember the time when the Labour Party Caucus decided to raise salaries by £200 and allowances by £200. That was brought up in Caucus and reported in the Press. Then Big Joe got to work at Dunstan House and said, "You cannot do it." The result was—and hon. members will remember it—we had two separate A.L.P. Caucus meetings. There was the £200 extra allowance boys and the £100 a year allowance boys meeting in different rooms in the House. Finally, as a result of a plea by the ex-hon. member for Toowoomba, the then Acting Premier, Caucus accepted the £200 a year increase in salary and the £100 a year allowance. They obeyed the whiplash of Joe Bukowski at Dunstan House. The then Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Frank Roberts, left the Labour Party because Bukowski put the same screw on him and the Labour aldermen as was put on the Labour members in this House. So if we are going to discuss anything in Parliament, let us tell the blasted truth about it and be done with it. It is the same A.W.U. gang who does not believe in Parliament fixing its own salaries who recently—it sneaked out; they did not have the guts, courage or decency to publish it—jacked up their own salaries. District secretaries now get £2,500 a year, organisers £2,300 a year, and Joe jacked his own salary up to £3,000 a year. This provision was introduced as a compromise by the then Acting Premier, and it was a pretty good

compromise. It quietened down the 200-a-year salary-and-allowance-boys who were flying the flag of rebellion.

I make my position perfectly clear on every occasion that a rise in salary is debated. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that in the final analysis Parliament should be the master of its own destiny. Hon. members should have the courage and guts to face up to their responsibility. We should have the courage to say to the electors, "We believe that members are entitled to a certain annual salary and allowance." We should have the courage to go back to our electors and justify the stand we took. I have always done so, and I think all other hon. members should have the courage to do the same thing. It is true, as the Leader of the Opposition said, that when there is a rise in salary in the air, members will come round pulling your coat tails.

I stand four-square on this subject and I have never deviated one hair's breadth in my attitude. I am the most popular hon. member in the House when a Bill to increase Parliamentary salaries is suggested. Everyone says to me, "Good on you, Tom. Get into it. Get as much as you can for us." And so on. In the Chamber, however, when the motion is put, I find that many who clap me on the back in the corridor and down in the broom cupboard and the room I occupied before I was relegated to the broom cupboard, square-off to their electors by voting against any increase in salary, and adopt an attitude of pious opposition in the debate. Let us be courageous enough to face our responsibilities. I know what I am worth, and the people of Mundingburra would gladly see me get it.

An Opposition Member: What do you reckon you are worth?

Mr. AIKENS: I would not be overpaid at £5,000 a year, bearing in mind the work I do, and if Parliament passed a Bill to give me £5,000 a year, I would vote for it and take it. There should be no mistake about that. The people of Mundingburra would congratulate me on it.

Parliament cannot pass a Bill discriminating between hon. members on salaries. I could not take £5,000 a year if I knew that some other hon. members were also to be paid £5,000 a year, because on past performances some of them are not worth 2s. a week. Consequently, Parliament must reach a fair average of the salary to be paid. I am quite happy to take the salary that is given to me, knowing that I am worth more, and knowing that the people of Mundingburra realise I am worth more. I have always made my attitude clear. The Premier will agree that I have always expressed the same sentiments when discussing Parliamentary salaries and related subjects. How can we appoint a tribunal and say we will wholeheartedly accept its decisions, if we think the decisions are wrong or unjust.

Mr. Mann: You are not bound to accept them.

Mr. AIKENS: No. That is the point made by the Leader of the Opposition. If the hon. member had been in the Chamber, he would have heard it. After a tribunal makes a finding on Parliamentary salaries, it is up to Parliament to accept or reject its recommendations. Parliament may accept them in toto or in part, or reject them in toto or in part. In the final analysis it comes back to Parliament, so why go through the hypocrisy of appointing a commission to determine Parliamentary salaries?

I do not object to the appointment of a commission to make recommendations after taking evidence from various hon. members on the salary they should get, but if the Government, after they appoint a commission, are going to say, "The commission has decided that a member of Parliament should be paid this salary and that decision is final," I would oppose it, because the Government would be constituting a commission with powers superior to Parliament.

The hon. member for Windsor recently said it was shocking that the Attorney-General should have written into an Act the power to veto the decision of a commission appointed by Parliament. To write anything else into an Act or deprive him of that power would be a negation of democracy, and place the commission above Parliament, which created it.

Mr. Power: I did not have that power. It was vested in the Governor in Council.

Mr. AIKENS: Do not quibble. That is a distinction without a difference. I know the position of the Governor in Council.

Mr. Power: I should like to know who fixed the telephone allowance of £14 for the Baroona electorate. It would not pay the rent.

Mr. AIKENS: The hon. member should not squeal. If he was in the North and had to put his hand in his pocket and pay the expenses he have to pay he would have something to squeal about.

I now turn to the attitude of the Press, and particularly "The Courier-Mail." When hon. members received their last increase, that newspaper published the photographs of all hon. members on the front page. Incidentally, some drongo was rung in under my name, but that did not matter. It certainly was not my photograph, and where it was obtained I do not know. I did not mind it, as I am impervious to Press criticism. I think the caption read, "£47-a-week loafers," or "£47-a-week parasites." That newspaper tried to stir up the public against an increase to members of Parliament. I do not know whether any other member of Parliament does it, and I doubt it, but on every occasion I address my electors I tell them the salary I receive and I produce my Parliamentary

pay docket. I have it here if the Press would like to see it. I am quite open about what I get as a member of Parliament and I have nothing to hide from my constituents. I hide nothing from my people and that is why my majority goes up and up with every election.

Mr. Windsor: What is it?

Mr. AIKENS: Here it is and I hope the Press take the particulars down. There is a common belief amongst people that members of Parliament do not pay income tax. Have hon. members ever struck that? I have come across it frequently. It has been said that members of Parliament receive a salary of £47 a week clear for their pockets. I will tell everyone how much goes into my pocket every week and I hope the Press have the guts to publish this information. I know that the reporters will take the particulars down, but what the editor or sub-editors will do with it is another matter. If I am not worth more to the people of Mundingburra than the editor of "The Courier-Mail" is to Queensland I would have the decency to resign. My gross fortnightly pay is £95 19s. and from that I pay £4 a fortnight superannuation which goes down the drain because I will never collect it. You have to be out of Parliament to collect superannuation and I will never be out of it to collect it. I pay by way of income tax deduction £20 8s. a fortnight. I have no other source of income except my parliamentary salary. The total deduction a fortnight is £24 8s. leaving £71 11s. each fortnight which means £35 15s. 6d. a week. That is a vast difference from the £47 a week "The Courier-Mail" is always harping on. It has deliberately created in the minds of the people that we get £47 a week clear whereas in fact we get £35 15s. 6d. and out of that we have to pay, with the exception of the small allowances given us, all expenses incidental to being a member of Parliament. All hon. members know of the "bites" made on members of Parliament. I am happy to pay them because when an hon. member is made a president or vice-president of this or that organisation his little donation helps them along. I have to come to Brisbane to live for four months of the year and pay for my accommodation. This is taken out of one's salary and meagre allowance. I say that were I in my original position as a first-class driver in the Railway Department I would be earning more money net a fortnight than I am earning now. Let "The Courier-Mail" have the guts, which I doubt they have, to publish what members of Parliament really get.

There are a couple of matters that I think the Premier should look at. In the first place I say that the salary of the Chairman of Committees is totally inadequate. He gets £250 more than an ordinary member of

Parliament; the Whips get £100 more than an ordinary member and, in view of the responsibilities attached to the office of Chairman of Committees to give him only £150 more than a Whip is an injustice. Furthermore, the Premier might have a look at the salary granted to Mr. Speaker. He will remember that not last time but the time before when the question of salaries was raised in Parliament the Speaker got the same salary as a Minister of the Crown but he was left behind when the salaries of Ministers went up. The Premier is advised to look at the salaries of the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees, the latter particularly.

When fixing the salary of a member of Parliament one should fix it not on the basis of the actual work a member does for his constituency. Some members of Parliament are good. I am not the only good member. There might be, for all I know, other members who are as efficient and as conscientious as I am. If there are any other members as efficient and conscientious as I, I am prepared to give them full credit for their efficiency and conscientiousness. There are, however, members—and there is nothing to be gained by getting away from the fact—who are time-servers and straightout loafers. One should not fix the salary of a member on the basis of whether he works hard or loafs on his electorate. The salary should be fixed on what an hon. member should do for his electorate.

Salaries should be fixed on the representation to which an electorate is entitled. Whether a member gives to his electorate the type of service that it needs and deserves is a matter between the member and his electorate. That is true democracy. If they want a time-server and a loafer and they keep electing him, that is their business, not ours. If they want a conscientious man and an efficient man and they keep electing him, that is purely a matter between the electors and the member. It is not the business of this Parliament to determine whether a man is inefficient or whether he is a hard worker or a loafer. I repeat, for Parliament to have any say in that would be a negation of democracy. Salaries of members of Parliament should be fixed on what a member should do if he were a good and conscientious member, but I am afraid that in the past the matter has not been approached in that way.

I do not care whether parliamentary salaries are tied up with Public Service salaries or whether they are not. I do not care whether the Government puts into practice the rumour that is current that now the Country-Liberal Party are in power they are going to make Parliament purely and simply a haven for the wealthy man who can afford to accept little or no salary. There is too great a tendency to belittle the work done by Parliament and Parliamentarians. If the present Government

want to keep out of Parliament by economic pressure and by financial starvation the representatives of the working class who rely on the parliamentary salary as their sole means of livelihood, they will not get rid of me that way. I would not care if they abolished parliamentary salaries tomorrow. If it were part of their policy to try to weed out the genuine representatives of the ordinary people, the working-class people, I should go to work for eight months of the year in Townsville and come down to Parliament for the other four months of the year at my own expense and pay everything out of my own pocket. I would not see the people of Mundingburra deprived of their representation. Whether or not these rumours have any foundation in fact, I do not know; but if this is a step towards a gradual and continuous reduction in salaries that will make it virtually impossible for a man to come into Parliament and live on his parliamentary salary, I shall regret that very much, but I can assure the Government that it will not drive me out of Parliament.

Mr. GAVEN: What are you worrying about, then?

Mr. AIKENS: I could live where the hon. member would starve.

Mr. GAVEN: I will take you up on that.

Mr. AIKENS: I would get a seven-course meal where the hon. member would not get a bit of damper and corned beef. I have come up the hard way. I told the previous speaker that I was a corned-beef-and-damper man. I was born one, reared one, and will always remain one because I am too old to change now. If that is the ultimate aim of the Government, then it might affect some members of the Chamber, but I live pretty frugally.

That is the message I give the Government. I do not care what they do in a spirit of political vindictiveness. If they are going to be politically vindictive, that is all right with me. I can set my course to the compass bearing that is given by the Government. If they are trying to squeeze the ordinary man out of Parliament, I shall still be here even though the ranks of the Opposition may be somewhat depleted by economic pressure, and I know that one or two members of the Opposition would be able to get a living where I could get a living. I do not care whether they appoint a commission or a tribunal in the future or not to recommend a basis on which parliamentary salaries should be fixed, because in the long run, as the Leader of the Opposition said, it comes back to this Parliament. We are the elected representatives of the people; we are the controllers of the State, and we should have the courage and the decency to face up to all our responsibilities, including the determination of parliamentary salaries and allowances.

Mr. GAIR (South Brisbane) (12.35 p.m.): I rise to support the Bill because I believe experience has shown that it is impracticable and inappropriate to relate the salaries of parliamentarians to the salaries of public servants or, for that matter, of people in other callings. The principle was introduced in 1953 and, with the Leader of the Opposition, I believe it was done with a genuine desire to put an end to the periodical wrangles about salaries. However, experience has shown not only that it is unfair to public servants, but also that it can operate unfairly to parliamentarians and it places members of the Industrial Court in a very invidious position when they are dealing with the award covering the Under Secretaries or other public servants to whose salaries the salaries of parliamentarians are related.

So the set-up with salaries of parliamentarians is very unsatisfactory. What are the alternative methods of determining their increases or decreases? For very many years Parliament itself determined the salary of its members.

Mr. Aikens: And there was a lot of merit in that.

Mr. GAIR: I subscribe to that view, too. Against that, it is very hard to convince the public of the justice of having parliamentarians determine their own salaries. The alternative suggested by the Premier is an independent tribunal to determine the salaries in the same way as an independent tribunal determines the wages and salaries of those engaged in all other callings. Whatever method is adopted, unfortunately a big section of the public will continue to believe that parliamentarians are overpaid.

Mr. Aikens: And that belief is fanned by the Press.

Mr. GAIR: That is indisputably correct.

In the Federal sphere tribunals have been appointed and have made determinations on salaries, allowances and concessions for parliamentarians and, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, the members of the Government of the day have merely picked the eyes out of the recommendations. They have overlooked or failed to give effect to those recommendations that have not appealed to them because they would be a disadvantage to parliamentarians. If we set up a tribunal we must give effect to its findings whether they are favourable or unfavourable; otherwise our case for the establishment of the tribunal falls down.

Mr. Aikens: You would be giving away the powers of Parliament if you did that.

Mr. GAIR: If we set up a tribunal?

Mr. Aikens: No, if you accepted the recommendations in toto whether they were right or wrong.

Mr. GAIR: I do not know that it would be entirely correct to say that.

In the first instance the Government determine that a tribunal shall be set up. The tribunal makes recommendations and the Premier in all probability brings down legislation based on those recommendations.

Mr. Aikens: Based on the recommendations.

Mr. GAIR: That is so. An opportunity would then be given to Parliament to determine the matter in the final analysis. I believe that the existing set-up has been a disadvantage for a section of the Public Service. When they go before the Industrial Court for a variation of their award I believe that members of the Court have in mind that if they increase the salaries of these public servants they are also going to increase the salaries of parliamentarians.

Mr. Aikens: And their own salaries too.

Mr. GAIR: That is so. It is an unsatisfactory position. We should be prepared to put up with the odium and have the courage to do it ourselves or appoint a tribunal. Surely the qualified men appointed to carry out investigations as to the just and adequate salaries to be paid to representatives of the people would have regard to all the difficulties associated with the calling. Indeed, hon. members themselves would have the right and opportunity to present evidence to the tribunal in setting out their own case. On the other hand the public could state their view—although they have not shown any great desire to appear before tribunals in other places. They would have an opportunity to say that members of Parliament should not get any further increase in salary.

I favour the Bill because I think it is impractical and inappropriate that we should be tied to the salary of other people, in the Public Service or outside. We should either do it ourselves as a Parliament or appoint a tribunal.

Mr. Aikens: I favour the former method.

Mr. GAIR: Yes. There was a time when I believed that Parliament should have the right to do it, but there were disadvantages. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the spectacle of hon. members of the former Opposition wanting an increase in salary but adopting a hypocritical attitude in the Chamber because they were not prepared to accept their measure of blame or responsibility for an increase. As I said by way of interjection, they want an increase in salary but they are not prepared to accept any measure of odium that might arise in the minds of the public. That is a most unsatisfactory set-up and one of my objections to the matter being left to Parliament. I have seen it happen on more than one occasion. Hon. members of the Opposition have resisted increases and spoken about

the poverty of primary producers and others, and yet were more enthusiastic about an increase than Government members.

Mr. Aikens: More enthusiastic out in the corridors.

Mr. GAIR: That is what I am saying. They come in here and adopt a different attitude. That destroys the virtue of Parliament's doing it itself. I have given a good deal of thought to the matter over the years. In 1948, when I was Acting Premier, we adjusted the wages of Parliamentarians and took as our basis the determination of a tribunal in Victoria. On that occasion the then Leader of the Opposition, who is now Premier, and members of the Opposition conferred with me and other members of the Government, and we came to a mutual agreement on what the increase should be and we were supported by the decisions of the Victorian tribunal in this connection. It was then that an alteration was made in the salary of the Speaker. The Speaker in Victoria received a salary less than a Minister. I think the same thing applies in most of the States; I have not checked it in recent times. With all due respects to the occupant of the Speakership, from my own Parliamentary experience I would say that a Speaker does not merit the salary of a Minister. He has not the same responsibility as a Minister has. The Speaker controls the House when Parliament is sitting. He shares the responsibility for the conduct of Parliament with the Chairman of Committees, who has an equally arduous task. All amendments to legislation and discussion on the Financial Statement and Estimates take place in Committee. The Speaker has responsibility outside Parliament in looking after the management of the House, but he is not tied to the job in the same way as a Minister is. He is not required to introduce legislation, answer questions, run a department, and travel about the State attending to ministerial duties. That is the reason why the salary of the Speaker was not increased at that time proportionate with the salary of Ministers. I think that the salary of Speakers in every State Parliament, unless they have been altered since 1948, are less than that of Ministers.

Mr. Aikens: Do you not think that the Chairman of Committees is poorly paid with £250 more than an ordinary member?

Mr. GAIR: I might agree with the hon. member there. I cannot argue that the salary of a Speaker should be equal to that of a Minister. I do not think that there is any comparison between the two portions. I approve of the elimination of the principle that obtains at the moment. The most satisfactory way to deal with the question of salaries for Parliamentarians is to place it in the hands of a tribunal.

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) (12.49 p.m.): This is a matter of willingness to accept responsibility, rather than pass it on to a tribunal so as to avoid unfavourable

public reaction. Therein lies the strength or weakness of any Government.

If hon. members exercise a sense of proportion, decency and justice, no tribunal is better equipped to fix parliamentary salaries than Parliament itself. It has been said that Parliament is the supreme body and must not delegate its authority. I remind the Government that when they were in Opposition no one deplored delegation of power by Parliament to an outside, non-elected body more than they did. Members of Parliament should have the courage to fix their own salaries. I do not suggest that we should be reckless or fix an extravagant salary. I have never heard of a politician dying from starvation or under-nourishment while he was a parliamentarian, nor have I heard of the wives of parliamentarians having to work.

Many extraneous and irrelevant arguments are introduced from time to time. Those hypocritical statements cause much harm. The opinion is heard that politicians should be paid a good salary to ensure they are honest. There is no way of making a man honest if he is not born with that characteristic. So that argument falls to the ground.

The issue should be left to hon. members and their electors. After all, each hon. member is elected under a democratic system and irrespective of the opinions of our colleagues we must all remember that every hon. member before election must run the gauntlet of the ballot box, the judgment of his constituents.

I agree that some powers must be delegated by Parliament, but the delegation of powers, authority or responsibility by Parliament must be reduced to an absolute minimum.

Suppose a tribunal is appointed and it makes a recommendation. That recommendation must be ratified by Parliament.

Mr. Aikens: Or rejected.

Mr. BURROWS: That is so, and the responsibility comes back to Parliament. Some of the electors may be fooled by the appointment of a tribunal. That reminds me of a story about a shearer and an Indian hawker in the West who was giving credit to shearers pending the cut-out of the shed. The shearers let their beards grow during the time they were there. After the shearing they went to the hawker in their shearing attire and settled their debts. One of their number, however, resolved to leave without paying his debt, and while he was getting dressed he realised that he did not have a stud. He thought, "I will go down to the hawker. He will not know me now that I have shaved and have had a good clean-up." He approached the hawker and asked for a stud. The hawker said to him, "Have you been working in this shed?" The shearer replied, "Oh, no, I am just a traveller going through." He handed him the stud and asked for 6d. The man handed him 6d. and the hawker said, "I might not know you with your whiskers off but I am sure Allah will."

However, we deceive ourselves in believing that we are fooling the electors by referring this matter to a tribunal because the greatest mistake any politician can make is to underestimate the intelligence of the electors as a whole. They will not be deceived; they will know that we have only passed the buck. When Federal Parliamentarians rejected the recommendations of the tribunal that they disliked and accepted only those that they liked they did not fool the people, nor were the people fooled by the findings of the tribunal when Federal Parliamentarians got a very handsome increase in salary. Within six months or so after the tribunal made its findings one of the members of that body was given a lucrative position in the Public Service.

Mr. Aikens: Quite recently when they jacked up the daily allowances for members of the Federal Parliament to £3 a day, the matter did not go to a tribunal.

Mr. BURROWS: I agree with the hon. member for Mundingburra. What is the use of fooling ourselves by thinking we are fooling the public? If we are not prepared to accept our responsibility in doing this job we should not be here. Let us not bother to quote the mistakes of the past. We are elected to govern the country, and if we are not prepared to govern, but only to enter the social side, to let the unpleasant things or those that attract stigma or odium or might do us harm at the ballot box go by the board, we should not be here. I believe the Premier sincerely wishes to see that every member is paid a reasonable sum for his services. But I think it would be better if we got together on a non-party basis and voted on the matter. Let us face up to our responsibilities. I do not want to be a hero and score off the other fellow. I do not want to go outside and say that Tom Aikens from Mundingburra voted for £2,500 and I only agreed on £2,000. If the £2,500 is carried I will take it as eagerly as the hon. member for Mundingburra. This is our responsibility; let us face up to it. The more we do in this House and the less we delegate to outsiders the better.

Motion (Mr. Nicklin) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Nicklin, read a first time.

SUPPLY.

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT— RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Taylor, Clayfield, in the chair.)

Debate resumed from 26 September (see p. 358) on Mr. Hiley's motion—

“That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1957-1958, a sum

not exceeding £1,132 to defray the salary of the Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor.”

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (2.16 p.m.): As this is the first occasion upon which we have had to speak as the Opposition on the presentation of the Budget, I should like to congratulate the Treasurer on his presentation of the Financial Statement for this year. At the same time, we cannot help feeling somewhat disappointed that more information has not been given to the Committee on this very important occasion of a new Government's taking over the reins of office in this State. We think we could have been given more information about the policy of the Government in regard to money matters. The Financial Statement appears to offer some criticism of the administration by the previous Treasurer. However, other than by attempting to outline the policy of the political parties represented in the Government and implement it in the Budget, it seems that the Government are content to carry on in the same way as did the previous administrations in this State. I realise the difficulties of the Treasurer on this occasion. He has not had a great deal of time to actually study the forms of expenditure and their different departmental categories on the last occasions. Notwithstanding that, I think he could have given to the Committee some criticism of past administrations and something on which we could have made some constructive suggestions.

I think it worthwhile to mention the extraordinary likeness that exists between the hon. gentleman's assessment of the Australian economy and the assessment of the Australian economy made by the Federal Treasurer, Sir Arthur Fadden. In commencing his presentation of the Federal Budget, Sir Arthur Fadden said, “During the past year our economy has gained greatly in stability and strength.” The Treasurer of this State said, “The year just concluded found the general Australian economy one of substantial strength.” Those two statements indicate that both the State Treasurer and the Federal Treasurer agreed that the Australian economy was in a very sound position. I suppose that we on this side of the Chamber could also agree that the economy of Australia, on a very broad basis, has that appearance of stability and a great deal of strength, too. But it is clear that neither the State Treasurer nor the Federal Treasurer has studied the economy from the point of view of the average wage-earner and his family. That is obvious when one reads the State Budget and the Federal Budget. No doubt their outlook is conditioned by the thinking in the particular stratum of society to which they both belong. It is natural that on that basis they should find the Australian economy very strong. Last financial year was certainly distinguished by the very sudden upsurge

of monopoly capitalism in Australia, particularly in relation to the retail trade and banking. In those two respects, we find monopoly capitalism being created. Monopolies are being brought about in the retail trade by mergers and in the banking industry through affiliations with hire purchase companies. Big businesses are making fantastic profits at the expense of small businessmen. An index of the growth of the retail monopolies in Australia, with consequential elimination of small businesses, was given at the recent all-Australian retailers' conference in Brisbane when it was disclosed that in one year the sales of the products of one of the country's biggest manufacturers to small businessmen dropped from 50 to 20 per cent. of total sales and their sales to big business monopolies increased from 50 per cent. to 80 per cent. as the small men were forced out.

Take as an example when Waltons merged with Sears Roebuck several years back. Sears Roebuck are the biggest retailing monopoly in the United States. Indeed they control most of the retail trade there. Since their merger with Waltons in Australia we have heard much propaganda and Press publicity to the effect that it is a great boon to the consumers of Australia, a dream-world of lower prices and cheaper commodities. Usually it is that way for a short time while they are taking over but once the small man is forced out of business the demand is controlled by the monopoly; production is not increased and prices find their own higher level. It is, of course, the perfect system of capitalism which the State and Federal Treasurers seem to delight in attempting to mislead the public into believing is freedom of competition while conversely every effort is being made to destroy competition by the very strength of the financial resources until they have a free run of the market undisciplined by governmental control.

After all, what is wrong with the small businessman? What is wrong with the man who runs the corner shop where the suburbanite who has a bad day at the races can book up a few pounds' worth of groceries or where the housewife can send a child on a Sunday to buy a pound of butter, possibly against the law? Small businesses are an important part of the family life of the small community in particular, but with the growth of monopolies brought about by the present financial system, they are gradually being forced out.

Mr. Pizzey: You cannot buy many of those small businesses very cheaply.

Mr. LLOYD: They will be cheap in the future because recently Walton Sears announced their intention of extending their business to the suburban areas, as they have already done in New South Wales. When Walton Sears enter into competition with already-established large businesses like the

B.C.C. and Allan and Stark, the small businessman will not be able to operate. He may be all right just now. A very popular story being spread is that the large businesses are attracting business to the suburbs. Perhaps they are, temporarily, but once control is taken by several large monopolies entering firstly into competition and then into arrangement, the small business man will disappear from the community and his disappearance will be one of the greatest tragedies of community life in Australia. Under the system being created by the present financial policy of the Commonwealth Government the individual does not matter. The encouragement of freedom, individuality and enterprise means little to the Tories.

Perkins in "The Roosevelt I Knew," says—

"The great industrialists and steel corporations learned from the depression that prosperity was a two-faced goddess, and that no-one would be prosperous unless the workers had a modest prosperity.

"Their wages must enable them to be a continuous market for consumer goods, and in turn the makers and distributors of consumer goods would be a continuous market for steel and durable goods."

How true that is. At the present time with great prosperity in primary production in Australia we find that after all the best market is the man employed in industry. The working man and his family represent the most guaranteed market for consumer goods. Immediately consumption reaches a high level it is essential that there should be expansion and when there is expansion steel and durable goods are in high demand.

There is no doubt that in a country like Australia we can hold the balance with high demand, but only by some measure of control. Once control is lifted altogether from the economy we find the commencement of what has already started in Australia, apparent prosperity but on the other hand the average wage-earner and his family suffering to some extent because of unemployment. I admit that in Australia, in the last year particularly, there has been a rising share market. Possibly it has fallen a little since the launching of the satellite but the share-market has been prosperous. Overseas balances are bright and the balance of trade is sound. But it is not much use Australia's carrying along with an apparent prosperity unless there is an equitable sharing of the prosperity throughout the community. Little thought is given to the 100,000 people at present unemployed in Australia. When introducing the Federal Budget Sir Arthur Fadden made some mention of unemployment and promised that it would be cured. We cannot see any degree of curing at the present time. The Federal Minister for Labour, Mr. Holt, does not seem to think that the increasing unemployment trend in Australia is at all serious. It is serious enough to the unemployed. Unemployed

families with two children are trying to live on the meagre increased Social Service contribution of a maximum of £6 2s. 6d. a week. Out of that they have to pay £4 a week if they are fortunate enough to be in occupation of a New Agreement Housing Commission home. Mr. Holt did not make us any happier when he recently stated that the unemployment position could change early next year when 60,000 additional workers, ex-students from schools and migrants, would arrive on the labour market of Australia. There again is the commencement of another unemployment trend by the sudden entry onto the labour market of 60,000 people within the next 12 months from schools and migration. They have to be found employment or reasonable subsistence. It can be done only by some form of control of the whole of the economy of Australia, by controlling the banking system to the extent that there will be equitable distribution of the wealth the nation undoubtedly possesses. In the meantime the State Treasurer made only passing reference to unemployment. At 30 August, this year there were 7,394 registered unemployed in Queensland. Unemployment is one of the State's big problems which must be tackled. Perhaps 7,394 does not sound a great number when it is said quickly but when we realise it could represent the population of a fair-sized Queensland town we can see its magnitude. They all have families. When we consider that the work force in Australia is not more than 4,000,000 out of a population of approximately 8,000,000 we can see very clearly the trend of unemployment.

There is also another matter that we must consider. I do not believe in making statements in relation to matters of public interest in an endeavour to frighten people, but I cannot see how the Japanese Trade Treaty can have any other effect than add to unemployment throughout Australia generally. Under this treaty we have to rely on the kindness of the noble Japanese to refrain from sending such quantities of their textiles and other goods to Australia that could damage existing industries in this country. The Minister for Labour and Industry has been running round Queensland and Australia talking about the number of new firms that have been registered in this State. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that industry is hesitant about development. This hesitancy may be caused to a slight degree from the world position, but it is mainly due to the worry about the impact that the Japanese Trade Treaty will have on secondary industry. When we remember the effect that similar treaties have had in other countries such as Canada and the United States we must give the matter very serious consideration in this country. Many of the trade unions and employers' organisations are concerned about this problem. Under the treaty some of the trade benefits extended to the Australian producer are referred to. The first is a valuable one for the wool industry.

The Japanese have promised 90 per cent. of the exchange available to Japanese wool-buyers for Australian wool free of customs duty. They agree to allow access for fair average quality wheat to the Japanese market. They also agree to equal access with other countries to 40 per cent. of the Japanese imports of sugar. The same applies to barley. The apparent value of profit production in Australia would be tremendous if there were no adverse reaction to the increased trade. Before this agreement was signed 100,000 tons of Australian sugar was purchased by the Japanese Government at a cost of £6,000,000. According to what Mr. McEwan tells us a delegation of wheat-growers to Japan entered into an agreement with the Japanese to supply them 2,250,000 bushels of fair average quality wheat. That was the first consignment of f.a.q. wheat sent from Australia to Japan since the war. It was evidence of the apparent sincerity of the Japanese.

Mr. Power: And the wheat consumer has had to pay another 4s. a bushel.

Mr. LLOYD: It is a long story. While the treaty between Australia and Japan was being negotiated, the Japanese delegation in Canada was in bother over the quantity and value of Japanese exports to that country under the 1954 agreement. It was bartering with the Canadian Government to increase imports of textiles and other Japanese commodities on the basis that Japan would take the surplus Canadian wheat crop. The treaty between Canada and Japan is virtually identical with the agreement between Australia and Japan. Both treaties illustrate the Japanese characteristic of bargaining. The trade delegation to Australia certainly placed an order for 2,225,000 bushels of Australian wheat, but at the same time they were negotiating with the Canadian Government to take the surplus crop from that country. The agreement to import f.a.q. Australian wheat depends on a breach of the terms of existing agreements with other countries. If Canada refuses to increase imports from Japan, the Japanese will buy more wheat from Australia. In other words, the Japanese are able to play one country against the other and so increase their export trade.

The agreement raises many problems, one being related to the most-favoured-nation tariff treatment accorded to Japan. Previously under the General Agreement of Trade and Tariffs the Australian Government applied quantitative restrictions to Japanese imports to prevent competition with existing secondary industries in Australia, but under the present agreement Japan must receive most-favoured-nation tariff treatment for a period of two years. That more or less makes the Japanese a party to the general agreement, whereas previously it had not been a party. Eventually Japan hopes to be a party to the agreement.

What will be the effect on local employment and the trade benefits for Australian producers? First, the agreement must create unemployment and, second, the benefit to primary producers may not be as great as imagined, because of loss of other overseas markets. Most-favoured-nation tariffs will now be applied to Japanese imports, and Japan will receive the benefits now accorded to other foreign countries that are parties to the general agreement. There is to be no interference with the principle of preference to British goods, but there will be interference in the balance of trade between Australia, the United Kingdom and Continental countries. Japanese goods will be sold in competition with those of Australian industries, and with goods imported from the United Kingdom and other Continental countries.

We must remember that the United Kingdom has been the heaviest buyer of our wool in past years. Continental countries also are important purchasers of many of our primary products. If we interfere with the quantities of goods imported into Australia from those countries there will be a diminution in the buying by those countries from Australia. Goods from those countries cannot be sold in competition with Japanese goods and there will consequently be a deterioration in exports to Australia upsetting the balance between this country and those countries. There will be the natural effect of the cutting-down in the purchases of primary products from Australia. A magazine was produced by the Victorian Chamber of Manufactures, dated August 1957, and it gives an assessment of what Britain expects will be the loss of trade during the currency of the Japanese agreement. An article on page 329 is headed "Japanese Trade—British Anxiety regarding Australian Market" and it reads—

"Textile manufacturers in Britain fear that the signing of the agreement might lead to a cut of up to 60 per cent in Britain's valuable cotton goods trade with Australia.

"The Rayon Weaving Association, which represents 300 Midland firms, has sent a telegram to the Australian High Commissioner in London, Sir Eric Harrison, expressing 'deep concern' at the proposals."

Later on the article says—

"British exports of woven cotton piece goods to Australia last year totalled £8,100,000 sterling.

"A 60 per cent cut would therefore mean more than £5,250,000 sterling to British industry."

That represents a considerable sum of money particularly when we relate it to British and continental trade in the purchase of many of our products.

On page 324 of the same journal we come to an assessment of the position in the United States of America. The article says—

"This was a repetition of earlier U.S.A. experience with the Japanese 'dollar blouse.' In 1952 the Japanese shipped a trial order of 38 dozen blouses to retail in the United States at a dollar each. By 1954 sales of the blouse had reached four million dozen, and American garment makers were backed against the wall. When the Japanese judged they had gone as far as they might safely go without retaliation they imposed an annual quota of 2.5 million dozen blouses. This is about twice as much as the American market can absorb and still maintain the domestic blouse industry at the level it was before the Japanese invasion.

"This is the sort of self-restraint which threatens every Canadian market, from cameras to chinaware, which the Japanese have entered. What they did to the American blouse industry and are now doing to the Canadian T-shirt industry they can repeat wherever it is profitable to do so. With their high productivity and low costs, the Japanese can enter at will any foreign market which is opened to them. Once on that market the Government-controlled trading apparatus directs volume and kind of trade to their best advantage.

"When maximum penetration of a market is reached, the Japanese retreat to a self-imposed quota which gives them satisfactory annual sales and at the same time can be offered as an example of 'self-restraint.'

"In fairness to the Canadian negotiators of the Japanese-Canadian trade agreement in 1954, they did anticipate these tactics and provided for increases in the tariff against Japanese goods if offered 'in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic producers.' Regrettably, they did not anticipate the speed with which the Japanese can flood a market before retreating to the prepared position of 'self-restraint.' The damage is done before protection can be invoked."

Labour costs in Japan are low as compared with those obtaining in the rest of the world and that should give us food for thought. At page 325 of the same journal American manufacturers made this assessment of their industrial position—

"But Japanese goods kept flooding in.

"They made a blouse that sells here for 98 cents," said a manufacturer. "Our blouses had to retail at two dollars 98 cents."

Japanese caps sold at 20 cents. They cost more than 50 cents to produce in U.S.A.

Japanese pillowcases could be retailed at less than the American cost of production. Imports of velveteen last year were running ahead of domestic output.

Sale of Japanese gingham had jumped from less than three million square yards in 1953 to an estimated 70 million last year.

Last year Japan exported 3½ million dozen blouses to the United States—one for every two women.’’

In other words, it is very obvious that they flood the market until there is a protest, then retreat to what is a prepared position where they think they can stabilise their markets in a country. There have been cases in Canada and the United States of America in which that has done serious damage to existing industries.

I believe that the whole matter should be considered very carefully. I believe that the Minister was very naive when he introduced the treaty into the Federal Parliament and stated that he had the assurance of the Japanese delegation, and could rely on it, that they would not flood the market and damage existing industries.

But in Part C of the agreed minutes there is a very clear definition of how they operate in Japan in relation to restricting exports to other countries. Paragraph 1 of Part C says—

“... the Australian Delegation pointed out that the basis of Article V was the mutual expectation that as a result of the Agreement there would be increased opportunity for expansion of Japanese exports to Australia without serious damage to Australian industry or sudden and serious disruption of the pattern of Australia’s imports. This expectation was based on the premises that exports from Japan in particular lines, especially in the products of Australian industries historically or potentially particularly liable to disruption in the event of an undue increase in the volume of imports from Japan, would not be allowed to reach such a volume, or to be shipped under such conditions as would cause or threaten serious damage of this kind. Since, in its view, the accord of most-favoured-nation treatment to Japanese goods could result in such a situation, it would welcome the co-operation of the Japanese authorities in dealing with these situations and considered that early and effective arrangements, if undertaken in Japan, could make a substantial contribution to their solution.”

But in paragraph 2, in reply to the Australian Delegation, the Japanese Delegation pointed out that under Japanese legislation export was free in principle and that the Japanese Government could take only limited measures to deal with these problems. However, the Japanese Delegation indicated that the Japanese Government would use its best

endeavours, within its constitutional authority, to see that exports from Japan to Australia were conducted in such a way as to avoid or remedy damage or prospect of damage to which the Australian Delegation had referred. That is a clear indication that the Japanese Government has very little constitutional power to restrict the flow of exports from Japan to any country in the world, and it depends on what negotiations can proceed after the first protest is made and substantiated by industry here in Australia to the sudden inflow of Japanese goods.

Mr. Hiley: Whilst Australia preserves a system of import licensing, is not that an effective check quantitatively?

Mr. LLOYD: No, not in this case. Under the most-favoured-nation tariff agreement they have equal rights.

Mr. Hiley: That is right, but they still have to get their import licences.

Mr. LLOYD: They still breach the agreement by flooding the market.

Mr. Hiley: They still have to get an import licence.

Mr. LLOYD: Yes, but that would be considered under this agreement as breaching the agreement and restricting trade.

Mr. Hiley: I think you will find that import licensing still applies.

Mr. LLOYD: Yes, but in this case they have agreed with the Japanese delegation that they will not take any action until the matter has been referred to Japan. That has been agreed to in this treaty.

Mr. Hiley: That is the export part; but who is authorised to import? You must have imports.

Mr. LLOYD: That depends. If the number of import licences granted is reduced, Japan can immediately repudiate the treaty and refuse to accept Australian goods. Japan and other countries have always taken the attitude that immediately any such action is taken they can resume negotiation by verbally offering to take further goods. They have done that in Canada. There they have offered to become the largest purchaser of Canadian wheat. At the same time they are offering Australian wheat access to their markets if any other country breaches an agreement. In other words, they can barter as between Australia and Canada on fair-average-quality wheat. They will continue to do that and, as has been pointed out, the greatest danger lies in the possible sudden influx of Japanese-manufactured goods into Australia. It could immediately create a depression within our own industries and cause a falling-off in Australian consumer demand. It could seriously affect primary production and cause a much more serious depression than would the falling off of the

demand from other nations such as the United Kingdom and countries on the Continent.

Mr. Hiley: Do you really think those goods can come in without any quantitative limit?

Mr. LLOYD: Without any restriction in quantity at all.

Mr. Hiley: You will find out about that.

Mr. LLOYD: They will have to receive the same treatment as that given other nations.

Mr. Hiley: The same as Britain, France, Belgium and every other country operating under import licences?

Mr. LLOYD: Equality of tariffs, equality of treatment, under the most-favoured-nation tariff agreement—the same treaty. Experience over the past few years has shown the great damage that can follow when no protection is given to local industries and when an influx of goods is allowed to create unemployment. We have worked many years for the high standard of living we enjoy and we do not want to see it reduced. If controls or restrictions are necessary for its protection, let us have them. Naturally we seek to help other countries that do not enjoy as high a standard of living but, because of the very nature of competition on the market between goods produced in Japan and goods produced in countries like Canada, the United States, Britain and Australia, it is imperative that we protect our home industries. Unemployment is far too serious a problem to be set aside lightly simply because we think that by entering into an agreement like this we will benefit our primary producers. Eventually it could reduce their prosperity and that of the country generally.

The Commonwealth Government are bringing about a very unsound financial position through their failure to apply any form of credit restriction. They allow the banks to create credit within the country through monopolies with high rates of interest and we shall never be able to get a high standard of living for everybody until some form of credit restriction is imposed. Efforts have been made by many people, and by Sir Arthur Fadden in particular, to show why private expenditure should not be controlled. Several years ago when introducing the Budget he said that private expenditure in Australia had increased to an alarming extent but it was not his intention to take any action to control the amount of it.

He did make an attempt. He called a conference of finance companies and asked for an undertaking that they would refrain from the practice of offering high rates of interest on debenture mortgages and asked them to increase the deposits required for hire-purchase activities. For a short time an attempt was made by many of the hire-purchase companies to borrow the principle

but some finance companies refused and other companies had to step into line with them because of the competition created. Efforts have been made to show that the economy was strong because the value of consumption had risen substantially over a year. That does not mean that people consumed more, it means that they paid more. This fact is demonstrated in many items of production. People have eaten less because of increased prices.

Only recently the Queensland Government introduced steep increases in the price of meat which will add 10s. to 12s. to the weekly meat bill. People will eat less meat. In its last report the Queensland Butter Marketing Board stated that for the year ended 30 June Queensland consumed 1,000 boxes of butter less than the previous year; notwithstanding the fact that there were many thousands more people in Queensland less butter was consumed. Butter is too costly for the working-man's family on today's wages. There can be no doubt that many families are supplementing butter with margarine. The Government are making sure that people will not be able to buy the cheaper substitute. On 28 September last the Minister for Agriculture and Stock said that the Government had firmly rejected applications for increased quotas by margarine manufacturers on the grounds that the dairying industry must be protected from unfair competition. The Minister's conception of fair competition, however, was revealed in a subsequent statement when he expressed the hope that the Commonwealth Government would raise the tariff on vegetable oils, a circumstance which could put the margarine manufacturers out of business which would perhaps suit some hon. members opposite.

Mr. Hiley: How would the present quotas compare with the highest your Government allowed? More than double.

Mr. LLOYD: Butter is so expensive that the demand for margarine has become very great. The quality of margarine has greatly improved. The Government have declared themselves to be wedded to a policy of increasing meat prices. At the beginning of this month an extra 2d a lb was added to previous prices. With the falling off in the export market it is becoming increasingly difficult to sell frozen beef overseas, particularly to the United Kingdom. In all probability it is necessary for the consuming public to subsidise the fallen export price. Increased meat prices are beyond the economic capacity of many working people in the community. Dairying interests and their spokesmen should realise that they cannot force people into buying costly butter by trying to force the alternative and less costly margarine off the market. With gradually receding real purchasing power local consumers have had enough of paying high prices for local butter in order that

overseas breakfast tables may be supplied with the same butter at a low price. Their resistance to the high price of butter is reflected in the State's butter consumption. It fell from 677,771 boxes in 1954-55 to 664,961 in 1955-56, and to 654,590 in 1956-57.

I do not know if the Government think they will correct this decline by denying people the right to buy margarine. I think all that they will achieve is to create a buyer resistance to the market. I mentioned earlier that the Treasurer made no great attempt to outline policy in the future but the hon. gentleman did mention one or two things relating to the fact that he was budgeting for a deficit. His recent statements differ from what he said in 1951. I quote his remarks from "Hansard," 1951, volume 201, at page 664—

"We could with advantage spend just a little time looking at some of the positive contributions by means of which demand inflation has been levelled off."

It had been levelled off. Apparently the hon. gentleman considered inflation had been prevented to some extent. The quotation continues—

"I have spoken of the Commonwealth Government's budgeting for a surplus of £114,000,000. That will be a big contribution. I commend the practice of the Treasurer of producing surpluses and budgeting for them. Whilst they are tiny, every surplus that has been produced in the period of under-consumption and over-demand is a good thing. Keep on doing it and in no circumstances ever let the deficit creep into your accounts in a period of inflation."

On this occasion there is an estimated deficit of over £1,500,000. I agree with the Treasurer that in order to attempt to prevent unemployment it might be necessary to budget for a deficit if we think the financial position will improve in a short period. The Treasurer points out, quite rightly, how the cash balances have decreased over the years. He mentioned the year 1956-1957 when the total balances held by the State amounted to £25.7 million. For the year 1953 the total balances amounted to £19,511,885 and for the year 1957 they amounted to £14,952,331. Apparently in the intervening period the Government were able to accumulate some additional balances, and it was fortunate that they were able to do so. The allocations by the Commonwealth Government over the intervening years have been so small that it was essential to take from reserves the moneys necessary to create employment. The only criticism I have to offer of the past year's activities is that sufficient regard has not been paid to what might happen in the future. The placing of 560 people out of employment at the one time is not a true indication of the present or future position. Most hon. members will agree that a department should be able to assess the funds it will need in the near future. If that was done, wholesale

dismissal of men could be avoided. If they were dismissed over a period, those men could be absorbed by private enterprise.

That was an undesirable aspect of last year's Budget, particularly when it is realised that the increase in expenditure was the largest for a number of years, £7.7 million over the previous year, compared with an average of approximately £5,000,000 for five years. That average was high because of the increase last year of £7.7 million, and the increase in 1952-1953 of £6,000,000. The increase in the period 1951-1952 to that time was £2,000,000 to £3,000,000 a year.

I thought hon. members would have had from the Treasurer a better indication of the policy of his Government, particularly as they are a new Government. Not one member of the Cabinet, during the debate on the Address in Reply, informed hon. members of the intention of the Government during the present session. We listened to many maiden speeches by new hon. members of the Country-Liberal Government. That was a desirable feature of the debate and those speeches were enjoyed by all hon. members, but at the same time further information could have been given. The Minister for Labour and Industry, who has received so much Press publicity on the encouragement of industry, should have said during that debate how he was planning to bring industries to the State.

On that score, I invite hon. members to read the answer to my question this morning. Of the 130 new firms registered by the Registrar of Firms in the two months, most are manufacturers' agents, beauty salons, auctioneers and real estate agents, indent companies and so on. Only about 5 of the 110 are manufacturers, who will help the development of the State.

Mr. Wood: One is an adviser on the care of hair and the scalp.

Mr. LLOYD: That is so.

I hope members of the Cabinet will give some indication of the intentions of the Government. The public are entitled to the information. The Financial Statement should contain a considerable amount of information of use to industry and the public generally. The Treasurer's predecessor in many of his Financial Statements gave very valuable information in addition to the tables that were printed and tabled while the Financial Statement was being read. The Government should have indicated their policy for the coming 12 months, in fact, for the coming three years.

I agree with the Treasurer's statement that it is necessary to make a cautious approach to the problems and analyse the financial position pending consideration of future action, but credence cannot be given to his suggestion that a courteous approach to the Federal Government will mean more finance for the State. It is hard to believe that the Federal Treasurer would deprive the people of any State of their rights under the

Financial Agreement between the States and the Commonwealth just because the Government of a State were annoyed about their treatment by the Commonwealth and have made a Press statement on it. It is obvious that the whole of the financial relationships between the States and the Commonwealth and particularly between Queensland and the Commonwealth must be overhauled. It has been found in the past that many of the other States had been granted favourable treatment by the Commonwealth. If one studies Loan allocations one will find the disparity between South Australia and Queensland. That State received a loan allocation of £7,000,000 higher than Queensland. Of course, with semi-government and local authority allocations our figure is higher than that of South Australia and it may be that that State has a different system of loan allocation to local authorities. The greater area and concentration of population in Queensland justifies an additional allocation of loan money for semi-government and local-authority works. It is interesting to see in relation to the public debt the increases in the interest charges that have crept in over the last year or two. Sinking Fund contributions are increasing to the extent of £250,000 annually. The net public debt has increased in five years to 30 June, 1957, from £186.8 millions to £269.2 millions, an increase of almost £82.4 millions in five years. That gives an idea of the magnitude of the increase in the public debt in this State. It is going on continually. There has been an average increase of £66,000,000 in four years in the Queensland public debt and in the last 12 months the Commonwealth public debt has been reduced from £1926.6 million to £1,885.4 million, or a decrease of £41.2 millions in 12 months. The public debt of the States has increased by £103.3 million in the same period.

The total borrowing programme since 1951 has amounted to £1,175.8 millions and of that £588.3 millions or one half has been derived from Commonwealth sources. That is a tremendous figure when considered in the light of the increase in the public debt. I realise that what I am going to say has been said in this House on many occasions, but it cannot be stressed too much, that whilst the Commonwealth has been receiving high taxation it has been transferring from revenue to Loan Consolidation and Investment Reserve in excess of £100,000,000 a year to finance short falls in loan raising in Australia. The local domestic loan raising of the States have decreased from £5,000,000 to £1,000,000 and there is a danger of a falling-off in the Commonwealth Bank deposits. During 1956-1957—and this figure is most revealing—£194.8 million was appropriated from Consolidated Revenue to Loan Consolidation and Indebtedness Reserve of which £96,000,000 has been for the financing of State works and housing. This year

it is estimated that there will be an appropriation of £119.3 millions to reserves for this purpose. That £194.8 million appropriated from Consolidated Revenue gave a real surplus to the Commonwealth Government of £90 million in its last Budget. The money has been there for the States at all times and should have been used for development works.

The Treasurer himself has a very clear understanding of this problem, and he has given us an excellent idea of what he intends doing in relation to development. He has stated, firstly, that private enterprise will have to play a larger part in the development of this State. Unfortunately, many hon. members on the Government side seem to have gained the impression that all you have to do is snap your fingers and large industries will begin to develop and expand in this State regardless of whether there is any power, light, or water, available for them. The days when industries pioneered their own services are past. Today competitive markets demand that certain essential services are provided before industry can be established and expanded.

One of the greatest obstacles to the development of industries in the past has been the difficulty of transporting goods and the marketing of the goods. That is one of the biggest difficulties we must overcome before we will see any wholesale expansion of secondary industries in Queensland.

It is the duty of every Government to ensure that they have a balanced programme of expansion for essential works and the normal services of education, hospitalisation, and the other services that are the responsibility of State Governments. I gained the impression from this Financial Statement that the Treasurer has the opinion that private industry can undertake for the Government many of their developmental works; but that is impossible unless a balanced programme of expenditure is drawn up by the Government themselves. If we cut down on developmental works, we shall destroy the incentive to establish industries in this State. In the past we have requested financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government for the establishment of new projects. The Burdekin River authority comes to mind as one particularly in point. We asked for financial assistance to enable it to expedite its construction programme. Unfortunately, in the past, developmental works in the north of this State have been painfully slow because of the lack of ready money.

An examination of our financial position at the end of last year shows that, although our cash balance had diminished considerably, our investments were still fairly high and really stable. I think we should examine those investments to see whether they can be used in a better way. In trust and special funds in Queensland there is an amount of

£11 million invested in Commonwealth Government securities. The State Government Insurance Office has an amount of approximately £9,000,000 invested in Commonwealth Government securities. I realise that much of that £11,000,000 is tied up in trust funds. For example, the Public Service Superannuation Fund has reached almost £6,000,000. That is available to the Treasurer. He has to pay 5 per cent. interest to the fund, but it is money held in trust and cannot be used for ordinary works normally undertaken from Consolidated Revenue or revenue itself. What I cannot understand is why this money cannot be utilised for investment in works in this State. We can show by per capita payments on loan allocations and grants by the Commonwealth Government that Queensland is suffering because of the lack of a realisation of the problems confronting the Government of this State. At the same time we are investing and re-investing in Commonwealth Government securities the money we hold in trust. There is a precedent for the transfer of some of it to Queensland loans. In 1952 an amount of £350,000 in Commonwealth Government securities was allocated by the State Government Insurance Office to the State Electricity Commission. It was discounted and invested over a longer period of repayment at a higher rate of interest. Much of the interest over the years—approximately £20,000,000—has been at rates varying from 3½ per cent. to 4½ per cent. and in one minor case it was 5 per cent. I cannot see any reason why moneys should not be transferred from Trust Funds, in small loans, to say the Burdekin River Authority to expedite construction work, to the Brisbane City Council by way of a special loan to sewer Brisbane, and to other local authorities and semi-governmental authorities to carry out work that will ensure a return to the State Government. The Public Service Superannuation Fund has a credit balance of £6,000,000. Even though there is a capital indebtedness by the State itself, there is no great demand for anything like the full amount held in the fund. In fact, it increases by almost £330,000 a year. Much of it could be used for purely State works that would give a return to the State and create additional employment.

I am grateful to the previous Treasurer for a table setting out a per-capita analysis of Commonwealth finances made available to all the States. It appears at page 551 of "Hansard" No. 7, of 20 September, 1956. It sets out the totals for each State of tax reimbursement and special financial assistance grants, Commonwealth Grants Commission grants, and loan moneys (public loans and Commonwealth sources) for 1955-1956 as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Queensland	32	1	7
Tasmania	70	9	9
Western Australia ..	56	18	0
South Australia ..	54	8	5
New South Wales ..	34	12	10
Victoria	34	11	5

It is obvious that although Queensland has the greatest potential of any State in the Commonwealth and the largest area, it is given the smallest grant from the Commonwealth Government on a per-capita basis. The question is: what can be done? The Treasurer has said that consideration will be given to Queensland's becoming a claimant State before the Commonwealth Grants Commission. The Prime Minister was approached by the previous Government and his reply was very discouraging. He asked them to give the matter more mature consideration before making a claim. Of course there is no reason why we could not become a claimant State as long as we could prove that, under the present system of budgeting, we could not carry out our developmental responsibilities under the Commonwealth Constitution, but there is no doubt at all that we should lose a great deal of our sovereignty and suffer a reduction in our powers of government. In all probability the Commonwealth Grants Commission will insist that the present system of free hospitalisation be terminated, that we should make a charge for hospitalisation in the public wards. We must give the matter very serious consideration because we are likely to lose full control of our own administration. At the present time large amounts of money are granted to the five States of Australia, excluding Queensland, for war service land settlement. From time to time hon. members opposite have said that we neglected war service land settlement. Our political policy, approved by the people of Queensland, has been that the State Government should have control of all productive land within the State. In order to protect the land in the future we should have some control over it. Under their scheme the Commonwealth Government wish to take the control of the land completely away from the people of Queensland and the State Government. In other words, their granting of finance for a war service land settlement scheme was conditional upon our altering our political policy, something which was never envisaged under the Commonwealth Constitution. Under the constitutional setup in Australia, the people of Queensland have the right to elect their own party to government. Once elected to government that party have the democratic right to implement their political policy. By insisting that the policy should be altered the Commonwealth Government deprived the State Government of sovereignty. There is one instance of how the Commonwealth Government by financial control, can unscrupulously control State Governments. I am sure that the Treasurer will realise that through the Commonwealth Grants Commission the Commonwealth Government would be in a position to dictate political policy to the present or any future Queensland Government, as they have done in the past in other States. It is dangerous. We should protect the free hospitals scheme as much as we possibly can. The Commonwealth Grants

Commission will not make money available unless they are convinced that the State Government have done everything possible to secure finance in accordance with the policy of the Commonwealth Government.

The Treasurer and I have disagreed considerably about the principle of uniform taxation in the past but on this occasion I believe that he and the Government have acted correctly. I agree to a continuance of the principle of uniform taxation. I am sure that many hon. members opposite will not be very happy with this policy, particularly the Minister for Education who once was trapped into saying that he most certainly disagreed with uniform taxation and if he had the opportunity he would insist on the States' imposing their own form of taxation.

I think the figures of Commonwealth revenue from income and company tax are very important. In 1956-1957 £620.3 million was collected, in 1957-1958 the estimate is £675,000,000. In 1956-1957 the tax grants to States amounted to £174,000,000 and for 1957-1958 it is estimated at £190,000,000. The Commonwealth grants to Tasmania, Western Australia and South Australia for 1956-1957 amounted to £18.5 million and the estimated amount for 1957-1958 is £19.5 million. The total estimated tax reimbursements and grants to the States this year is £209.5 million. The total amount collected from income tax will be £675,000,000. It is obvious that the balance is used to finance their own developmental works. The Snowy River scheme will claim £18,500,000. Many other capital works will be financed from revenue. Approximately £120,000,000 will be transferred to the Loan Consolidation and Investment Reserve which allows the States' programmes to be undertaken. The position between the Commonwealth and the States is such that it is essential that a conference be convened to ensure that the States receive a just return by way of tax reimbursement. The figures given include supplementary grants which commenced in 1951-1952 owing to increased costs. In that year an amount of £33,000,000 was used to supplement the tax reimbursements to the States. From 1951-1952 onwards there has been a gradual reduction in the supplementary grants to the States. The year before last the amount was £15,000,000 and last year it was slightly increased to £17,000,000, and this year it will be increased to £23.8 million. In order to maintain the same benefit, in view of the increases in costs and population the grant of £33,000,000 in 1951-1952 should have reached the sum of £30,000,000 to £50,000,000 in order to give the States an opportunity to balance their budgets and undertake essential developmental works. The Treasurer has pointed out that there will be a reduction in developmental works expenditure this year. There has been a 50 per cent. reduction in the amount to be expended by the Burdekin River authority. In the future he

stated that a further review should be made in the light of the development of Australia as a national responsibility. The revenue derived by the States should be utilised for essential services. I do not think that we should go to the extreme on this matter. We must pursue a policy of embarking on large developmental schemes. We are losing too much each year from the soil. The heavy flooding in the Burdekin and many other rivers has resulted in the loss of rich alluvial soil and water that could be conserved with great benefit. We must solve the financial relationship of the Commonwealth and the States.

One of the suggestions is that Queensland should become an agent State. I have mentioned some of the difficulties. A State Government should not be asked to relinquish some of its power in order to secure additional finance.

I have mentioned the encouragement given to trading banks under the charter to establish savings banks. Queensland has not received a great deal of benefit from savings banks deposits. Of the increased savings 20 per cent. was to be provided for housing, by way of loans to building societies. I thought the Treasurer would have made a statement on this very important subject. With the establishment of savings banks by the Bank of New South Wales and other trading banks, possibly £1,500,000 of housing finance has been lost. Loans to co-operative building societies could alleviate the housing problem even if they catered for those people able to make high repayments or to pay high deposits.

The trading banks' charter to establish savings banks has created many problems. In the past there has been an erroneous impression that banks lend to the extent of their deposits. That is not so. Banks give credit, and are responsible for creating inflation and deflation, but under the financial policy of the present Federal Government hire-purchase companies have been established to loan money at rates of 30 per cent. and 20 per cent. on various commodities and 10 per cent. for housing purposes. Since the abolition of credit restrictions and capital issues control, money that could have been utilised for housing and development has been placed at the disposal of manipulators of finance—usurers. Usury is a manipulation of finance for gain, without productive effort. The problem must be faced by the Commonwealth Government. On one occasion they approached the Premiers to transfer certain State power to the Commonwealth. The Premier of Victoria, in his usual Tory fashion, refused to agree, and the attempt was abandoned by the Federal Government. Surely there is some other solution. If the States cannot agree unanimously to transfer certain powers to the Commonwealth a referendum could be held.

The public could be asked their opinion on Section 92 and subsequent sections of the Commonwealth Constitution.

In America the States have certain powers. They can apply to Congress for certain powers to control interstate trade and commerce. It is a very simple procedure. If the Commonwealth Government were sincere in their desire to establish a balance between public and private investment, they could approach the people, and I am sure the people, with their knowledge of the activities of hire-purchase companies and the rates of interest charged by them, would agree to an alteration in the Commonwealth Constitution. It is unfortunate that private banks are allowed to affiliate with or form their own hire-purchase companies. Of the eight trading banks in Australia today there are seven having affiliations with the hire-purchase business. According to the "Sun Herald" financial review of 15 September the most recent announcement was that of the Industrial Acceptance Corporation tying itself up to the A.N.Z. Bank. In short the Australian Guarantee Corporation is virtually the Bank of New South Wales, the Industrial Acceptance Corporation is the A.N.Z. Bank, Customs Credit is the National Bank, General Credits the Commercial Banking Company of Sydney and the Commercial Bank of Australia, Esanda, the English Scottish and Australian Bank Limited, and the Finance Corporation is the Bank of Adelaide. Those banks and hire-purchase companies can restrict the flow of credit to small businesses and primary producers as they have done in many parts of Australia. The small man in business, whether it be retail or any other form, or a primary producer who is in financial trouble—and a lot will be if this drought continues—can approach the bank for a loan to carry on over the difficult problem. Such small men or primary producers are told to go round the corner to the various hire-purchase companies who will grant loans at high rates of interest. The principle of increasing interest rates should be under the control of the Government. The Government must control interest rates because interest rates are in the main the controlling features in deflation and inflation. Increasing interest rates should not be used as a means of forcing people who require small loans, to pay exorbitant rates of interest.

I do not think we can continue under the present arrangement unless there is a complete overhaul to permit the flow of capital into public works. We have to get rid of the old conservative view that we must at all times make money available for private expenditure and we must cut down in times of plenty the amount of public works. The present policy of the Commonwealth Government in a young country like Australia is wrong because many things require to be done immediately. Many of our watercourses require damming; works are required for

transportation, electricity and power and other essential services, all things essential to the expansion of private industry. We should undertake the completion of the Burdekin River project on the same lines as the United States of America embarked on the Tennessee River scheme. The United States embarked on the large-scale construction of dams and the introduction of hydro-electric schemes against the very bitter opposition that came from private capital and electrical undertakings in America. What tremendous advantages have accrued to that country which was previously an arid region and non-productive. It is now fully productive providing industry with power, light and the means of irrigation. We could do the same thing in this country if we embarked on a scheme of public expenditure which would not force the country into bankruptcy. Where the assets are available capital must be expended if we are to expand. Money should be spent to develop the assets of the country to return to the people the means of prosperity and provide the incentive necessary for capital to come from other countries. We must also provide prosperity by means of increased production and give to the hungriest nations of the world, the Asiatic nations, an incentive to look to us instead of to the communistic countries.

(Time expired.)

Mr. EWAN (Roma) (3.46 p.m.): I have listened to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for the last one and a-half hours. I think he made a speech typical of a devoted Labour man in Federal politics. Perhaps because of the barrenness of ideas that is typified by the representatives on the Opposition benches today, it was thought necessary to disregard the contents of the Budget and so keep right away from State matters. He presented a case on international politics, trade, and banking, possibly with the erroneous idea, as a devoted Labour man, that he might be assisting Dr. Evatt, or possibly, again erroneously, in an endeavour to embarrass the Menzies-Fadden Government. The hon. member for Kedron likened our present State Treasurer to Sir Arthur Fadden, the Federal Treasurer. I think that in the light of circumstances, that the Treasurer must accept that as a distinct compliment, because when the history of Australia is written I am sure that Sir Arthur Fadden's name will go down in the annals of this nation as perhaps one of the greatest Treasurers Australia has ever known.

Mr. Hanlon: Not as a great Queenslander.

Mr. Davies: A deserter of Queensland's interests.

Mr. EWAN: Listen to that—a deserter of Queensland! He is a Queenslander, born, bred, reared and educated here, and he will indicate in no uncertain fashion how loyal he is to the State of his birth when he has businesslike people to deal with.

I extend to the Treasurer my personal congratulations, and I feel sure the collective congratulations of members on the Government benches, upon the clear, concise and able manner in which he presented his Financial Statement for the year 1957-1958. His expressed determination to depart from past forms of presentation that tended to delude the people and perpetuate distortions in our accounting system will meet with the full approval of all honest and thinking people in Queensland. After all, in my opinion the object of a Financial Statement should be to place before the people clearly and truthfully a factual statement of a Government's stewardship during the period under review, and to give some indication of the course to be followed in the coming year in regard to estimates of revenue and expenditure. I think the Treasurer has followed this elementary basic principle which has always been departed from by Labour Governments, particularly the Government so recently and ignominiously thrown out by the people. I shall quote some of the remarks of the Treasurer so that I might associate myself with them. He said, on page 3—

"But this appearance of budgetary equilibrium should not lull hon. members or the public at large into any false sense of financial ease at the Queensland Treasury. Indeed, as I shall show you presently, the 'surplus' of £15,230 was achieved by including in the revenue for the year withdrawals from reserves and by omitting from the year's expenditure losses in certain of the State's trading ventures.

"In order to present a more factual measure of the result for the past year, I list the following needs for adjustment in respect of transactions in certain Trust and Special Funds which were not brought to account in the Consolidated Revenue Fund."

Then he set out a list. In previous Financial Statements those losses were always disguised to delude the public into believing that the State's trading for the year was sound.

Then the Treasurer examined the position of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. He set out the losses and other debit balances that had direct relation to, but had not been reflected in, the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Later, he had this to say of the £14,000,000 currently required for superannuation and the like—

"Although it could reasonably be expected that portion of the above liability should be met from future revenue of the State, it could also be claimed that a sum of several million is necessary to bring the revenue resources of the State into a position of tolerable sufficiency."

So the state of affairs that existed in the regime of past Governments and were tolerated provide a damning indictment of Labour's methods deserving of the severest censure. I think all hon. members

on both sides will join with me in congratulating the Treasurer on making such disclosures. Thus it will be readily understood that the present Country-Liberal Government inherited from the late unlamented Labour Government during the year under review a number of losses from State socialistic ventures such as the State coal mine, State coke works and State treatment works, amounting to about £610,000 thereby reducing, as has already been indicated, the surplus of £15,000 as claimed by the previous administration to a factual deficit of about £595,000 for the year's operations. However, we have the assurance of the Treasurer, thanks to the honesty and decency of the Government that were granted a mandate from the people so recently—

Mr. Gair: A minority.

Mr. EWAN: That this state of affairs shall not continue.

Mr. Power interjected.

Mr. EWAN: Now listen to the howls! They say we have not got the majority behind us, yet they framed the electoral laws. Of course we have a majority, in accordance with the provisions of the very electoral laws that the hon. members who interject helped to frame. Now they rebound upon them and punch them on the nose and they cannot take a licking.

Mr. Power: I can.

Mr. EWAN: But one of the hon. member's colleagues cannot. Do not forget that if they had to face the people now they might not even be here.

However, it is interesting to note that during 1956-1957 Queensland's population increased by 2.1 per cent. to an estimated total of 1,400,000 people at 30 June, 1957. Queensland has the second lowest rate of increase from all sources despite the great natural advantages of the State which should have attracted migrants from all over the world. Why has it not attracted them?

Mr. Jesson: I will bite, why not?

Mr. EWAN: The hon. member was a member of a Government that did not provide the attractions that would have brought these people here.

Mr. Hanlon: Now that we have these beauty salons here we are going to do better with the new government.

Mr. EWAN: The hon. member for Ithaca agrees with me. I believe that he has a great future ahead of him. It will not be very long before he is sitting over here because he has too much ability to stay where he is.

The density of population in Queensland is also the second lowest in Australia. We have great areas of beautiful land but its development has been retarded in 25 years of Labour rule.

The total public indebtedness is £269,000,000 or £192 10s. per head of population.

Mr. Jesson: A mere bagatelle in a country like this.

Mr. EWAN: Let the hon. member see that he does something to help in the redemption of the public debt. The revenue collected for governmental purposes during 1956-1957 amounted to £61 13s. 5d. and expenditure was £61 13s. 3d. per head of population. Even the hon. member for Hinchinbrook will agree that the present Government are desirous of bringing about the increased and rapid development of the latent potentials of the State which will ultimately bring in its train greater production, greater opportunities, and better conditions for all. As the Treasurer pointed out, it will provide new jobs for new people. He indicated perfectly clearly that he is not desirous of placing a greater burden on the tax-paying public. We are firmly convinced that the development so necessary for the future of the State and the welfare of its people must come to a large extent through private enterprise which has been ridiculed by hon. members of successive Labour Governments for the last 25 years. The development of the State is a national problem. As the Treasurer indicated it calls for the co-operation of each and every person within the State and every person in the Commonwealth of Australia and other countries in the world who may be interested in the development of the immense possibilities of Queensland. Let us frame a policy and carry it out. With or without the co-operation of the Opposition it is the intention of the present Government to develop Queensland.

Mr. Hanlon: We have not heard any policy yet.

Mr. EWAN: Present negotiations will develop the greatest fields of bauxite and aluminium in the world. We on the Government side dedicate ourselves to the carrying out of that policy. As the Treasurer indicated, there is no suggestion in our policy of lifting the rate of taxation to a higher level than that which applied in the other States despite the murmurings of the hon. member for Mundingburra.

Mr. Aikens: I draw big audiences. I don't speak to two men and a dog, as you did up North recently.

Mr. EWAN: I am reminded of what the late Mr. Hanlon said on one occasion after the hon. member for Mundingburra had claimed that he was worth £5,000 to £10,000 a year. Mr. Hanlon said, "Perhaps the hon. member is right because the people of Australia seem to pay their entertainers high salaries." So the hon. member has nothing to worry about. The hon. member's entertainment value is such that he can always command a very high figure.

Mr. Aikens: And a big audience.

Mr. EWAN: And a big audience, too; that is perfectly true. Each and every member on the Government benches stands four-square behind the words of the Treasurer. In reply to some of the remarks of the hon. member who just resumed his seat, I quote the following from page 17 of the Financial Statement in relation to approaches to the Commonwealth Government—

"We are certain the proper case can be prepared and that it should command sympathetic consideration. All I say to you is that the Government proposes to prepare its case carefully and to present it temperately. We have yet to be persuaded that the submission of inadequately prepared cases supplemented by provocative remarks in the Press, can accord to the standards of responsible public finance or for that matter bring a readier acceptance from the authority to whom they are addressed. Queensland's case in this matter will be prepared and submitted courteously. I have no fear that, on such a basis, the State will receive anything other than fair treatment."

Mr. Wood: Do you not agree it has been put up effectively in previous years?

Mr. EWAN: But most discourteously. It has been put up to the Commonwealth Government or to the Loan Council in the same manner that some fellows adopt towards the policeman who picks them up in the street and takes them home. They turn round and kick the policeman in the shins.

Mr. Davies: The facts are there.

Mr. EWAN: When you are asking for favours—not only your just rights—you should not do it in such a discourteous manner. The policy of the Country-Liberal Government which received an overwhelming mandate from the people recently is rapidly taking shape. It is earning the commendation of all thinking sections of the community. The result of the election last Saturday in Gregory, a Labour seat for many years, was most gratifying. The Government now represent a majority of electors in the western division of the State. The entry of Mr. Rae, the successful candidate in Gregory will enrich the administrative capacity of the Government, and many Opposition members will be sorry he is here. The election there was a most tangible expression by the people of confidence in the Government.

Mr. Graham: Do not kid yourself.

Mr. EWAN: The hon. member knows what happened in Gregory.

Having spent the last 10 days in the wide open spaces of the Gregory electorate, I am convinced that one of the greatest things this Government can do is to remove the strait jacket of red tape and inhibitive legislation to which this State has been subjected for the last 25 years.

The Government must restore the confidence of private enterprise and must respect and give effect to the wishes of the majority of the people, both producers and consumers. There has been no respect for the wishes of the people in the last 25 years. Dictation by pressure groups as to what the people should or should not do is inconsistent with efficiency, justice and freedom. That state of affairs has flourished for the last 25 years. During that period the great majority of the people—

Mr. Graham: Have prospered under Labour treatment.

Mr. EWAN: Have laboured under the illusion that they were free, but they were not. The public cannot buy a gallon of petrol in the city area at the week-end. The public can buy an ice cream on Sunday from the little storekeeper, but, as mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, they are unable to buy a pound of sugar, and yet they are supposed to be free. The public are not allowed to work as hard or as long as they like, even for themselves. Prohibition and denial of individual rights have been the rule.

The Government must remove inhibitive legislation and restore to the public their inalienable right as free citizens to follow the occupation they choose.

Mr. Aikens: But not margarine manufacture.

Mr. EWAN: Anything they like. Today the public are not allowed to do anything. There are restrictions in every walk of life.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interruptions. I should be pleased if hon. members would allow the hon. member for Roma to proceed.

Mr. EWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your intervention. I really delight in interjections, because I know that the truth must be hurting some members of the Opposition.

Mr. Thackeray: One man, one job.

Mr. EWAN: Once again we hear the old cry. Why does not the hon. member practise what he preaches?

Mr. Thackeray: You put it into operation.

Mr. EWAN: I know all about the Opposition members. All hon. members will agree that the people should have the right to engage in the occupation they choose and the right to worship as they please. One should have the right to follow in the footsteps of his parents without undue discrimination. The whole of the Labour Movement has been dominated by sectional interests and class-hatred. The Government to which I have the honour to belong are pledged to restore honesty, decency and freedom to the people of the State. Despite the rude interjections by the hon. member for Hinchinbrook—

Mr. Jesson: I never said a word.

1957—o

Mr. EWAN: —I want to deal with some of the factors which affect my own electorate. All thinking Queenslanders will want the Government to press on as rapidly as possible with the implementation of the land policy that we placed before the people during the election campaign, and to restore order out of chaos in our land industries. There is chaos in those industries at the present time. The position is such that land-owners do not know what to do. They do not know what will happen to their leases despite the provision of the Land Act that they can approach the Government in the last term of their leases to ask the Government's intentions. The few instances where the Government did indicate its intentions were negligible and that policy brought about chaotic conditions in our land industries so far as developmental work was concerned.

Mr. Davies: Is that the reason why you got £150,000?

Mr. EWAN: I would have got more if I could.

Mr. Davies: What part of the State are you referring to?

Mr. EWAN: All of it.

Mr. Davies: What are you going to do about it?

Mr. EWAN: A lot of people who voted Labour at the last election are thanking us for what we are doing. I have had many letters from people on the subject. Let us consider how unsympathetic the former Government, or the late unlamented Government as I prefer to call them, were in relation to rentals.

There are only perhaps one or two members in Opposition who know anything about land matters. The hon. member for Warrego has been adamant in his unremitting efforts to convince the people of the State that no landholders are worried about the incidence of rent. I cannot see eye to eye with him in that respect. Remember that land rentals are assessed mostly on a seven-year basis although some of the old leases extend over 14 years. The total rentals collected in Queensland from grazing and pastoral selections in 1951 amounted to £1,191,000. In 1957, the next reappraisal period the amount was £2,527,000 or an increase of £1,336,000 or 100 per cent.

Mr. Graham: What was the relative value of cattle? Would they have increased by 100 per cent?

Mr. EWAN: The relative value of cattle does not come into the matter. The provisions of the Land Acts framed by Labour Governments distinctly state that in determining the rental no cognisance will be taken of improvements that will increase the carrying capacity.

Mr. Graham: On what do they determine the rentals?

Mr. EWAN: On the potential carrying capacity, in contravention of the Act.

Mr. Davies: Are you going to reduce the rentals?

Mr. EWAN: Never mind what the Government are going to do. To inform hon. members opposite just what happens and how these people increase the value of the Crown estate and how they are penalised, I shall read the following letter:—

"I have had what I consider unjust treatment from the Lands Department in connection with the reappraisal of the rent of my Grazing Homestead for the second period of the lease. The Ranger's valuation was 12d.; my estimate under present conditions was 4d. per acre. The Land Court assessed the rent at 10d. per acre. Since 1911 the rent has been 4d. per acre.

"About seven years ago I was given a new lease at the same 4d., with the condition that I was to keep the seedlings under control.

"I have put my life's work into this selection, and improved it from a property that would not carry 100 head of cattle to a reasonably good property. During the period of good seasons and prices, I put most of my profits back into the country, so that if prices fell I would be able to carry on. Instead of me reaping the benefit of my work the Lands Department say that I am to pay about £400 a year rent, instead of the £27 10s. 1d. I have been paying since 1911."

But that is not all. The Shire Council have raised the rates from £50 to £312 a year in accordance with the increased value.

The letter continues—

"If the present drought continues for another month or two, I will have very few stock left.

"The next highest rent in this locality is 6d., which is much better country.

"Can you do anything to get my rent reduced? If my rent remains at 10d. then the country round about here will be assessed on that basis, which I can assure you is much too high.

"I know that we can appeal against the Land Court decision, but the expense is too high."

Hon. members opposite would not know that in many cases these blocks are opened in a green and unimproved condition. Many of them have no water on them. The tenant comes out and he slogs in, even living in a tin hut in some cases, carts his water, kills the timber, provides watering facilities, and works for many years to make it something worthwhile for the State. What does he get for doing it? A higher rent as soon as he comes up for reappraisal. When his lease is up, half his lease is resumed, while his neighbour on the other side of the road who has not done a thing gets no increase in rent

and loses none of his lease. That is why I charge hon. members opposite with unsympathetic treatment of these people.

Let me show their actions in all their naked iniquity, in all their naked disgrace. They settled soldiers from World War I. at Wandoan and Taroom on areas that were determined and approved by one of the greatest living land authorities this State has ever known, Mr. W. L. Payne. Those men struggled in the way that I have indicated to hon. members. They went on to green blocks, and worked for many years, and in some cases their wives worked and struggled with them. They improved those blocks until they could make a reasonable living out of them and at the end of World War II hon. members who now occupy the Opposition benches but who then occupied the Treasury benches froze the land that belonged to the returned soldiers of World War I. These men were quite agreeable as long as they got justice, but did they get justice? Their land remained frozen from 1946 till 1951, when much of it was acquired. It will readily be realised that no developmental work took place during those years. At what values were the blocks acquired in 1951? Remember they were the boys of World War I. They were acquired at 1942 values, despite the fact that many of those boys could have sold the same land to outside people for twice the price that the so-called "friends of the workers" Government paid. In many cases they forced them to accept those prices. There is the infamous document! Many of the prices were settled by negotiation and many by Land Court determination. In other cases, what was the action of the Government that claimed to be so proud of their record, that professed friendship and justice for the workers and concern for the under-privileged and those on the lower income brackets?

Mr. Graham: You tell us and we will all know.

Mr. EWAN: My word I will tell hon. members what they did. They settled some by negotiation but others, who had the courage to fight as free people for their inalienable rights, were subjected to some of the most vile victimisation that any decent people could be subjected to. I make no apology for saying that.

Mr. Jesson: What sort of victimisation?

Mr. EWAN: I will explain if the hon. member is patient. Quite a few of those people appealed. The Government accepted the court's valuation on some of them. The men who stood behind the appellants and influenced them were, amongst others, Messrs. C. L. and A. E. Rigby. Would the Government accept the determination of the greatest living land authority in Queensland, Mr. Payne? No! They victimised Rigby. Rigby's case really determined whether or not these seven people were to get justice;

his was the test case. When Mr. Payne gave his decision every decent landholder in the State thought it would be accepted by the Government but, no, they appealed and took the case right up to the High Court. If Rigby wants to go any further he has to take it to the Privy Council. Hon. members heard what the small landholder said:—"I cannot go to the Land Appeal Court over my rental because it costs too much." What do they think of the position of the seven men who were courageous enough to fight for their rights? The legal costs of the Crown are paid by the taxpayers and therefore the Government can with impunity go to the Privy Council; but what about these decent, honest, courageous soldiers seeking justice? They have to find the money themselves to defend their rights. Would any fair-minded person agree that those men should have been victimised? Surely the answer is "No" with a capital "N"!

Mr. Graham: That is only your assessment of it.

Mr. EWAN: All right, it may be my assessment. Let me go further. Mr. Payne's determination of the value of Rigby's land was £21,000. Not one of the seven has been paid in full for the land acquired by the Labour Government in 1951 despite the fact that at the present time World War II soldiers are settled on the land. What would hon. members say if their land had been acquired and somebody else had settled on it but they had not been paid for it six years after acquisition? Would they think they were being justly treated?

Mr. Davies: If there is any injustice will you see that it is rectified?

Mr. EWAN: My word, we will! I have made representations to the present honest, decent Government. It was my privilege and honour to act on behalf of these boys when I was in the Chamber from 1950 to 1953. I made representations to the Government which were so ignominiously thrown out recently. What consideration did they give? They continued with their case to the High Court of Australia to break these courageous boys who were prepared to fight. I have every confidence in the honesty, integrity and sense of justice of the new Government to rectify one of the greatest wrongs ever perpetuated on returned soldiers in Queensland, and by a Labour Government. I hope hon. members opposite will watch what happens. Without a doubt we will resume soldier settlement here but we will not have a repetition of the dismal failures of Labour Governments in the past. I have in mind Clare and Wandooan. Ninety per cent. of the settlement schemes sponsored by Labour Governments have been dismal failures. There are examples all over the West. One man at Mitchell has 48,000 acres made up of 1,240-acre blocks, a man at Wallumbilla has 15,000 acres made up of 640-acre blocks. Yet hon. members opposite

want to talk about their great irrigation schemes. The hon. member who just resumed his seat spoke about the Burdekin Valley. They want to irrigate—

Mr. Davies: Do you not agree with it?

Mr. EWAN: Of course I do, but I want to know where the markets are to be found for the produce.

Mr. Graham: Private enterprise will do that.

Mr. EWAN: Yes, when we have the people. If men are settled in these irrigated areas like Clare how are they going to make a living? Where are they going to market their produce? No consideration whatsoever has been given to these important factors in land settlement schemes in the past.

Mr. Graham: Where will we put them?

Mr. EWAN: Do not sentence them to penal servitude for life as the Labour Government did to the boys at Clare.

Mr. Graham: That is your opinion.

Mr. EWAN: Let the hon. member have a look at it for himself. Bearing the name of Graham, I think he will agree with me.

Let us consider what an inheritance this Government has received from Labour Governments. What about transport?

Mr. Jesson: Tully Falls. The Sunlander and diesel engines.

Mr. EWAN: I am talking about goods transport, not passenger transport. Railways and road transport are in a chaotic condition. It has all been passed onto the new Government to correct. It will be corrected with the full co-operation of all people interested. We believe that the railways must take their rightful place in the scheme, but other ancilliary forms of transport must be encouraged too. We inherited a run-down railway system and there was discontent amongst the employees.

Mr. Graham: There will be more under Chalk.

Mr. EWAN: There will not be more discontent; on the contrary there will be content brought about by our policy. Ninety-eight per cent. of the men want it. A lot of them were fearful of their jobs.

Mr. Graham: They are now.

Mr. EWAN: They were under Labour administration.

Mr. Thackeray: You will sack the railway men.

Mr. EWAN: We kept men on that the Labour Government were going to put off. We have not sacked one. The railways would not carry wool during the wool strike, but road transport carried it. Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution places road

transport in an awkward position. Enterprising young fellows came up with trucks from New South Wales and engaged in interstate transport. This occurred because of the stupid action of the Railway Union in not allowing decent railway men to carry the wool. You let the other fellows come in on interstate trade and you have them here today and cannot tax them.

Mr. Graham: Is that our fault, too?

Mr. EWAN: Of course it is. The Labour Government did not have enough sense to call a conference of Transport Ministers throughout Australia and frame a policy such as was laid down in Victoria and ask the Commonwealth to take over the powers and remit the taxation back to the States.

Mr. Graham: Is that done in Victoria?

Mr. EWAN: They advanced a scheme.

Mr. Graham: Is it in operation?

Mr. EWAN: It will be. The Labour Government were so behind the times that they did not think of it.

Mr. Davies: Give us some facts about transport on the railways.

Mr. EWAN: That is in more capable hands than mine. As a result of consultations with representatives from all sections of transport we shall develop an efficient system that will have the co-operation of all employees.

One of the most important aspects of our development is main and arterial roads. In past years these were used by Labour Governments as political footballs. Work was commenced before an election date to cover the residential qualifications in the Act. By this means employees were transferred from one electorate to another where their vote was most needed.

Mr. Davies: That is wrong.

Mr. EWAN: It is true. We have had many examples of it. If the hon. member cares to check the building of main and arterial roads he will find that they were commenced two or three months before an election and work was stopped immediately after the election. That practice was so prevalent that we in the West hoped there would be more elections so that we would be able to get another seven or eight miles of bitumen road. The great Condamine Highway was built in this manner.

Mr. Davies: Was that the position in Flinders? Did the Government build a few miles every year.

Mr. EWAN: There is not one mile of bitumen road in Flinders because until now it was a safe Labour seat. The same thing applies to Gregory, which was formerly a safe Labour seat. It was only in electorates like Roma, Balonne and Warwick that bitumen roads were constructed.

The present Government, within a reasonable period, will build a bitumen road to connect the bitumen strips built in the past, so that there will be a bitumen highway to Charleville. In furtherance of the Government's policy I hope at a later stage there will be a road from St. George to Surat and a road from Roma to Rolleston connecting with the Charters Towers Highway. There will then be an all-weather road from Brisbane to Charleville, Longreach, Cloncurry, Mt. Isa, Tennants Creek and Darwin. I hope the Government will then build the section from Surat to St. George and across to Rolleston. In that way the southern capitals of Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide, will have a direct route to the North through the towns of this State. It will be of immense value for defence and developmental purposes. I am sure that a courteous, businesslike and sound approach to the Commonwealth Government will result in the Commonwealth Government accepting financial responsibility for the scheme.

I now turn to housing. The inglorious record of past Labour Governments is well known. I was at Muttaborra in the Gregory electorate recently. Not one Housing Commission home has been erected there in 25 years.

Mr. Graham: Are homes required?

Mr. EWAN: Certainly. The Premier was inundated with requests from people there for houses. Within the next six months the people of Muttaborra will get the houses they have been seeking for 25 years.

Mr. Thackeray: How many?

Mr. EWAN: That is not the hon. member's business.

Mr. Hanlon: You told the people that if they did not return a Country Party candidate they would get nothing in Gregory.

Mr. EWAN: The hon. member and the record of past Labour Governments supported that statement. That is why the electorate is represented by a member of the Country Party. I do not think I should pursue the subject any further.

I extend to the Treasurer my personal compliments and the collective compliments of every Government member on the manner in which he presented the Budget. I think I am expressing the wish of every Government member when I say I hope he will be spared for many years to render the service that is characteristic of him. His work will be a monument to him. He is one of the brilliant men of the State. I thank hon. members for their patience.

Mr. HOOPER (Buranda) (4.39 p.m.): I congratulate the Treasurer on the manner in which he introduced his first Budget. It is the forerunner of many Budgets that he will present over the years. I suggest that the electors of Buranda, whom I have the

honour to represent, have a case for urgent financial consideration in the flood prevention scheme for Stone's Corner and the Deshon Estate. Over the years these areas have been subject to severe flooding and Labour Governments in the past have completely ignored this urgent need. Stone's Corner is one of the biggest suburban shopping centres in Brisbane and the gateway to the South Coast. Stone's Corner and the Deshon Estate are very closely populated areas and the flooding affects people from Stone's Corner to the Deshon Estate and for miles to the Brisbane River. For that matter, the flooding continues right through the electorate of Norman to the Brisbane River. Admittedly there is a scheme under way at the Stone's Corner bridge. The money for the scheme has been raised by private loan by the Brisbane City Council from the Bank of New South Wales. The council, being short of funds after years of pleading to the State Government, took the matter into its own hands. As the area from Stone's Corner bridge to the river is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Harbours and Marine I make this urgent appeal to my Government to give consideration to this most necessary matter of removing obstructions, deepening and widening the creek, thus allowing a quick getaway of the water from the upper reaches to prevent flooding. I make the urgent appeal because we know only too well how the people concerned have suffered over the years.

Being a returned soldier and one who was brought up in the country in Queensland I feel that there is urgent need to settle our ex-servicemen on the land. It was most heartening to hear the speech of the hon. member for Roma. It is pleasing to know that the Government intend to become an agent State under the war service land settlement scheme and I say the sooner the better for Queensland. Let me take hon. members back to 1945 when the war ended. In that year the then Prime Minister called a conference of the States and asked each State to inaugurate a war service land settlement scheme, two types being envisaged. The first was known as the principal State scheme, where the States found all the capital money for the acquisition and development of land and financing settlers, and the Commonwealth shared equally in the losses. The second was the agent State scheme where the Commonwealth supplied all the money to the States for acquisition and development of land and financed settlers and they shared with the States administrative expenses and the States contributed two-fifths of the losses incurred. This amounted to a grant of land for the development of rural Queensland. Queensland adopted the former scheme. Discharged members of the forces were given to understand that they had a reasonable chance of being settled if they were suitable.

Three thousand two hundred applications were received, and approximately 1,800 were adjudged by a State committee to be suitable.

But of those 1,800, only 470 were actually settled, and there were still 1,270 approved and eligible persons awaiting settlement when the State announced that the scheme would be discontinued. Although this announcement was made in 1954, only a few settlers at Clare and a small number on sugar blocks were placed after February, 1952. By comparison, New South Wales and Victoria have each placed about 3,000 under the scheme, in addition to the single-unit farms and other methods of settlement for ex-servicemen that were purely State schemes.

In 1952, quite dissatisfied with the rate of settlement under the scheme, the Commonwealth Government again offered Queensland an agent-State agreement, but many excuses were made. One of these was loss of sovereignty, about which we have heard something this afternoon, but that excuse was completely untrue because the Commonwealth Government cannot hold land under its constitution. Queensland again rejected the liberal offer of money for development. In May 1953 it made a counter offer of an agreement which took all the points of advantage in both agreements and none of the points that it disliked. Obviously, the Commonwealth Government could not accept this, but it was sufficient to lay all the blame at the feet of the Commonwealth. By slyly concealed half truths and red herrings, the Minister of the day set out to justify his actions, but he could not blind the public to the dismal failure for which he was responsible.

The loss that Queensland sustained through this arrogant disregard of public welfare may be gauged when it is stated that Queensland spent £3,750,000 on the War Service Land Settlement scheme and practically all of this money will be repaid by the settlers or partly offset by the Commonwealth contributions. The Commonwealth has put £63,000,000 into three smaller States, an average of £21,000,000 each, compared with Queensland's £3,750,000, and that £21,000,000 to each of those States is a grant, not a loan. Apart from the re-establishment of soldiers, the loss to Queensland's development is staggering. In its administration, too, the Queensland effort could only be described as a bungle. The Land Administration Board was responsible for the acquisition and development of the land and for its allotment to settlers. It planned the farms and worked out the development programmes. As soon as the settler was allocated his farm he was financed by another authority which was answerable to another Minister, who from there on could, by the rate and amount of finance, control development and indeed control land use. The settler had little remedy by way of appeal. If developmental work was necessary another department, completely separate and without interest in the scheme, would be asked to carry it out and the cost to the settler was very great. Under the State War Service

Land Settlement Legislation in 1946, the maximum loan to an ex-serviceman was £5,000. In 1952 that was increased to £7,500 to cover fencing, the building of a house, yards and sheds, clearing, and the supplying of stock and plant. Can hon. members visualise that being possible today? If £5,000 was required in 1945-1946, three times that amount would be necessary now. There is little wonder that the farmers of Wandoan, where development is costly, are bogged down and progress is slow.

The insincerity of the late Government can be demonstrated as follows: In Stage 1, Wandoan, there were approximately 120 farms designed, roads practically finished, and water points finished. In fact, they were ready in 1952 for settlement. All this work had been done by the use of loan moneys earmarked for the War Service Land Settlement Scheme in the Budgets. In February, 1952, 32 blocks were balloted for. There was nothing to stop further ballots being opened immediately after and the whole area within 12 months, but at that time the scheme was used as a political football and later on the pretext was that it cost the State too much. The blocks were balloted outside the scheme, mostly to ex-servicemen it is true. This was on account of cost, mind you, but it cost the State just as much money to open them, and the development was practically done. The loans to settlers for development were the same as those under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme. By doing it this way they denied any settler who would have been eligible under the scheme the right to draw a 12 months' living allowance from the Commonwealth—and that is a grant—and enjoying remission of rents and interests for the assistance period of one year. All that was denied the ex-serviceman. If the blocks had been opened under the scheme Queensland at the time would have been paid half the cost of the road-building. They lost therefore between £100,000 and £200,000 simply to drive home their dislike of the scheme.

The need to become an agent State is urgent not only to give the ex-servicemen the chance they deserve but also to develop the great State of Queensland. The development of the State is a matter in which the Country-Liberal Government are keenly interested. Already they have taken steps to attract much-needed southern and overseas capital to hasten the work, which is of paramount importance. The State is so richly endowed with natural resources that it offers unlimited opportunities for capital investment and the establishment of new industry.

In the time at my disposal I wish to put forward a few suggestions which I believe can be developed with worthwhile results as long as full and planned thinking are applied to each in the degree they deserve. First of all I mention the great possibilities for the development of the tourist industry. We all know what has taken place on the South

Coast. It has become a mecca for southern and overseas tourists. I believe that similar development could take place in two other areas, the near North Coast and the glorious Hinchinbrook and Whitsunday Passages of North Queensland.

On the near North Coast we have Bribie Island with its great stretch of surfing beaches, an ideal site for a modern tourist resort. Before it can be fully developed it is essential that it should be made easily accessible by the construction of a causeway from the mainland. The ocean side of Bribie Island could be quickly developed by the building of a modern tourist hotel, tennis courts, bowling greens, golf links, etc., and the throwing open of more land for building sites. It is important, however, that new homes built should be of a good standard to prevent unsightly shanties being built. On the mainland splendid beaches stretch from Maroochydoore to Noosa, providing favourable sites for new and modern townships. The rich scenic hinterland provides the visitor with many beautiful scenic tours. Development of the mineral sands industry may hasten the opening up of this potential new tourist area for settlement.

I am sure that if the Americans had possession of the North Queensland coast they would have already built a huge tourist industry by developing some of the beauty spots which abound in both the Hinchinbrook and Whitsunday Passages. I commend to my Government the possibilities that are open for capitalising on the tourist potential of this tropical wonderland. The tourist industry presents us with a particularly good opportunity to attract overseas and southern capital for its further development. At the same time it can attract more tourist money for Queensland. I think that is very important because the tourist industry in itself will attract money to Queensland and open up vast areas for development.

Another splendid avenue for development lies in the use of huge tracts of wallum country now regarded as unprofitable. This area stretches for miles along the coastline between Mackay and Cairns. One has only to read of the success of the great land development scheme which is being carried out by the A.M.P. Society in the 90-mile desert in South Australia and Victoria to realise just what can be done in Queensland. In 1949 this company embarked on a project of a type not previously attempted in Australia by a financial institution. With the co-operation of the Governments of South Australia and Victoria large areas of desert land were taken up, of which a substantial portion has now been converted to prosperous farm sites. The C.S.I.R.O. has discovered that the barrenness of the 90-mile desert in South Australia was due mainly to a deficiency in the soil of micro-nutrient elements. These elements can be corrected by the application of small amounts of copper sulphate and zinc

sulphate and of phosphates which are commonly lacking in Australian soils. With the co-operation of the C.S.I.R.O. and the Waite Institute, an organisation attached to the University of Adelaide for the purpose of agricultural research, the A.M.P. Society has already established over 100,000 acres of pasture in the South Australian portion of the desert. In the Victorian portion an area of 240,000 acres is also under lease. Since 1949 the A.M.P. Society has cleared and developed over 100,000 acres of scrub land near Keith and Bordertown in South Australia, and it is estimated that by the time of the final allotment more than 80 settlers will be established on their own farms. A similar project is being carried out by the Esperance Syndicate in Western Australia which has attracted both American and Australian capital in its successful development.

Mr. Sparkes: They are given security over there; that is why they go there.

Mr. HOOPER: I agree. Queensland badly needs population particularly in the areas north of Brisbane.

Mr. Davies: In that wallum country splendid work is being done by the Fairymead Sugar Company.

Mr. HOOPER: Yes. If we do not populate our northern areas now we may have to do it later under the heels of other countries who are now looking with hungry eyes at our vast open spaces. Here is our opportunity. Surely what the A.M.P. Society has done in the South could be carried out in our northern areas with the co-operation of our own State Government Insurance Office.

Mr. Sparkes: Don't you realise that the Government which has gone out would not give them any incentive to do that sort of thing?

Mr. HOOPER: I realise that. I believe that these schemes could be carried out in our own State with the co-operation of the State Government Insurance Office and other insurance companies which derive income from this State. I believe that we can achieve a really big job for Queensland by developing such schemes to open up more land for immediate settlement and bring out suitable settlers to open up further thousands of acres of new country for our primary production.

The next matter I wish to deal with is the decentralisation of industries, so essential to our more rapid development. We are fortunate in having great coal resources. Let us utilise them to the best advantage by establishing industries as near as possible to the coalfields. Generating stations for regional electricity boards should be built on the coalfields, not hundreds of miles away, thus obviating transport charges. The development of the colossal tonnages of excellent steaming coal at Blair Athol should be encouraged. Some years ago American officials and private bodies were keenly interested in a scheme to develop Blair Athol by

building a railway to the coast near Mackay and establishing an overseas export market for this coal. The opportunities are still there for such an export market with Japan and other parts of the Far East. The possibilities of arousing American interest in this project should be started as quickly as possible. The Callide coalfield provides splendid opportunities for many new manufacturing industries, particularly at Gladstone.

We hear that industrialists seek space to build factories at Newcastle and other great southern ports adjacent to coalfields. Gladstone has a magnificent deep-water harbour with ample space on the foreshores for new industries. With Callide coal these industries would have low-cost power and could load their products direct from the factories to ships for transport to markets. Southern and overseas interests should be informed either by a publicity drive or by a special delegation to go to the United Kingdom, Europe and the United States of the opportunities awaiting industry at Gladstone.

Bowen has a fine harbour with huge reserves of coal nearby. It could become another Newcastle if new industries could be attracted to it. Much interest has been shown in the United Kingdom in regard to the establishment of a steel and iron industry at Bowen. The obstacle seems to be lack of adequate supplies of iron ore. I believe at least 200,000,000 tons of iron ore would have to be in sight before such a project could be considered. To date efforts to discover such tonnages have not been very successful. The Government may consider it worth while to offer a reward for the finding of a large deposit of iron ore in the State, so that a widespread search could be encouraged. If we cannot find iron ore, we may be able to send coke to Noumea in exchange for iron ore, but as Queensland's reserves of high quality coking coal are barely sufficient to meet the future demands of Mt. Isa and other huge mining projects in the North West, exploration should be conducted throughout the huge Nebo coalfield to discover further deposits of coking coal, which must be in seams other than those at present being exploited at Collinsville and Scottville. The Nebo coalfield which is very extensive has barely been explored by drilling. The search for more valuable coking coal in North Queensland is a project worthy of urgent consideration.

The mining industry seems to be destined to play a very considerable part in the future development of North Queensland. The spectacular discoveries of uranium at Mary Kathleen and the great extension of the known zinc, copper and lead deposits at Mt. Isa and huge bauxite deposits in the Cape York Peninsula indicate the great part the mining industry is going to play in the development of our State. The greatest search for minerals in Queensland's history is now taking place in the North and North-West, where large, well equipped mining

companies are searching for copper, lead, zinc, gold, uranium, tin, bauxite and oil. This activity will doubtless bring forth other spectacular developments that will accelerate our industrial expansion. The Department of Mines and the Geological Survey Branch should be expanded in the immediate future to meet the needs of the mining industry, and in that way assist in the search for petroleum. Recent views of experts indicate that the discovery of commercial deposits of oil in Queensland is certain, limited only by the amount of deep drilling that may be carried out in our great sedimentary basins. The Government should encourage deep drilling operations and the compilation of a detailed map of sedimentary deposits. This information would assist private companies to select areas for deep test drilling and so ensure a greater chance of locating commercial oil.

The Geological Survey Department is at the present time housed under shocking conditions, with inadequate space, and it should be remedied as quickly as possible and the staff enlarged to meet future requirements. Modern Geological survey is essential if efficient services are to be given to the mining industry. We need a thoroughly organised sell-Queensland campaign through the Press, films, radio and overseas exhibitions so as to encourage the flow of capital and industries to our great State. It calls for the fullest co-operation between the Government and industry and public bodies. It has to be on a scale sufficiently impressive to bring direct results. We have men in the Government service with the ability to assist in the formation of a central committee or brains trust, men capable of launching this campaign successfully. A conference should be called as quickly as possible to discuss it.

No publicity is given to Queensland in the southern States. We should have more tourist posters in the South and overseas.

Coal boards should survey the markets for coal both locally and overseas. There should be overall regional planning for development. The utilisation of poor grade opals and sapphires in the building trade is something that could be looked into. Poor grade gems are suitable for beautification purposes, particularly in big buildings.

Before I resume my seat I desire to mention a matter of great concern to us all—the third party insurance cover on motor vehicles. It is compulsory. An owner of a vehicle is required to take out a third party insurance cover with one of the 124 insurance companies in Queensland before registration is granted. A certificate is issued for a period of 12 months to coincide with the 12 months of registration. Each year thereafter the Main Roads Department renew third party insurance premiums with the motor vehicle fee unless advice is received from an insurance company that it will not continue the cover beyond the expiry date. Figures

recently taken out and quoted in "The Courier-Mail" on 27 September last show that 10 per cent. of the certificates falling due are declined by the insurance companies. When considering third-party insurance cover, three chief types are involved—

- (a) A dishonest person using an unregistered vehicle;
- (b) A person using a vehicle after the fees have expired; and
- (c) A person using a vehicle on which the company has declined the cover and on which he has paid motor-vehicle renewal fees and not supplied a new certificate of insurance.

In these cases there would not be any third-party cover, and the person injured by the vehicle would have to sue the owner of the vehicle privately, if he could be located, and recover only what he was able to pay.

Two other types need examination. There is no specific rate of premium for an invalid chair. Therefore, this class is dealt with under Class 10 of the Schedule—"Any motor vehicle or a class not specified £5 5s. 0d." Main Roads registration and driving fees are waived in the case of invalid chairs, but the third-party premium is charged at five guineas. We know that an invalid chair is no particular danger to persons who use the roads and streets.

The other type is tractors. These are exempt from third-party insurance by the definition of a motor vehicle in the insurance register, but they are so numerous and travel at such fast speeds that third-party insurance is very necessary.

Where injury is caused and there is no insurance cover the Insurance Commissioner should have a fund for such cases. Such a fund could be built up by adding an amount each year to all other premiums and that amount could be paid by the Main Roads Department to the fund required.

There are various reasons why third party insurance is not accepted by insurance companies, the chief being that third party insurance is not remunerative. Another reason is that the owner of the vehicle has no other business with the company and does not sign an application with the Company although requested to do so.

I suggest that the Government investigate these matters as soon as possible.

Finally, I again offer my congratulations to the Treasurer upon the way in which he introduced the Financial Statement.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Murrumba) (5.20 p.m.): At the outset, I join with previous speakers in complimenting the Treasurer upon his Budget speech. Despite the veiled warning contained in his speech, and despite the not-altogether-bright picture that he painted, the finances of this State are in his very capable hands. Some of the statements would undoubtedly lead people to believe that the

Treasurers of the past were as adept at gerrymandering Budgets as Governments of the past were at gerrymandering elections. However, I should like to begin my speech on a pleasant note. I do not want to incur the wrath of hon. members opposite.

At the concluding stages of the Address-in-Reply debate I unfortunately ran out of time when I was about to bring forward the very important subject of the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade. The overall picture of the Brigade needs very little illumination. It is perhaps one of the greatest medical and humane services in the State. Unfortunately, many of its branches, especially in country centres, have fallen on evil days. Some are finding it almost impossible to make ends meet. How often do we see ambulance men in uniform working at night when they should be at home, working at week-ends when they should be mowing their lawns and doing other chores around the house? How often do we see them out attending to chocolate wheels—wheels of chance, or whatever they might be called—and taking part in organising and running carnivals virtually to pay their own wages and to raise enough money to keep their centres going to give the public an efficient service? Over all the finances of the Brigade on the surface seem to be quite rosy. That is true of many branches. Many country centres have complete autonomy. They are responsible for raising their own funds, buying their own cars and financing their own activities. Some are in better-class areas with a hospital handy, and that has a big bearing on their finances. Others in poorer areas are not in a sound financial position.

One branch in my area is at Caboolture, situated 35 miles from Brisbane on the main highway. In addition to local calls they very often have to serve the travelling public. During the year they attend many cases of accident on the main Bruce Highway. Out of their own funds they are forced to carry those people back to Brisbane. They do it very willingly, of course. Because of the lack of hospitalisation in the area they are sometimes compelled to bring local cases to Brisbane for specialist treatment. It is too far to return to Caboolture and make another trip to pick up the patient and very often one man's time is fully occupied in the one trip from Caboolture to Brisbane, waiting at the hospital while the patient is treated, and returning to Caboolture. Many other ambulance centres throughout the State are in the same plight. Where there is a hospital within a few miles, the running is not so bad. Unfortunately this year the Caboolture ambulance is £100 down in revenue as compared with 1956. The prospects for 1958 are no better.

Mr. Graham: What do they attribute it to?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mainly overall running expenses have become higher. The 40-hour week has meant the employment of

extra men, consequently overall costs have risen. The cost of replacement cars is high. I have no quarrel with their being granted the 40-hour week—I fought hard enough for it. They are just as much entitled to it as the butcher, baker, or any other tradesman.

Mr. Davies: Did not the Country Party vote against it?

Mr. NICHOLSON: The hon. member is being ridiculous. Is he trying to start an argument? We have always been in favour of ambulance men receiving humane and decent treatment, just as hon. members opposite demand them for every other worker, and we think they are entitled to them. I do not think the hon. member for Maryborough could have been listening to me. I am trying to point out that ambulance men are expected to work at week-ends and in their own time to earn money by running carnivals. Hon. members opposite condone it.

Mr. Davies: I was trying to recall the vote on the 40-hour week.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I am not talking about the 40-hour week, only as it applies to ambulance men. If the hon. member had enough intelligence he could understand me.

Mr. Davies: I was trying to use it to explain—

Mr. NICHOLSON: The hon. member was trying to use it for political purposes as he usually does.

I maintain that ambulance men are just as much entitled as anybody else to a 40-hour week. It does throw an additional burden on the superintendents. So far the superintendents have battled along and carried the greater part of the burden of afterhour work. I am not going to discuss that very fully because I understand there is now an application before the Industrial Court.

I believe there is a solution to the problem of financing the poorer ambulance centres. When representations have been made to past Governments ambulance representatives have been told that ambulance finances are in excellent condition. The amount of money available to the ambulance brigade throughout Queensland was quoted but they did not go into special cases. I think the answer might be in what I might term "mendicant centres," centres that could not possibly cope with all ambulance centre requirements under existing financial arrangements. If they could be granted an additional subsidy of even 2½ per cent. it would make a big difference to their revenue. Failing that perhaps there could be a grant to centres which could show just cause why they were entitled to extra remuneration. The War Veterans Home at Caboolture is an excellent institution but it makes inroads into the finances of the Caboolture Centre. They are very happy to be of service to the

old war veterans, but unfortunately it does mean a drain on reserves because of extra running to and from Brisbane. Perhaps centres that are performing charitable work connected with old people's homes could be granted extra remuneration. It may be said that many of the centres would probably fall down on the job of collecting their own fees if they got additional grants. If the returns showed that any centre lagged in collections compared with the previous year they could be asked to explain, and if the explanation was not satisfactory they might lose the additional subsidy. I do not think any centre that was granted an additional subsidy would be inclined to loaf on the job. If the money is available, I hope more generous treatment will be given to some of the poorer branches. Some of the large branches could possibly afford to pay a subsidy to a smaller one.

Mr. Davies: Do you think the money is likely to be available?

Mr. NICHOLSON: I am hoping for the best; I am putting it to the Treasurer. When the hon. member takes over the Treasury I shall put the same thing to him. I think it will be adjusted long before he takes over. I have been very interested in the tourist industry for many years. According to the last report by the Tourist Bureau Queensland once again received over £1,000,000 in fees over the counter. Since 1953-1954 the amount has risen from £1,009,774 to £1,302,408 in 1956-1957. These figures show that tourist traffic in Queensland is growing but it is not developing fast enough. The Tourist Bureau must attract more tourists from outside the State. Perhaps it is the general policy that those who wish to have a holiday should travel to another State, but Queensland is so vast and has such a wonderful tourist potential that there is no need to go outside the State to enjoy a very pleasant holiday. I have travelled over most of this State and I have travelled in every other State of the Commonwealth and in New Zealand, but I have yet to find greater tourists attractions than those in Queensland, particularly in the North. No other country in the world can boast of a barrier reef or some of our other attractions. Queensland's tourist potential is not advertised sufficiently.

Last November I made a tour of New Zealand. I inquired in all towns I visited and at all travel agencies about Queensland, and found that virtually no pamphlets on Queensland were available. I did the best I could to advertise Queensland while I was in that country.

I was pleased to read in the report that in the near future it is proposed to establish a tourist relationship between Queensland and New Zealand. It is not difficult to establish a tourist branch, or at least an agency. If the Tourist Bureau is prepared to pay a small commission to other tourist departments

or travel agencies, it could mean thousands and thousands of pounds in tourist revenue to Queensland. The cost would be small. It may amount only to the cost of producing illustrated pamphlets and paying commission to agents.

I asked the Minister for Labour and Industry for information on the number of agencies and branches of the Tourist Bureau throughout Queensland. To say the least, I was astounded at the low number. Every tourist agency or branch is a potential advertiser of Queensland's tourist resorts. The lack of publicity given to tourist resorts is very surprising. In most travel agencies there are pamphlets on Java, Fiji, New Zealand, and even Honolulu and America, but in few instances can any pamphlets be found about Queensland. The travel agencies in the South are poorly equipped with literature from Queensland.

Delegates of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association visited Queensland recently. They were issued with propaganda pamphlets, but the Tourist Bureau did not see fit to include any brochure on Redcliffe, despite the fact that the Council there provide the Bureau with the pamphlets. That may have been an oversight, but it would appear that Redcliffe has been out on a limb for a long time in the opinion of the Tourist Bureau.

Despite the attention of the Licensing Commission to hotel accommodation, there are still many hotels that do not provide suitable accommodation. The Licensing Commission, and I think it has been backed to a certain extent by the Tourist Bureau, seems to have decided that hotels should provide only for the luxury tourist. We want all classes of tourists in this State. Accommodation, including hotel accommodation, must be graded under a scheme similar to that operating in New Zealand. In that way the requirements of all classes of tourists will be met. It is all very well to say that in Lennons we have one of the finest hotels in the Southern Hemisphere. No doubt it is, but I could not afford to take my wife and family there. There are many other hotels at which I could not afford to stay. There must be a more even approach to the subject of accommodation for tourists. If we are to learn a lesson or two about the tourist trade we should take a tip from New Zealand, a dominion that has relied on the tourist trade ever since I can remember.

An Opposition Member: Has the Commonwealth Government got a tourist centre over there.

Mr. NICHOLSON: There is a very fine centre at Wellington under the control of the Department of External Affairs. It provides for all requirements in the matter of tourist or other information.

Mr. Davies: Just established?

Mr. NICHOLSON: It has been established for a number of years; it was in operation when I was in New Zealand in 1951. We can learn much from New Zealand about hotel accommodation. The hotels are graded to determine the tariff, the grading being based on the standard of accommodation and cuisine provided. I got particulars from the Minister of Industries and Commerce of how it is determined.

There is one thing with which I do not agree and that is that the prices charged at these hotels are fixed by a price-fixing department. The Tourist Bureau should work in conjunction with the price-fixing branch in grading hotels. No place that I visited had a higher standard of accommodation in comparison with tariff charged than New Zealand. For instance, the St. George Hotel in Wellington provides first-class luxury accommodation; it is the hotel at which delegates to the Colombo Conference stayed. It has a maximum tariff of three guineas a day, inclusive. The tariff includes all meals, morning tea, afternoon tea, and supper if required. There is, admittedly, an additional charge for bathroom accommodation which works out at 5s. a day.

An Opposition Member: Do you call that cheap?

Mr. NICHOLSON: It is cheap by Australian standards.

Mr. Thackeray: 5s. for a bath!

Mr. NICHOLSON: Bathroom accommodation. A first-class hotel situated in the North Island and deemed to be one of the newest and most modern in New Zealand is called the Putaruru. It offers five-star accommodation, the second top grade and provides every modern comfort including hot and cold water, telephone in all bedrooms, every room equipped with toilet, bath or shower, wall to wall carpets, central heating, spacious and comfortable lounges are all combined to make one's stay at this hotel completely relaxing and restful. The tariff is 40s. a day. I had the pleasure of staying at this hotel, situated in the heart of the North Island of New Zealand.

Mr. Thackeray interjected.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I said before that the Queensland Tourist Department puts too much faith in luxury tourists and condones the building of too many luxury hotels.

The hotels in New Zealand are graded on a star system, from one star up to five stars, with a three star plus between three-star and four-star. Then there is maximum grade above those. When a hotel proprietor applies to have his hotel graded, he is asked to state in which category he thinks his hotel comes. The requirements for each grading are set out in a document under the heading "Licensed Hotel Grading."

One-star hotels include hotels that provide plain, wholesome meals, clean bedrooms and bathrooms, indoor toilet, commercial or sitting room, and are conducted on approved lines laid down in conjunction with the Licensing Commission.

Two-star hotels provide good catering, clean rooms with comfortable beds and warm floor covering, more modern bath and toilet facilities, lounge, commercial or sitting rooms (all well lighted), and a reasonable standard of comfort.

Three-star hotels provide modern amenities, comfort and service of the standard largely favoured by the average traveller and with appropriate cuisine. They also provide bathrooms, separate shower boxes, hand basins and shaving facilities independent of bathrooms, comfortable bedrooms with superior furnishings and floor coverings, and well-lighted corridors with appropriate coverings and an adequately-appointed lounge.

Then there are the three-star plus hotels. They provide a high standard of modern three-star amenities, but offer four-star features, particularly in regard to cuisine and comfort. An essential feature is a large proportion of bedrooms with hot and cold water.

Coming to the better classes, the four-star hotels are larger and more luxurious hotels, with a high standard of comfort, cuisine, and modern amenities. All rooms are equipped with hot and cold running water, and the hotels have large lounges, adequate office and porter service, and silent early morning service. They also provide writing accommodation and notepaper, and most rooms in this grade are equipped with reading lamps over the beds.

Mr. Davies: What is the four-star tariff?

Mr. NICHOLSON: I shall tell the hon. member that; I am coming to that later.

Hotels in the five-star grading are of the de luxe class. All bedrooms have wall-to-wall carpets, reading lights, and wash basins with hot and cold water. A percentage of the rooms must have a private bath and/or shower. There are keys to all rooms, which is quite a change from Queensland hotels. Private suites that are not permanently engaged are an essential qualification, and the hotels must have large, airy lounges, central heating, and superior service. There must also be an adequate elevator service to all floors.

Maximum hotels offer the highest standard of modern luxury, accommodation, and service. All bedrooms are soundproof, and they have private bath or shower, toilet, bed reading lights, telephones, wall-to-wall carpets, keys, and 24-hour room service.

The final paragraph in that document says—

“With a view not only to assisting your own interest, but also to presenting to the Division all relevant details of your hotel as clearly and accurately as possible, kindly complete the attached questionnaire, fully but concisely, and return it to this office. On receipt of this information the Division will arrange for an inspection of your hotel to be made as soon as possible.”

That might all sound irrelevant but I mentioned it because it is high time that the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau had a similar scheme for grading hotels in this State.

We should also issue a booklet similar to that put out by the New Zealand Tourist Bureau. The New Zealand booklet takes in the various centres such as Wellington, Taranaki, Hawke's Bay and Gisborne, and lists all the hotels and tariffs. For instance, the St. George Hotel, Wellington, a maximum-class hotel, with a tariff of 50s. a day. The Midland Hotel, Wellington, a four-star hotel, has an inclusive tariff of 36s. 6d. a day. The standard of accommodation at a four-star hotel is about equal to that of the Gresham Hotel in Brisbane and almost up to that of the Carlton Hotel. It may be said of New Zealand, “Oh, they are on sterling and their basic wage is not quite as high as ours.” When I was there the basic wage was £11 18s. a week. True, they are on sterling, but a pound is a pound in any man's country and the New Zealand wage-earner's pound means the same to him as the Australian's does to him.

Mr. Burrows: And those hotel rates are sterling?

Mr. NICHOLSON: They are all sterling.

Mr. Davies: When you were there did you see the new Commonwealth Tourist Bureau in Wellington that they are just starting?

Mr. NICHOLSON: No, I did not see it.

Mr. Davies: You will see a reference to it at the bottom of page 4 of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau's Report. Mr. Ferguson said that the Commonwealth Government have made a start.

Mr. NICHOLSON: That is quite right. Provision has been made. The Director says—

“Arrangements have now been completed for the opening of this office in Wellington, in premises made available by the New Zealand Department of Tourist and Publicity.”

A move has at last been made to advertise Queensland. I was very pleased to see that a Queenslander, Mr. Joseph Wilson, formerly manager of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau at Adelaide, is to be in charge of that department. Perhaps Queensland will now get its fair share of publicity.

The Queensland Government Tourist Bureau might well take a leaf out of New Zealand's book. I stayed at the Duke of Edinburgh Hotel in Wellington. It was the only accommodation available because the Colombo Conference was on at the time. It was a very nice hotel with an excellent table. The inclusive tariff was 32s. 6d. a day.

Mr. Davies: What is your opinion of Queensland hotels?

Mr. NICHOLSON: I would not like to give my opinion of some of them.

Mr. Davies: Private enterprise!

Mr. NICHOLSON: I do not say that it is a slight on private enterprise. I think it is an indictment of the Licensing Commission for not bringing the big stick into operation sooner.

Mr. Davies: They should not need compulsion.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Perhaps nobody has criticised the Licensing Commission more than I have about their laxity in not forcing many hotels to have proper standards. Of course, the old cry was, “We can't do anything until materials and manpower are in greater supply.” There is no excuse now. Any hotel not up to standard should now be made to come up to standard.

The Tourist Bureau can help materially by asking all hotels to send in particulars and ask for a grading. If the Tourist Bureau published details of hotels with their gradings I believe that the hotels would be only too pleased to get into a higher classification. Put the onus on the hotel proprietor to name the classification in which he desires his hotel to be placed in the book. Because of competition he will naturally strive to have his hotel included in the three-star or four-star group rather than the one-star or two-star group.

In New Zealand the Tourist Bureau works in co-operation with the automobile association. This automobile association booklet contains a list of hotels in every province and town. Opening it at random, here is the Wellington Hotel in Christchurch. The telephone number is given and there are directions how to get there. There is a noting “H.W.” on the side—hot water. It is a three-star plus hotel. The average motorist picking up that book can see immediately where he is headed for. He knows the tariff he can afford and he can pick a hotel he can afford to take his wife and family to. He will not stay the night at a hotel only to be astounded at the bill he receives next morning. He can get it in black and white from this automobile association booklet or from other booklets issued by the Tourist Bureau. There is a great deal to learn about the tourist industry.

Mr. Houston: Give us the annual leave and you will get plenty of tourists.

Mr. NICHOLSON: That is right. I have been talking about the people who normally stay in a hotel. What about the tourists who like to travel under their own steam? There are three main groups of tourists who have not been sufficiently catered for by the Tourist Bureau. I refer to the caravaner, the ordinary motorist who tours the State and stays at hotels or motels overnight, or for a few days and the tent-dweller. Each deserves the same consideration as is provided for luxury tourists. Queensland lacks caravan parks and facilities where caravaners can spend a few days. They should be provided with more amenities than are available today. The tent-dweller is also a source of income to the State. The local business man benefits more from this class of tourist than from the luxury tourist. Much depends on the development of camping areas by local authorities. Many local authorities in the coastal areas have established camping areas and caravan parks of a very high standard. The Government could do a great deal by encouraging private enterprise to set up caravan parks by providing land on a fair rental basis or allowing it to be purchased outright. Perhaps other Government departments have not given sufficient encouragement to people who desire to develop tourist areas. I do not wish to encroach on the preserves of northern members, but I point out that private enterprise has developed the islands in the Whitsunday Group, and they would have been developed to a greater extent if previous Governments had been more fully seized with the potentialities of the tourist industry. Many people are afraid to spend much in the development of those islands because of the insecurity of the lease. Perhaps 20 or 30 years is not sufficient for a person who is prepared to put thousands into a scheme. I think the Department of Public Lands should alter its policy to provide some areas on a freehold basis, the same as in the projected policy in regard to farm land and building sites.

Mr. Ewan: Living areas.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Yes.

Many mountain resorts would be developed if the holders of that land could freehold it. There should be a liaison between other departments such as the Department of Main Roads, the Department of Public Lands, the Department of Development, and the Tourist Bureau or the Department of Labour and Industry. The tourist industry is in its infancy in Queensland, despite the fact that Queensland has the greatest tourist potential of the States.

I suggest that the New Zealand scheme of grading hotel accommodation should be adopted, the facts to be contained in a booklet.

I suggest also the production of an attractive brochure covering all tourist resorts, setting out the attractions, the accommodation, and the available amenities.

I have not in mind a booklet such as that issued by the previous Government, "Welcome to Queensland," which was merely a propaganda medium for them. The booklet I suggest should have the facts about the various resorts. It could be distributed throughout Australia and the rest of the world; it would help to increase the present over-the-counter receipts from £1,000,000 a year to £2,000,000, £3,000,000 or even £5,000,000.

Insufficient money has been expended on publicity. There are not sufficient agencies or branches throughout the State. Many travel agencies throughout Queensland would be only too pleased to act for the Queensland Tourist Bureau and supply all information on tourist attractions. The Minister is keenly interested in the development of Queensland as a tourist State. I hope my suggestions have been of assistance to him. I have had personal experience of the tourist industry. The State has many worthwhile tourist attractions, but they are crying out for development.

I think I should refer to Bribie Island, one of the greatest potential tourist resorts of Queensland. I had the pleasure today of introducing a deputation to the Premier asking for the building of a viaduct from the mainland to Bribie Island. The Government may call tenders for the building of it. The Premier has promised to submit the scheme to Cabinet. I am not revealing any secret, because he has already made a Press statement on the subject. Tenders will be called and when that is done I say to the hon. member for Southport, "Look out for the Gold Coast." Bribie Island has 35 miles of unbroken coastline of beautiful surfing beaches. It has natural beauties in its flora and fauna; they cannot be equalled in any other part of Queensland. And then there is the beautiful Bribie Passage which cannot be surpassed as a tourist attraction. At present a barge service operates from the mainland to the island which is sufficient in normal times but I want to emphasise what occurred last week-end to show the need for better facilities for the travellers to the island. Although there was a shuttle service with two barges travellers had to wait five hours before they could cross the channel to Bribie Island. However, such is the attraction of Bribie Island that people will wait five hours to cross and pay 10s. each way. There would be a toll on the viaduct but travellers would not have to pay half what they pay now to enjoy the facilities of fishing and sporting there. Bribie Island is undoubtedly the future Coney Island of Queensland. I thank the Premier for giving so much consideration to the building of a viaduct.

The Minister for Labour and Industry has a big job ahead of him in developing the tourist industry of Queensland. The Treasurer I know will see that the tourist business is not a one-way traffic, that it will

provide a profit. I am sure he will grant the necessary money for the development of the tourist industry in this State.

Mr. GILMORE (Tablelands) (7.28 p.m.): I join with other hon. members in complimenting the Treasurer on the way in which he presented his Financial Statement. It was really a great day for Queensland after all these long years of Labour Governments to know that at last a Country-Liberal Government have presented a Budget. I was pleased that provision was made in the Budget, to carry out our election promises to supply textbooks free of cost to pupils in the schools.

Mr. Sparkes: What we promise we do.

Mr. GILMORE: I am glad to be associated with that remark. I am sure that everything possible will be done to have the textbooks available for the commencement of the 1958 school year.

I draw particular attention to electricity charges with special reference to the area covered by the Cairns Regional Electricity Board. The surcharge at the present time is 10 per cent. more than city areas and the shire of Mulgrave. At one time it was 166 per cent. above city rates. A conference was held last Friday between the association of shire representatives and the chairman of the Cairns Regional Electricity Board, Alderman Fulton. When a motion was moved that a uniform tariff be introduced, he said that it would be impossible to do that at this stage. I quote his remarks from "The Cairns Post" of Saturday last—

"Alderman Fulton said that once tariffs became standard, the board would get no more Government subsidy and would be burdened with the whole of the cost of developing back areas. The subsidy went a long way to establishing transmission lines. A lot of those lines were running at a loss, but it had been done for the development of the area."

Mr. Gaven: Who is quoted as saying that?

Mr. GILMORE: Alderman Fulton, the chairman of the Cairns Regional Electricity Board. He went on to say—

"Two things must be remembered—abolition of the surcharge would mean loss of Government subsidy, and the C.R.E.B. had the cheapest supply in the whole of Australia."

Finally, when the vote was taken, Alderman Fulton said,

"I am not against it. I am all for it," I have had the Act searched to find where the chairman of the board got his information about the loss of Government subsidy. I should like to assure the representatives of the local authorities at that conference and the people directly affected that there is no such provision in the Act. I know Alderman

Fulton well enough to know that he acted in good faith, and he probably will be delighted to know that the electricity board will not lose the Government subsidy if it abolishes the surcharge.

For many years the people of Australia, particularly the people of Queensland, have heard the words "potential" and "development" used on many occasions. Let us see if we can do something about developing the State's potential, because I have no doubt that Queenslanders understand that potential is of little use until something is done to make it effective. Queensland undoubtedly has a great capacity for primary production, and there is also plenty of scope for development of our mineral and forestry resources, and, as the hon. member for Murrumbidgee would say, our tourist resources. All those resources have a great potential, and this is the first Government that have attempted to develop it. I am confident that a committee will be established that will say to people who wish to develop this country, "If you come into this market, you will find ready sales for these commodities," or, "Although these commodities can be produced or manufactured, there are not very many markets available for them, and some other commodities would not have a market at all." We must develop this country, and if we do that I am sure we shall attract the capital so necessary for its development. We have a great deal of land and many people anxious to use it, but we must first find the markets before we can attract capital to exploit the land, the mineral resources, and the timber.

Mr. Lloyd: Cheap transport, too.

Mr. GILMORE: Markets are of very little use without transport. The three main means of transport available to us are shipping, road and rail. Let us examine them carefully. The shipping industry in Queensland is in a very sorry state. For example, the sugar industry has been forced to turn to bulk handling mainly because a few extremists on the waterfront have brought about a slow turn-round of shipping. Of course, there are other economic reasons. I do not blame all waterfront workers. There are some very fine men among them.

Mr. Lloyd: That is an old story.

Mr. GILMORE: Of course it is an old story. It is an obvious one and well worth the telling. I know it hurts the Labour Party because its members supported the Communists on the waterfront for years. It is obvious that it hurts them when they find the power and influence they have wielded over the years diminishing.

Road transport is a young industry being built up by private enterprise, by men anxious to give service, and to deliver the goods on time, safely and in sound condition. The people are gaining confidence in road transport and beginning to demand that more of

it be made available to them. Those who pay for it cannot be blamed for wanting to call the tune.

The Queensland Railways have condemned themselves in the past and they need no further condemnation from me. We have the assurance of the new Minister for Transport that he is doing his best to remedy the ills of the department.

Mr. Lloyd: They did a great job during the war.

Mr. GILMORE: Hon. members opposite still live in the days of the war. It has been acknowledged dozens of times that the Railway Department did a great job during the war. However, members of the Labour Party are famous for their long memories and their shortsightedness.

The Railway Department is becoming increasingly aware of the competition from road transport and it is learning that as a public utility it must give service. It must learn that the customer is always right. The customer is demanding his rights, too, so we may look forward with confidence to improvement in the railways till they take their rightful place in the transport system. We need the railways more today than ever before. I will be a strong critic of them when necessary just as I will be their greatest supporter supporter when they deserve my support. They have a very important function to perform.

I was attacked for making a suggestion that we should get it on a business footing. I was assured by the Minister of the great loyalty of the Commissioner, of which I have no doubt. On the other hand I was told by the Opposition how competent and efficient he is. The question that arises in the minds of the hon. members and the general public is, who then is to blame for the deterioration in the department, for the late arrival of consignments, for the shocking state of our rolling stock, and the dozen and one things that go to bring about the chaotic condition of the railways? There is only one answer, and that is that the hand of the Labour Party has prevented this efficient man from doing his job. It matters not to me who manages the railways, but it matters to me and every Queenslander that they are efficiently and properly managed.

Mr. Davies: You said he should be sacked.

Mr. GILMORE: Of course I did.

Mr. Davies: Have you changed your opinion?

Mr. GILMORE: Every man who considers himself elected to do a job and finds anyone is not doing his job should suggest a remedy. I believe one of the big factors in preventing the railways from being competent and efficient is the method of promotion. A young fellow joins the department after

passing the Junior or Senior examination, he may be full of ambition but he soon realises that he has no hope of promotion no matter how much he studies or how hard he works until the retirement or death of those who joined the department before him. Private enterprise does not carry out that policy. Private enterprise promotes on ability; and it is a very sane principal, which I should like to see applied to the railways. One Opposition speaker suggested that it lends itself to graft.

Mr. Thackeray: It does, too; take the running staff.

Mr. GILMORE: If it does lend itself to graft in public enterprise it does not seem to do so in private enterprise. It is remarkable that the word should attract so much attention. The railways have had a virtual monopoly for some time, and now they are beginning to give service because we have heard in this Chamber how much opposition there is to monopolies. I think I heard some of it today. But if we support a monopoly that is in itself so inefficient that it cannot deliver the goods—

Mr. Davies: What are going to do to cure the inefficiency that you claim is there?

Mr. GILMORE: The Minister has assured us that his ambition is to make the railways pay. I do not know that it is the main factor in our transport system, but it is a most desirable one. I would be the first to give credit where it is due if there is more management and guidance and the railways do pay. The principal function of the railways in this developmental programme that is about to take place is to give service; therefore I was delighted to read where there is a fast goods train to be scheduled between South Queensland and North Queensland in the immediate future. It is a very good thing and it is a wonder that it has not been done before.

Mr. Thackeray: The Duggan Administration laid it down.

Mr. Pizzey: Why didn't you do it?

Mr. Davis interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: There is far too much interruption. Relevant interjections are allowed, but continuous interruption is disorderly.

Mr. GILMORE: I am delighted that so much attention is being given to the railways. I trust that my simple suggestions will help to increase the efficiency of the railways to a point when the people are proud of the department. An efficient railway system with security for employees is highly desirable.

I was astounded at the stand taken by Opposition members who took me to task for a simple statement. Their attitude was that the boss was perfect. I made an appeal on

behalf of employees on the Etheridge line. I asked for better housing, a western allowance and refrigerators for them, but not one Opposition member commented on those requests. The workers now know beyond a shadow of a doubt that they have been deserted by the Labour Party. The men on that line did not have one supporter, but the boss was supported by every Opposition speaker. The Labour Party deserted the men doing the work.

Mr. Sparkes: They never have supported them.

Mr. GILMORE: That is so. The Labour Government thought only of themselves. They pulled the wool over the eyes of the worker, but at last the workers have someone who will speak for them.

Soldier settlement in Queensland causes me much concern. There are two methods under which aid is given by the Federal Government for soldier settlement. If a State is an agent State, the Federal Government provide the money to be distributed by the State. If a State is a principal State, the Federal Government subsidise the money spent on a £1 for £2 basis, with a limit of £2,000,000.

Mr. Lloyd: That is pretty cheap.

Mr. GILMORE: It must have been cheap as it was abandoned three years ago by the Queensland Government. The soldiers of Queensland have been let down completely by Labour Governments. It is three years since any soldier settlement was undertaken in Queensland.

I have a copy of the second reading speech of the Minister for Primary Industries. He distributed among the States loan funds of over £8,000,000 for the current year, and that has been going on for years. The other States have succeeded in settling ex-soldiers.

Mr. Burrows: They have settled them all right!

Mr. GILMORE: They have been settled on the land. I am speaking about something of which I have knowledge. These are the amounts distributed during the current year—

State.	Amount.
	£
New South Wales	1,369,000
Victoria	1,750,000
South Australia	956,000
Western Australia	1,853,000
Tasmania	2,042,000

Queensland did not apply for a penny. That disgraceful situation should be made known to every soldier. I hope that the Government will fulfill their promises and apply to have Queensland made an agent State.

Mr. Lloyd: And have the big companies coming in.

Mr. GILMORE: Soldier settlement has nothing to do with big companies. We have the Tinaroo Dam and the Dimbulah-Mareeba project with plenty of irrigated land and farms available from time to time and I hope that money will be channelled into that area to allow soldier settlement to take place.

The Sub-Department of Forestry is a very good and efficient one and is deserving of great credit but I do not think that the department has sufficient capital to do a big enough job. It should be expanded considerably and greater areas of country planted and more money made available for experimentation on forest soils. We have our native trees but we should be able to use our soils to greater advantage by reforestation. I hope that during the life of the Government more funds are made available for reforestation. It is a task that should lean heavily on every Government in Australia; we should leave our forests not denuded but enlarged. Those doing the job should have the advantages of more money. As much timber as possible should be retained in the rain forest areas for reforestation. It is timber that grows so well and is beautiful to look at. We cannot afford to denude our forests completely and leave them barren areas.

Mr. Davies: Do you think you will get the extra funds?

Mr. GILMORE: I am appealing for the funds as I want to see this work done.

Mr. Davies: Don't you think Sir Arthur Fadden is responsible?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GILMORE: It is of the utmost importance to Queensland that every help be given to the great mining projects. It is most difficult for the ordinary Queenslander to realise the wealth in the Peninsula—bauxite, uranium and copper, these rare and precious metals. Under the careful guidance of the Minister for Mines we shall build up a very prosperous mining industry.

I congratulate the Treasurer on the presentation of his Budget; I hope he will present many more in the future.

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) (7.58 p.m.): In his Financial Statement the Treasurer said that brevity of the Government's period in office had compelled him to devote the whole of his available time to the assessment of the financial situation and the charting of the courses to be followed. He is no novice at the job. This is my eleventh year in Parliament and he was a veteran when I came here. In previous years, when other Treasurers presented Budgets, the present Treasurer was in Opposition. On receiving his copy of the Financial Statement he went carefully into it and when the debate was resumed he led the Opposition. He has the background to make it much easier for him to understand the finances of the State and

the problems associated with finance better than the typical man who comes into Parliament. He is unequalled in that regard. We cannot excuse the negative nature of the Budget and its barrenness and lack of initiative on the plea that the hon. gentleman is only a new member or that he has not had the time to get a grip of his subject. In his own words, he admits that he has devoted the whole of his time to charting courses to be followed.

I read the Budget, and, like most hon. members, I looked forward to finding something revolutionary in it. I hoped to find that some of the assurances given during the election campaign that all the mistakes made by the Labour Party would be corrected had been carried out and that the Government had profited by the mistakes made by the Labour Party. However, the Budget only indicates a desire to blunder on and repeat the mistakes. (Laughter.) I am reminded that loud laughter bespeaks the vacant mind. I am not ashamed to admit that I have made mistakes, but I have not made the mistake of ever voting for the Country Party. I am prepared to admit that I have made mistakes, and I believe in the theory that a man who has never made a mistake has made nothing of his life. Even when I was on the Government benches I did not claim that the Labour Party was a perfect party, and it certainly was never a mutual admiration society as far as I was concerned. I hope that we never reach the stage of believing that because a man has a Labour brand or a Liberal brand, he is perfect. The hon. member for Aubigny could tell hon. members that it is impossible to make a Hereford out of a Jersey just by putting the brand of the hon. member for Aubigny on the Jersey. If we came into this Chamber with the narrow-minded approach that the party to which we belong was perfect or even near perfect, we would be doing an injustice not only to our State but to ourselves.

I looked in the Budget for some prospect of relief for the unemployed. I looked for some suggestion of providing more homes for the homeless. Perhaps more than anything I looked for some provision for relief for those good Queenslanders in the drought-stricken areas who are doing a much more useful job for this State than any of us in this Chamber and who are trying to lead normal lives in the face of an abnormally prolonged dry season. As I said previously I looked in vain. To all intents and purposes the Treasurer has simply copied previous Budgets. There is nothing new in this one. He has taken great pains to indicate that he has transferred £200,000 from one Housing Commission fund to another Housing Commission fund. That may mean a better chance of spending the money but, as he is also Minister for Housing, he could have spent it in any case, so the trans-

action makes little difference to the State—certainly no greater difference than that between carrying your purse in your left-hand pocket and carrying it in your right. However, let us give him full marks for the transfer. He visited Gladstone last week and he will know that £200,000 would not build enough houses to satisfy the wants of such a relatively small town as that.

A Government Member: That is a bit of an admission.

Mr. BURROWS: I will concede it and say that he did it but I would not say it was a stroke of financial genius by any means. However, it was about the only new thing I could find in the Budget. When the Treasurer was in Opposition he often criticised the presentation of Budgets and I agreed with some of his suggestions but we have the same stereotyped presentation as before. He has the background; no-one will dispute his capacity, and, without being over-critical, I must confess that I am very disappointed in the Budget generally.

He spoke of transferring some figures and, by a process of adjustment, he converted an alleged surplus of £15,000 into a deficit of £609,000. But does that make any real difference? It is certainly a substantial amount but whether it is treated one way as a surplus or another as a deficit is immaterial. I have never been happy about the losses on State enterprises and I may develop the point later.

Mr. Roberts: There are possibly a few men in gaol for less than that.

Mr. BURROWS: I think the hon. member would know more about that than I would.

For some months past the State has been in the grip of a vicious drought and it still is. It has taken a heavy toll. Even before cattle began to die the drought had caused a loss of income to many primary producers, particularly in Central Queensland.

I read this morning that the Premier had agreed to ask the clergy to pray for rain. I have no quarrel with that, but I think it would be more appropriate if he asked the clergy to pray for a better Government, a Government with more sympathy and understanding that would be prepared to make a tangible contribution to the relief of the hardship the primary producers are suffering. Many hon. members will say that farmers should store fodder, that they are not a very provident class. I am just as close to farmers, dairy farmers in particular, as any hon. member in the Chamber. I have spent most of the last 10 days visiting dairy farmers and other primary producers in my electorate. I have been to places where they are down to their last few bales of hay or last few bags of grain. They have been feeding for a long time. I saw 20 bales of lucerne hay in a shed, and I said to the farmer, "Things don't look too good." The farmer replied, "No, and that

is the last of 2,000 bales from when I started to feed." His prospects are far from bright. He has not got cost of production for his butter for many years. His whole family has to work to make ends meet. The family's living standards are below those of any worker under any award. I make special appeal to the Government for financial contribution, but not in the form of drought relief as we know it, something that is provided if the farmer signs a declaration that he has been refused any further assistance by the bank or any further credit by his storekeeper or merchant. That is only a vicious imitation of charity. I do not want charity for these men, but something that is their right.

I forget the actual figure but for the purposes of argument I will say that £140,000 was the loss last financial year on the State coal mines. It is a loss that occurs every year amounting to a greater or lesser figure. We expect to see it in the Budget each year. There has not been a drought since 1951 and the Queensland Government have not paid very much for drought relief over a period of years. The present Government have a greater obligation to dairy farmers and other primary producers than any other Government. I am not trying to apologise for anything that the previous Government did not do. I would say that 75 per cent. of the primary producers are supporters of the Parties now on the Treasury benches.

Mr. Hiley: Accepting what you say, what item of expenditure would you suggest we drop to make the funds available for the purpose you suggest? Would you suggest we stop Tinaroo to do it?

Mr. BURROWS: I suggest that if it were necessary to budget for a greater deficit in order to help these farmers the Government would be justified in doing so. They were aware of this drought; if they were not, there must be something wrong with their diplomatic corps. The Treasurer is surrounded by members who represent country electorates. They were told of this drought during the election campaign. No doubt the Treasurer has been told every day since the election of the seriousness of the drought. The Government should not be looking for excuses as to why they cannot pay it. They should not need any prompting from me in this regard. I believe that any member who came with me for a week and saw what these men are suffering would realise the economic loss to the State and agree with me. I suggest a few trainloads of grain be distributed amongst these farmers who have reached the end of their own resources for feeding their cattle. It can be done if the will to do it is there. I rose in my place to emphasise that point, to ask the Government to give it the fullest consideration. Seventy-five per cent. of these people support the Government.

Mr. Gaven: And always will.

Mr. BURROWS: I think this is the first time for 25 years that the sincerity of the Government has been put to the test. I challenge them to take it up and do something for these people. From the political point of view I suppose I should hope that they would not do it because their refusal would increase my majority; but I am big enough to know that that is the wrong attitude.

Mr. Hewitt: Your area was bad in 1951. What fight did you put up then? Answer that question.

Mr. BURROWS: If I told the hon. member what I did in 1951 he would say that I was only boasting. Do not worry about looking around to see if we made a mistake in order to justify yourselves in making one. I am here to look after my electorate, and my electorate is suffering today. It is not a matter of politics with me. I do not want any political kudos out of this. I can win my seat; I think hon. members will concede that. This is a very serious matter. I have spoken to the leader of our party and suggested that if something is not done about it within the next week that we move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of considering the matter.

Mr. Ewan: Grain alone will not keep the cattle alive. What do you suggest?

Mr. BURROWS: I can take the hon. member to a place and show him calves that were fed on corn up to the weaner stage. Hon. members with much more practical experience than the hon. member for Roma in the feeding of dairy cattle would confirm my statements about cattle fed on hammer mill grain.

Mr. Gaven: The hammer mill does a good job.

Mr. BURROWS: I was astounded at the results. The calves were given only a very small quantity once a day, but they had plenty of good water. It is a long time since I milked a cow, but my experience is that good water is more important than good food. Good food and bad water are nearly as bad as no food at all. I am not an expert, but with good water, a hammer mill and a few bags of grain of any description remarkable results can be achieved.

The Government, while in Opposition, professed concern for the farmers. They have never had an opportunity of demonstrating their sincerity. I challenge them now to prove it a practical manner.

The hon. member who has just resumed his seat referred to surcharges on electricity. I have mentioned the subject on many occasions. When I first entered Parliament the surcharge in my electorate was as much as 65 per cent. The Capricornia Regional Electricity Board has now abolished surcharges and has adopted a uniform tariff for

power. The decision in any area is a domestic matter. In my area it was merely a matter of passing a motion at the Board meeting. Alderman Jack O'Malley, the Mayor of Gladstone and chairman of the Regional Board, was largely responsible for the introduction of uniform tariff, and I commend him for it. With the cheap Callide coal, the Capricornia Regional Electricity Board is able to supply power at a lower rate than in any other place in Queensland. Uniform tariff is a big step towards decentralisation. A person desirous of starting a factory would naturally build it where the cheapest power was available. When the surcharge was operating, he certainly would not start a factory at Monto, one of the extremities of the supply area with a surcharge of 65 per cent. If I had wanted to build a small factory, and it would not be a big factory in a relatively small town like Monto, it would have been better to build it in Rockhampton, where the power was 65 per cent. cheaper. Apart from its fairness the introduction of uniform tariffs would make a big contribution towards the decentralisation of industry. If we send a telegram from Charleville to Brisbane we pay the same rate as if the telegram was originated in Brisbane. We had to build telephone lines to send telegrams but we never contemplated making surcharges on the people living in distant areas. Whoever introduced this vicious system of surcharges on electricity did a bad service to the community, and I would be happy to support the complete abolition of them if anybody is prepared to move in that direction or if the Government introduce legislation for it.

The hon. member for Tablelands spoke of road transport and its competition with the railways. We have to be realistic about road transport. I think that the highwaymen of the road have to be arrested. By saying that I do not mean arrested in the manner to which the term could be applied. They make no contribution towards road maintenance.

Mr. Ewan: What about petrol tax?

Mr. BURROWS: They might pay petrol tax but so does every user of the road. The man using a motor-boat pays petrol tax and I suppose the hon. member pays the tax when he uses the air lines.

Mr. Gaven: It is a tax on farmers too.

Mr. BURROWS: Yes, a lot of petrol is used on farms. There should be an all-round adjustment. It is most unfair on the score of efficiency and cheapness to compare road transport with rail transport. If the wages of every lengthsmen and the cost of every sleeper and rail were debited to Consolidated Revenue no doubt the railways could undercut road transport considerably. These men are making no contribution towards the maintenance of the roads and what is more have no regard for the working conditions

of their employees. Country members of Parliament placed similarly to me and who travel at night-time know that the road haulers travel at all hours of the night and make it pretty plain that they want more than a fair share of the road. I should say that at least 50 per cent. of them are discourteous; at least that is my experience of them. They are working on some sort of a margin or contract; I do not really know what it is. There is no such thing as stopping for a regular meal. They pull up and buy 5s. worth of fish and chips, get served as quickly as they can, and eat them as they drive along.

Mr. Davies: And they sleep at the roadside.

Mr. BURROWS: Yes. On many occasions I have pulled up only to find that they have been forced to sleep beside the road. All these things tend to break down the working conditions of employees in other sections of the transport industry that have to compete with them, and I do not think anybody wants to see working conditions reduced to that standard. Notwithstanding anything that I might have said about the lack of respect of the present Government for working conditions, I do not think even they would want to see that come about.

We must approach this problem realistically. Our roads are wearing out faster than new ones are being built. When I asked the Main Roads Department about the work to be done in my electorate this financial year and expressed surprise at the small amount of capital works to be undertaken, my attention was drawn to the necessity for spending a greatly increased amount on maintenance, and I have no doubt other hon. members have also had a similar experience. Our roads will not stand up to this heavy traffic. We are not putting stronger foundations under our roads today, because we want to build as many miles of road as we can with the money available. Our roads have no better foundations and no more bitumen on them than they had 25 or 30 years ago, yet the average weight of the loads being carried on them has increased 300 or 400 per cent. at the very least.

Mr. Ewan: Many of these transports run on roads that are not built.

Mr. BURROWS: Yes. From a national point of view, we cannot expect an unlicensed and unorganised form of transport to run in fair competition with an organised form of transport such as the railways that pays for everything it uses, or shipping, which has to pay port dues and many other things like that. Basically I think we all want to be fair, and we must face up to this problem. We know that Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution stands in the way, and we must be big enough to say that we want Section 92 altered to adjust this anomaly. Even though Section 92 protects some little thing about which we have a fetish and an

alteration of it would remove that protection, we should be prepared to press for the alteration, because the damage done there would be far less than the damage that is being done to our economy in the destruction of our roads. Unless we are prepared to deal with the problem in a businesslike way, we shall be doing the country a great disservice.

Mr. Hart: We have not the power to do it.

Mr. BURROWS: No, but we can give it our moral support, and we can at least indicate our determination in that regard.

Mr. Ewan: You caused that by letting them cart a lot of wool.

Mr. BURROWS: The hon. member cannot see beyond his own nose. He says the last Government caused it by allowing them to cart a lot of wool. If they approach problems with such a miserable outlook as that I despair of their ever achieving anything worthwhile. We have to be broad-minded. We must not seize on every little item that we can use to our own selfish political advantage without regard to its value to the community. Cannot we rise above that sort of thing, for the next 12 months or two years anyway? Surely the Government believe they will be there for three years! I will concede that they will if they assure me they will forget politics and knuckle down to some work for the next two years.

Mr. Evans: Right or wrong, wise or unwise?

Mr. BURROWS: They will most likely do many things that are wrong and many things that are unwise, but if they do more things that are wise and more that are right I will even overlook the others. I will concede a great deal if the Government will do the decent thing by those stricken by the drought. Let them not go along and say, "Sign this declaration. Wait till the inspector has a look to see if your cows need a feed." Do not ask the farmers to put up with humbug and red tape.

Mr. Ewan: You know all about that.

Mr. BURROWS: I know, and there is no greater enemy of it than I am. The hon. member may quote me on it anywhere he likes. I detest humbug and hypocrisy.

Mr. Hiley: Will you be satisfied if I give ten times as much as you gave?

Mr. BURROWS: I would be satisfied if the hon. gentleman were half as sincere as I—and I am not flattering myself—and if he had one-twentieth of the understanding of the problem that I have. I cannot expect him to. Where has he been away from Queen Street? One does not milk cows in Queen Street. If he accompanied me for a week I should not have to open my mouth to convince him that he should do something for those men.

Mr. Hiley: We provided £150,000 and you people provided nothing—not one penny.

Mr. BURROWS: The Treasurer thinks the drought is over. He thinks he has done something. Let him confer with the country members of his Government. I do not want him to commit himself. I do not want him to be frightened of making a political mistake or of doing something that we might seize upon and use for political purposes. The way he does it does not concern me as long as it is done. I will be the first to commend the Government if they play the game and do the decent thing. There would have been no need for me to rise to speak tonight if I could have got an extra day with the Treasurer when he visited Gladstone last week and taken him to the places I visited during the brief recess. I rose mainly to discuss the drought. If I have not aroused any interest in hon. members opposite I am very disappointed. I have never been more sincere when I urge the Government quickly to do something tangible. If they are going to pray for rain let them also pray for a better understanding of the problems besetting primary producers today, particularly the little man.

Mr. ANDERSON (Toowoomba) (8.41 p.m.): I join with previous Government speakers in congratulating the Treasurer and his departmental officers on the preparation and presentation of the Government's first budget.

Mr. Jesson: Full of hope.

Mr. ANDERSON: Full of hope and glory for us, yes. Some people think that the Treasurer should be a forecaster. He should know whether it is going to rain or not. I can assure the hon. member for Port Curtis that we are a sincere Government. When the need to help people in the country arises we are the Government to do it.

Of course the budget is not satisfactory to everybody because there is not enough money to spend. The Treasurer has made best use of what is available and we congratulate him on his Financial Statement, knowing full well that we are passing through troublesome times with perhaps worse to come. But they are sent to us to make us realise that we do not live in a land of milk and honey all the time. We must prepare and urge farmers to prepare for times like these. The Government will do what is expected of them when the time arrives.

Last Saturday night the Premier officially opened the new swimming pool at Warwick.

Mr. Jesson: Did he swim in the pool?

Mr. ANDERSON: No, it was too cold. I congratulate Warwick on the pool, it is a wonderful effort. More pools like that are needed throughout Queensland. That night the Premier referred to the centenary celebrations in 1959. He said that every local authority should make an effort to have

something tangible with which to commemorate the centenary. Warwick have their pool, and they will take on something else.

Hon. members do not always talk about the budget during the budget debate. They try to work the parish pump. In Toowoomba we have been trying to get the Government interested in an Olympic training pool. Plans have been approved for the Milne Bay Olympic Pool. That project was put before the previous Government every year for the last five years but it was knocked back on the grounds that no finance was available. We hope that sympathetic consideration will be given by the Government for funds for a pool in Toowoomba.

Mr. Jesson: Haven't you got public companies who will contribute something? What about Western Transport?

Mr. ANDERSON: They do pay. A previous speaker mentioned the transport companies were ruining roads and not paying taxes. He should distinguish between those who pay taxes and those who do not. Our company pays approximately £10,000 a month in road tax. I notice that in the transport section there are six police but the number should be increased to 60. It was six 15 years ago and it should be increased to 60 so as to get better control over our roads. If that were done much more revenue would be gained for the railways and Consolidated Revenue would benefit from the fines.

The appropriation for the Department of Health and Home Affairs has increased by approximately £1,750,000. Unfortunately the increase was necessary owing to the increased number of staff and salaries, which is to be expected with a growing population and free hospitalisation. Provision has been made for a new general hospital and nursing quarters in Toowoomba. This building has been needed for many years because most of the hospitals are overtaxed.

Mr. Jesson: You have a splendid hospital there now.

Mr. ANDERSON: There is always room for more. I was gratified to see an increase in grants to ambulance brigades of £27,000-odd. I trust that means an increase in subsidy to the ambulance brigades throughout Queensland.

There is also provision for £7,400 for the Blue Nursing Service which, I hope, includes something for the Toowoomba service which started last month and is a great benefit. I commend these people for their work. For many years the previous Governments promised Toowoomba a new Maternal and Child Welfare Clinic. We hope this Government will give sympathetic consideration to our request. The grant for homes is slightly less. That is unfortunate, because these homes do a good job. From the Estimates I learn that there are homes at Rockhampton,

Toowoomba, and other places throughout Queensland. I have here a letter seeking an increase in the grant. It states—

“Our average cost for maintenance per head per week for 1956-1957 was £2 16s. 8d. The approximate cost per head per week in comparable Government institutions is £7.”

That is a saving of £4 3s. 4d. per head per week. I trust that the Government will consider an increase in grants to these homes. The work is voluntary and every encouragement should be given to these people. I commend those who provide a home such as that for old people.

The next department with which I deal is the Department of Public Works and Local Government. With the inclusion of the Department of Local Government there has been an overall increase in salaries. I note too that the amount for cleaning has increased by £8,772 compared with last year. I should like some explanation of that increase. I should also like an explanation of the increase for travelling expenses, postage and incidentals. The increase for these items is out of proportion with other Departments.

The increase in Estimates for the Department of Labour and Industry is brought about by an increase in the personnel of the Police Department, and the inclusion of the Tourist Bureau and Inspection of Machinery, Scaffolding and Weights and Measures. An extra £10,000 has been provided for the Secondary Industries Division to cover publicity to attract industries to this State. That is very gratifying.

On 26 September the hon. members for Chermide and Merthyr made very interesting speeches on juvenile delinquency. The hon. member for Chermide suggested that £50,000 a year should be spent on the youth of the State. I agree, if the money is available. The citizens of Toowoomba are keen to have a Police and Youth Welfare Club in Toowoomba. Two public meetings on the subject have been held. The hon. member for Chermide said it was desirable not to have a club in the heart of the city as big as Brisbane, but that does not apply to cities such as Toowoomba, Rockhampton, Townsville and Ipswich. Clubs should be established in the heart of those cities. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for chairing the meeting in Toowoomba last night. It is pleasing to know that Opposition members are interested in the welfare of the youth of Queensland. I trust that the Government will be able to give grants or subsidies for the training of youth and for the care of the aged people. The main increase connected with the Department of Justice was for election expenses and I feel sure that the people of Queensland will not quibble at it because the election brought a real and sincere government to Queensland. From the Treasurer's Financial Statement we gather that £609,776 is required to offset

the losses for the year on the State coal-mines, State coke works and State treatment works. It must be a difficult task for the Treasurer to provide for all these things.

Mr. Davies: Do you think that the Government will sell the mines?

Mr. ANDERSON: I have no idea. Subsidies granted to local governing bodies is a growing problem for any government and a big drain upon our resources. We must expect subsidies to local authorities to increase because every local authority has much work to do. We have to increase subsidies to local authorities because they will require more money to carry out their function of improving the State.

I think all hon. members will agree that the Department of Education is one department that needs more money than has been allocated to it. Admittedly £1,000,000 more has been budgeted this year than was expended last year but that will be absorbed in rising costs and salary increases and an increase of 500 in the staff. I do not see any provision in the Estimates for the payment of teachers engaged in sub-normal training schools. This is a very serious problem and one in which I am interested. I implore the Minister to give it the consideration it demands. The system was started many years ago in Brisbane. We now have a strong branch in Toowoomba, one in Ipswich and Rockhampton and Townsville is making application to start a branch. We realise that it is a responsibility of the Government to provide for the training of sub-normal children. We expect the Government to do these things for us. Those interested in the training of sub-normal children are to be commended for their enterprise in helping children who cannot help themselves. What is more, much relief is given to parents for a few hours each day whilst their children are at training school. As Mayor of Toowoomba, I have called many public meetings of charity organisations but this is one organisation for which I feel strongly. I have tried to help the association in Toowoomba and it is gratifying to know that we are doing something in that regard. The sub-normal children of Toowoomba after having 12 months' training one is amazed at the improvement in them, particularly shown at their Christmas party when they sang Christmas carols. We commend those people who help with this home, but now that these training schools for sub-normal children have been established it is up to the Government to play a bigger part than they have played in the past. We are very grateful to the previous Government for giving us a £1 for £1 subsidy and helping us through the Public Works Department and with the equipment for the school, but we think that the teacher's salary or at least part of it, should now become the responsibility of the Government. The Education Department makes provision for teachers for

spastics and other children of that kind, but so far it has made no provision for teachers of sub-normal children.

Mr. Davies: Do not you think that the Commonwealth Government should make some contribution towards education?

Mr. ANDERSON: Perhaps they should, but there is no reason why the Queensland Government should not also make a contribution. We need school buildings, too. We have bought a big home in Toowoomba with the idea of making it a boarding school for sub-normal children from the country. We have not yet raised enough finance to build classrooms. We applied for a grant or subsidy towards building classrooms at the school in Toowoomba, but no money has yet been made available. We hope to take those children from the country and board them at that school, thus easing the burden on the country people. People have shifted to Toowoomba from as far away as Cunnamulla so that their children can go to the training school, and there are many more applications from people in various parts of Queensland for the admission of their children to this home.

Another problem that we are faced with is the care of these children after they leave school. The parents are very much concerned about this. A committee of which Professor Schonell is chairman has given much thought to this problem and has suggested that we start a farm colony in some place that is easily accessible. At one time there was an experimental farm near Dalby, but that has now been taken up. I understand that there are 1,800 acres of land at Burpengary on the North Coast that was purchased for a lazaret. I do not know whether it is suitable as a farm colony for sub-normal children, but I think it is well worth investigation. There may be other Crown land that is even more suitable than that. We must try to help these children. We have run stalls in the streets of Toowoomba to try to raise money for this worthy cause and we were glad to be able to do it.

Mr. Gair: What children are you catering for in particular? The spastics?

Mr. ANDERSON: No, the sub-normal children. We do not cater for spastics at all. They are in a different class altogether from the sub-normal children.

Mr. Gair: Backward children?

Mr. ANDERSON: No, not the backward children.

Mr. Ramsden: You mean the children with an I.Q. below 60.

Mr. ANDERSON: We can train them in many ways and it is gratifying to know that they are gaining in development every week.

To work the parish pump again—we need a new high school in Toowoomba, preferably with hostel accommodation for five days of the week so that children from Crow's Nest, Oakley, Pittsworth, Clifton and other centres just outside Toowoomba can attend. A very good site is available. It was an old gravel pit. The department has investigated it and agreed on its suitability. We know from the Budget that not much money is available but negotiations can be started and plans got under way. There used to be a great deal of red tape in Government departments. We have already made steps to reduce it, but in any case some of the preliminary moves could be made right away.

I do not envy the Minister for Transport for his job with the railways but I congratulate him on his excellent handling of it so far.

Mr. Jesson: He is not doing too good a job—not in my records.

Mr. ANDERSON: My word he is! I am sure he is getting requests from many people. Many approaches were made to the previous Minister for Transport for concessions for secondary industries. Some firms in country cities have concessions and others have not. Materials are sent in bulk to them to be made up and returned to the main port as made-up goods. For example, we have three clothing factories in Toowoomba. They pay full second-class rates on the material they get from Brisbane, and when they return it as made-up goods for re-sale they again pay second-class rates. We cannot hope to develop the State or to encourage decentralisation if those industries are not granted concessions. Firms have to be in a very big way before they are considered for concessions.

Mr. Thackeray: You want the Minister to make the railways pay. How can he make them pay if you want concessions?

Mr. ANDERSON: If costs are reduced and they can sell goods more cheaply they will manufacture more.

Mr. Thackeray: What about ore concessions for Mt. Isa?

Mr. ANDERSON: If they can show they are entitled to a concession they should be given every consideration. Indeed every city that seeks a concession should be considered.

Mr. Jesson: What about some of the transport companies giving concessions?

Mr. ANDERSON: The transport companies would give concessions. However, they are governed by the railway schedule. They cannot charge less than the railway schedule.

Railway crossings have always been a sore point with me. People should stop at them but unfortunately many do not. Recently we had a very tragic accident in Toowoomba.

We have had new lights put over the railway crossings in the city at Russell, Margaret, Herries and James Streets. The Council bears the expense of one light and the Railway Department pays for the other. Unfortunately there is no warning device. The sodium vapour lights burn all night but there is no indication given of the approach of a train. Admittedly motorists are supposed to stop but there are no signs warning them to stop. I urge the installation of some type of flashing device at railway crossings to indicate the approach of trains. Two people were killed in a tragic railway crossing accident in Toowoomba very recently. My own brother was killed at a railway crossing so I know the dangers.

I again congratulate the Treasurer on his Budget. It is up to all hon. members to set an example, to give the Government encouragement with concrete suggestions on how to improve the State's finances. We could start right here in this Chamber. I have been here only a short while but it is already evident to me that much time is wasted sitting here all day listening to hon. members who have nothing constructive to say. I know I do the same thing. During the Budget debate hon. members can speak on anything they like for an hour. I think that is wrong. Let us try to overcome the waste of manpower with 75 hon. members sitting around listening to one man speak for an hour or two hours.

Mr. Davies: It is a system which has evolved over the centuries. It has worked better than any other.

Mr. ANDERSON: Maybe it has, but it does seem a waste of time.

Mr. Jesson: What is your suggestion?

Mr. ANDERSON: Let hon. members keep to the subject under debate. When speaking on the Budget debate let hon. members speak about the Budget, not work the parish pump as I have been doing. It must be a bad example to public servants. I have been on deputations to Ministers or high officials in Government departments. Very often three or four departmental heads will receive deputations. Why have three or four men sitting around listening when one man could pass on to the others all that is necessary? To my mind it is a wilful waste of time. A girl takes down most things that are said and a copy could be supplied to other interested sub-departmental heads. Very often the deputation does not receive an answer but is told that it will be advised later. I think that much of the overlapping could be avoided.

I thank the Chamber for its attention and I trust that the Budget will be accepted as the Treasurer has presented it.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 9.16 p.m.