

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 24 OCTOBER 1957

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

were inadvertently omitted when the advance copies of the Report of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works were being bound. Approval is now sought for the insertion of the graph and design in the report.

Is it the pleasure of the House that these reproductions be inserted in the Report of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works which was tabled in the House on 22 October and ordered to be printed?

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS.

COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT AID FOR MARY KATHLEEN ROAD.

Mr. WOOD (North Toowoomba—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, and Main Roads—

“In view of (a) the remark by the Treasurer in his Financial Statement that two applications to the Commonwealth Government in 1956 for assistance in building the Mary Kathleen road to the uranium fields had been unsuccessful, and (b) two declarations in Parliament by the Minister on October 15 that an application by him had been successful, will he inform the House:—

“(1) What submissions were made to the Commonwealth Government in this matter?”

“(2) In what way has the Commonwealth Government decided to assist?”

“(3) To what extent has the Commonwealth Government committed itself financially in the project?”

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

“(1) (a) Letters were exchanged between the Honourable the Premier and the Right Honourable the Prime Minister from April 26, 1956, onwards. (b) The Commonwealth Government was asked to contribute to the cost of building the Mary Kathleen Road. This request was made verbally to Sir Arthur Fadden by a Deputation of the Cabinet, consisting of the Premier, State Treasurer and myself. Sir Arthur Fadden immediately arranged for the Commonwealth Co-ordinator-General to visit Queensland and enquire on the spot into the Government's submission. Following the Report of the Co-ordinator-General, this Government was notified that the Commonwealth would contribute the sum of £450,000 to the cost of the Road. Might I observe that this may be expected to be the fore-runner of many successful representations which my Government anticipates making to the Commonwealth Government. I need hardly add that the case was carefully prepared and courteously submitted.”

“(2) A contribution of up to £450,000 on a £ for £ basis towards the cost of construction.”

“(3) See No. (2).”

THURSDAY, 24 OCTOBER, 1957.

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

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATOR- GENERAL OF PUBLIC WORKS.

INSERTION OF GRAPH AND DESIGN.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that the Government Printer advises that two reproductions, namely—

(a) Graph—Loan allocations for the State works programmes,

(b) Design—Steel superstructures of some Australian bridges,

SALE OF URANIUM ORE.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, and Main Roads—

“(1) Has any agreement or arrangement been entered into between the State Government, past or present, and the Federal Government or any Commission with regard to the acquisition and/or sale of uranium ore or any of its derivatives produced in Queensland? If so, will he inform the House as fully as possible why such agreement or arrangement was entered into and the implications of it?”

“(2) As the powers of the Commonwealth Government in matters such as this are confined to defence, and the State Government retains and can exercise all Sovereign rights respecting the production, treatment and sale of uranium ore, will he assure the House that the Federal Government or its constituted Atomic Energy Commission will not be allowed to abuse the defence powers vested in them by the Federal Constitution?”

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

“(1) No.”

“(2) There has been no attempt by any Commonwealth instrumentality to impinge upon the State's sovereign rights in respect of uranium.”

MARRIED MALE ABORIGINALS, WOORABINDA SETTLEMENT.

Mr. THACKERAY (Keppel) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

“(1) Is he aware that married male aboriginals who live and work outside of the Woorabinda settlement, and who have wives and children at the settlement, are being denied the right to visit their wives and children at the settlement?”

“(2) If so, will he give an assurance that this harsh administration will cease, and these families be reunited when they so desire?”

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Stock), for **Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga), replied—

“(1) Married aboriginals attached to the Woorabinda Settlement, and who live and work outside the Settlement, are not denied the right to return to visit their wives and children. There are, however, two natives working and living outside the Settlement who have been refused permission to return because of their misconduct whilst residing on the Settlement. They have been told that they may take their wives and families from the Settlement as soon as they are able to provide suitable accommodation for them. Meanwhile, the Department has made arrangements which will enable the natives concerned, if they so desire, to see their families outside the Settlement at reasonable intervals.”

“(2) See answer to (1).”

NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED IN QUEENSLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) asked the Minister for Labour and Industry—

“(1) What is the number of unemployed registered at the unemployment bureaux in Queensland at the present time?”

“(2) What is his estimate of the number of unemployed not registered at the bureaux?”

“(3) Are there any unemployed immigrants in the State not registered? If so, how many are there and are they receiving any special allowance from the Commonwealth?”

Hon. K. J. MORRIS (Mount Coot-tha) replied—

“(1) The hon. member should be aware that the Unemployment Bureaux are conducted by the Commonwealth and not by the State Government. It is suggested, therefore, that he should secure this information from the correct source.”

“(2) It must be obvious to the hon. member that this is quite an improper question in that no accurate figures could be obtained.”

“(3) See answer to No. (1).”

SUITABLE CROPS FOR CLARE SETTLEMENT AREA.

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) asked the Minister for Agriculture and Stock—

“(1) Has the Agriculture Research Station in the Burdekin River Settlement Area made a report on the types of crops that can be successfully grown in the Clare Settlement Area?”

“(2) If so, which crops have been mentioned, and have they been classified according to belts of different soil types at various distances from the river?”

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

“(1) Yes. Findings on the new Millaroo Regional Experiment Station about twenty miles up-river from Clare have been reported in the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture and Stock and of the Burdekin River Authority.”

“(2) The potentialities are being investigated of—(a) The light textured levee soils, and (b) The heavy soils of the flood plains. The following crops have already been grown successfully on the levee soils:—tobacco, cotton, maize, safflower, wheat, cowpeas, beans, and grass seeds. Pastures are being established on the heavy soils of the flood plains. Small areas of rice have been grown successfully on these soils and their potentialities for other crops are to be investigated.”

LEVEL CROSSING AT OAKHURST.

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) asked the Minister for Transport—

“Will he reconsider his previous unfavourable reply to my request for some form of railway level crossing at Oakhurst instead of the present gate arrangement in view of the fact that recently a prominent citizen in the Aramara district narrowly escaped crashing into the end carriages of a long goods train at the dangerous open crossing which has to be used when the gates are closed?”

Hon. G. W. W. CHALK (Lockyer) replied—

“I regret I am unable to undertake to have the level crossing gates at Oakhurst replaced by some other form of crossing. The fact that the gates were closed against road traffic and that the gentleman referred to, therefore, had to use the alternative crossing, should have been an indication to him that a train was approaching and he should have exercised caution before crossing the line.”

FATAL ACCIDENTS AT ALDERLEY RAILWAY CROSSING.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) asked the Minister for Labour and Industry—

“(1) Would he inform the House of the number of fatal accidents that have occurred during the last five years at the Alderley railway crossing?”

“(2) In the opinion of the Commissioner of Police is this crossing an extreme danger hazard?”

Hon. K. J. MORRIS (Mount Coot-tha) replied—

“(1) Two.”

“(2) It is the opinion of the Commissioner of Police that there are adequate official traffic signs on both sides of the Alderley Railway Level Crossing, and if motorists heeded these official traffic signs collisions between motor vehicles and railway engines would not occur. As many motorists do not heed the official traffic signs, this Railway Level Crossing must be considered a dangerous hazard. It appears that the installation of “boom” gates or the installation of alternating red flashing warning lights operating automatically upon the approach to the Level Crossing of a train would be more effective and more likely to cause a motorist to stop and thereby reduce the possibility of collisions between motor vehicles and moving trains at this location.”

PAPER.

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Proclamation under the Mining Acts, 1898 to 1955.

SUPPLY.

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

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

Debate resumed from 22 October (see p. 605) 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. DEWAR (Chermside) (11.14 a.m.): At the outset I congratulate the Treasurer on the way in which he is applying himself to the duties of his portfolio. It is not an easy matter to pick up in a few weeks the threads of what virtually is the largest business in the State, or to analyse the finances of the State.

The task is a particularly hard one because the State has suffered from bad government for so long. The finances have been reduced to a sorry plight by successive Labour Governments over the past 20-odd years.

The Opposition comments on the Treasurer's criticism of previous Treasurers do not carry much weight. It has been said that although the Treasurer criticised the pattern of previous Financial Statements he has furnished one along similar lines. It would hardly be possible for him to do anything else in the time at his disposal. I am certain that the innovations that he suggested when he was in Opposition will be introduced into the Financial Statements that he will submit to this Chamber during the next 20 years that the Country-Liberal Government occupy the Treasury benches.

I refer now to the comments by the former Secretary for Public Works, the hon. member for Carnarvon, on the statements made during the Address-in-Reply debate about the tragic state of affairs at Zillmere. He said that the comments were irresponsible, and as I was the only one on the Government side who spoke on the subject he was obviously referring to me. I was quite pleased when the Treasurer told me the other day that my statements in this Chamber in my Address-in-Reply speech had been submitted to the officers of his department and that at least 95 per cent. of them could not be refuted. So much for the hon. member for Carnarvon and his reference to irresponsible statements.

During his speech on this debate he said that the need for housing was so great in 1950 that the Government in co-operation with the Commonwealth Government entered into contracts with overseas building organisations to bring in fabricated homes, and that the late E. M. Hanlon had said that his Government were prepared to lose £1,000,000 on the project. He further said that his technical officers had decided that the timber for the imported homes was not susceptible to borer infection and that it was not necessary

to immunise it. That was rather a peculiar decision seeing so many of our own softwoods and scrub timbers are susceptible to the lictus borer. It is not uncommon to treat our own timbers against the borer, the worst of which is so much better than that imported from European countries. It is strange that technical officers should decide that this rubbish—and that is all it can be called—which is only fit for the manufacture of packing cases, should not be immunised against borer infection.

No-one could compare the quality of the imported timbers with that of even the worst of our own timbers. Australian hardwoods, such as tallow wood, blackbutt, and ironbark, are the best woods in the world. No borer would care to test his teeth on them. Our pine, too, is definitely the best in the world and needs no borer treatment. As I say, there is no comparison between our own timbers and the rubbish that was brought in from overseas for housing purposes.

Mr. Aikens: Most of it was case timber.

Mr. DEWAR: That is all it was fit for.

In 1951 the then Minister said that the Government were not happy about the timber that was being used in the prefabricated houses; they thought something should be done about it. He said that a Commonwealth officer, Dr. Welch, had made a report but that the Government did not think the expenditure of from £80 to £100 a house on borer immunisation was warranted. He went on to say that it would be better to get the houses built and maintain them at a later stage. That was in 1951 and, as I pointed out by interjection, in 1952 departmental officers discovered the presence of the borer *hypotrupes bajulus* in the timber. They found it in samples submitted by Housing Commission officers. If the hon. member for Carnarvon is sincere when he says that in 1951 the Government were concerned and thought something should be done about immunising the timber because of its susceptibility to timber pests, why is it that when the existence of the European borer was discovered in 1952, he took no action?

Mr. Hilton: We did. The Forestry people and the Housing Commission people worked on it continuously from that date.

Mr. DEWAR: If you find borers in a piece of timber, is it possible for the Housing Commission and the Forestry Department to work on it for 4½ years and still not have a "go" at it? Within hours of the shocking borer infestation at Zillmere being brought before the notice of the present Minister for Housing, he made arrangements for fumigation experts throughout Australia to report on it. He even invited a South African expert on forestry matters who was here at the time to accompany him to Zillmere. As I say, within hours he was able to say that the pest could be treated with a certain type of fumigant.

Mr. Aikens: You will not kill the borer by conferences.

Mr. DEWAR: As the hon. member for Mundungburra says, you will not kill borers by talk. It is necessary to take some positive action. Within hours the present Minister initiated a programme and got on with the job. The previous Minister has the audacity to say that the Housing Commission and the Forestry Department were talking about it for 4½ years, yet not one positive step was taken to eradicate the borers. They have been allowed to feed on the houses at Zillmere, and to grow fat and perhaps spread to other parts of the State. If that is not an indictable action, I do not know what is. It is reprehensible to think that no action was taken by the previous Government between 1952, when the then Minister first raised the matter, and 3 August, 1957, a period of almost five years. Positive action should have been taken immediately to fumigate the timber. It is a disgusting state of affairs.

I dealt adequately with the subject of the borer at Zillmere when I spoke on the Address in Reply.

An A.L.P. Member: Tell us something about the missing houses.

Mr. DEWAR: I dealt with that, too, in the Address-in-Reply debate and I pointed out that only 855 of the 886 French houses contracted for were actually built of French material. Thirty-one disappeared. There is no need for me to develop that argument any further.

Mr. Hilton: In your usual untruthful manner.

Mr. DEWAR: Does the hon. member say more than 855 houses were built entirely out of French timber? He says I am telling an untruth. In other words, he is suggesting that more than 855 houses were built of French material. I deny that. In fact some of the 855 houses have Australian materials in them. I believe steps should be taken to find out what happened to the 31 that disappeared.

Mr. Aikens: Weren't we told that a lot of the timber was washed overboard on the way out?

Mr. DEWAR: That was just as much hooey as the action taken on the borer from 1952 to 1957.

I do not propose to spend a great deal of time on housing at this stage. From every point of view Labour failed miserably to face up adequately to the housing problem. I do not deny that proper steps were taken along certain lines and that much progress was made. I am not foolish enough to suggest that the Government did nothing. I have always been willing to give credit where credit is due. What was done outside Zillmere was a step in the right direction; it was good, but not enough was done because of

the Government's lack of imagination not merely on housing but on every phase of community life in Queensland.

Not the least of the great failures of the Government on housing was the failure to make moneys available to co-operative building societies by savings banks guarantees. In New South Wales alone in the post-war years £118,000,000 has been made available for housing through the terminating co-operative building societies scheme. What did we have in Queensland through that medium? Not one penny!

Mr. Aikens: What was the rate of interest?

Mr. DEWAR: The interest rate does not mean a thing. I do not see any lessening in demand. I do not hear any cry about the demand for homes decreasing. I still get weekly phone calls from young people who have made application to the Housing Commission to have homes built on their own land. It is foolish to argue that the interest rate has brought about any decrease in the demand for building. The demand is just as great today as it was five years ago when the interest rate was 1 per cent. lower, so let hon. members alert themselves on that. Had we taken part in a terminating co-operative building society programme, as the other States did, especially New South Wales, we should have had in the same period commensurate with our population, no less than £35,000,000. Just imagine what a great impetus it would have given home owners if in the eight to ten post-war years we could have thrown another £35,000,000 into the common housing pool.

It is elementary. In the last three weeks the official Opposition have launched an attack against the Government by innuendo and suggestion that they are not interested in the building of rental homes. The mere fact that hon. members of the Opposition did nothing that I know of on the floor of the Chamber to encourage the Government of the day to introduce the co-operative building society type of home-building shows that they helped to rob the State's building programme of £35,000,000. Is it not obvious that if an additional £35,000,000 had been thrown into the housing pool to build homes for persons desirous of owning their own homes that more houses could have been built with the money that was available under the Commonwealth-States Agreement to build contract-of-sale homes and rental homes? By their own actions they indict themselves. They are equally as culpable as any other force in the community that they suggest is to blame. By their attitude towards savings bank guarantees of co-operative building societies they have helped to cause the shortage of homes.

Had this £35,000,000 been thrown into the common pool on the basis of an advance of £2,500 to each person no fewer than 14,000 additional homes would have been built in Queensland. With an additional

14,000 homes through that avenue alone there would be no housing shortage in Queensland today. Had there been no housing shortage we could have attracted more industrial development. Had there been no housing problem Queensland could have encouraged a greater percentage of the migrant intake to build up the State's population and the State would have been in a very much better position. Do not forget that the previous Government had not only a bad record for housing but Queensland also had the smallest intake of migrants of any State. Had 14,000 additional homes been built, is it not obvious that there would have been less pressure on loan funds? More money would have been available for essential State development work. When the Commonwealth Government make an allocation of loan funds to Queensland it is the right of the Queensland Government to allocate a certain amount to housing. The Loan Council does not say to the Queensland Government, "You will spend £3,000,000 or £5,000,000, on housing."

Mr. Hilton: Yes they do.

Mr. DEWAR: They do not. The Queensland Government allocate the money for homes.

Mr. Lloyd: Tell us something about the £25 deposit.

Mr. DEWAR: I will deal with that at a later date. If these additional homes had been built it would have helped to lower interest rates.

All these things have a cumulative effect. It all comes back to the root cause—the failure of the Government to provide the finance available through the co-operative building societies' scheme. In the last two weeks there has been a drop in hire-purchase rates in relation to cars. That is because the demand has lessened. Is it not obvious that if we caught up with the housing shortage the demand for houses would lessen and so would the pressure on interest rates? A bank lag developed in the war years and this created great difficulties in the post-war years. It is only natural to expect the demand to drop as that shortage is overcome. In the War Service Homes Division the position is good now compared with the immediate post-war years. An additional 4,000 to 5,000 houses being built at the present rate will overcome the shortage. The War Service homes are making available this year an additional £600,000 for home purchase. When that is added to the £1,500,000 that the Treasurer has been able to make available through Savings Bank guarantees to the co-operative terminating building societies we have an amount of £2,100,000 additional money in the pool for housing this year. That represents roughly 1,000 homes. People who desire to own their own homes can look forward confidently in the next financial year to the satisfaction of their housing needs. I congratulate the Treasurer on his actions. I have been a lone

wolf for many years in my advocacy of multiple home units. I saw them in London during the war. The hon. member for Bulimba argued that such a type removed people from park lands and open spaces in which children could play, but that difficulty was easily overcome in London. I said in a previous speech in this Chamber that a building on the Thames embankment houses hundreds of families—a colossal building, with a park, playing areas and a swimming pool in the centre. Of course, I do not suggest that we have the financial resources of the Corporation of London to build that type of multiple dwelling, but we could embark on a modest programme of multiple units and it would be a big step towards easing the housing problem. Although our biggest problem is to house families, there are many childless couples, young people, old people, bachelors, spinsters, and students, who need single-unit accommodation. That will always be so. A building programme of that type could be undertaken in a suitable area like St. Paul's Terrace, which used to be known as Spring Hill.

Mr. Mann: It is still known as Spring Hill. St. Paul's Terrace is part of it.

Mr. DEWAR: I thank the hon. member. It is the dress circle of Brisbane; it would lend itself to the building of multiple units.

No matter what Government are in power and whether the hon. member for Brisbane is still in Parliament or whether the electorate returns a Liberal member, Spring Hill will still be the flat area of Brisbane.

Mr. Thackeray: He will still be the member.

Mr. DEWAR: Of that I have extreme doubt.

I deal now with another matter mentioned by the ex-Minister for Housing and the ex-Minister for Public Lands, the hon. member for Carnarvon—War Service Land Settlement.

He quoted at great length from statements alleged to have been made by the Premier about gifts under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme—I say it advisedly because I do not know that they were actually made. I did not hear the statements but, if they referred to this subject, it is obvious he was referring to the non-repayable amounts made available by the Commonwealth to the States. I do not think anyone suggests that under that scheme the money was given for nothing.

Mr. Aikens: Are you going to deal with the houses sold on a deposit of £25?

Mr. DEWAR: I am at present dealing with War Service Land Settlement.

Mr. Mann: Are you going to answer that question?

Mr. DEWAR: I shall answer it when I speak on the Trust and Special Funds.

The Commonwealth provided approximately £63,000,000 under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme to the three States that participated as agent States—Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania. Queensland was denied a commensurate amount through the arrogant refusal for political reasons of the Queensland Government to take part in the scheme. That sum was lost in addition to approximately £35,000,000 that could have been expended on housing if the previous State Government had encouraged the establishment of co-operative building societies here.

It is a singular coincidence that the ex-Minister who was in charge of the two departments and failed so miserably to accept these avenues of finance is the hon. member for Carnarvon. I do not know whether it happened by coincidence or design but I am charitable enough to believe it was a pure accident, that he was a victim of the policy of his Government—if it had a policy, and of that I am extremely doubtful.

Queensland had the opportunity to participate as an agent State. If the previous Government had availed themselves of the opportunity many millions of pounds would have flowed into the State. Not only would the men have been settled on the land in a proper manner but a much greater number would have been settled.

The hon. member for Carnarvon said that under agent-State conditions soldier settlers would be no better off than they now are. Indeed, he suggested they would be worse. He then referred to the annual rental. He used that as the peg on which to hang his hat. He said that the previous Government were able to settle ex-service men at a rental of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. compared with $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for perpetual lease land under agent-State conditions. Let us compare the $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest on leasehold under the principal-State basis with the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest on perpetual lease which can be converted at the end of 10 years to freehold. From his remarks the Minister's officers were either ignorant of the true position or deliberately misrepresented the facts. Queensland charges on the principal-State basis $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. as rent on the unimproved capital value of the land. The whole of the development work by way of loan to the settler bears interest at $3\frac{5}{8}$ per cent. with redemption over 30 years. Look at the position on the agent-State basis. A settler would pay $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. not only on the land but also the fencing, the water, and timber treatment and pasture or crop improvement. Under the agent-State principle he pays $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. as against $3\frac{5}{8}$ per cent. under the principal-State basis. Either the Minister knows that, or if he does not he was incorrectly informed. The agent-State basis provides for the improvements at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and also the first year's fertilisation of the property. The

settler has no need to repay any of the principal during the first 10 years—for the first 10 years he merely pays 2½ per cent. on the capital value of the property.

Mr. Hilton: He has to pay for his improvements.

Mr. DEWAR: Two and a-half per cent. on the improved value of the property and no repayment of principal for 10 years. On the principal-State basis he pays only 1½ per cent. on the land and 3½ per cent. on his house, fencing, water, crop and pasture improvements. In view of that the Minister had the hide to suggest that a settler under the principal-State arrangement would be on a better basis than a settler on the agent-State basis.

Mr. Hilton: You have not got it right yet.

Mr. DEWAR: After 10 years, with no repayment of the principal, he might elect to convert the property to freehold. Under the agent-State basis buildings are provided at 1946 cost and are repayable over thirty years. There is no comparison between the two schemes. The agent-State scheme has easy terms for 10 years and the land would be in a reasonable state of production immediately the settler goes onto the property because his pasture and crops are ready. His Queensland counterpart struggles from the word go because he is put on a piece of unimproved land and has to pay for the improvements he puts on it. The former Minister actually stated that settlers would not be on a more favourable basis under agent-State conditions than principal-State conditions. He carried on an argument with the then Treasurer for two or three minutes. Immediately the Commonwealth's agent-State basis applies the Commonwealth pays the cost of the land to the State or the person from whom it is resumed. The former Minister clearly indicates his lack of knowledge of the matter he was discussing.

Mr. Hilton: You read it.

Mr. DEWAR: I have read it.

Mr. Aikens: Read it out.

Mr. DEWAR: Under the Standing Orders I am not allowed to quote from "Hansard." However, this is what it says—

"Mr. Hilton: So far as the ex-service men are concerned, no. The advantage that might lie with the State is along these lines: under agent-State conditions the Commonwealth insist that they own the land. They make all the money available on the condition that they own the land and that they get the rent for it.

"Mr. Hiley: That is right. They buy it from the State. They pay us out in full.

"Mr. Hilton: Not straight out.

"Mr. Hiley: They buy the land from the State.

"Mr. Hilton: Not at all."

Now the Minister is saying that he did not say that. As a matter of fact, he repeats it on the next page.

Mr. Aikens: Read it.

Mr. DEWAR: I cannot, under the Standing Orders.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the hon. member for Chermiside that he is entitled to quote from a current debate.

Mr. DEWAR: It is amazing that the former Minister for Public Lands should know so little about the department that he administered. But that is typical of the previous Government. Right from the inception of war service land settlement the Queensland Government wanted no part of the scheme. During the years that we raised the matter when in Opposition, the then Government continued to advance the same arguments and to attack the Commonwealth Government. Either they did not understand the scheme or they deliberately misrepresented it to the people.

Mr. Aikens: Did your Party understand the scheme?

Mr. DEWAR: Of course they did. My only fear is that now it may be too late.

Mr. Hilton: Ha, ha!

Mr. DEWAR: The former Minister laughs when I say it may be too late. If it is not, there is no way in the world that the present Government will not embrace the scheme. I sincerely hope that it is not too late.

Mr. Walsh: Your Government have not been well advised.

Mr. DEWAR: They have been well advised, and they will be well advised to go into the scheme. That is the only way in which the ex-service men of this State will be settled on the land. When I say "settled" I do not mean settled in the way that Labour has settled them. We will see that they are settled in a way that will enable them to make a living on the land.

Mr. Jesson: You would not know the first thing about it.

Mr. DEWAR: I know the first, the second, and the third thing about it. Let the hon. member keep out of it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DEWAR: The Commonwealth Government received not a vestige of co-operation from the Queensland Government. The result was that hundreds of Queensland ex-service men were denied their right. Having served their country, they should be allowed to go on the land with Commonwealth financial help. They were denied that right by the actions of the Government from which this State suffered for so long.

Mr. Aikens: Were they not eligible under the ordinary land policy?

Mr. DEWAR: The Queensland Government made ridiculous excuses for refusing to accept the agent-State basis. The State Government receive payment for their interest in land that is acquired for settlement, just as any private owner would. The reason for the former Government's attitude, of course, is obvious. They believe in leasehold tenure and rental homes. They want everything on a leasehold basis.

Mr. Graham: A very good system.

Mr. DEWAR: The hon. member's Party does not believe in letting a man own his own home, or anything else. They are afraid that that would make him a capitalist. What a lot of nonsense! That system, and Labour's typical restrictive policy, have kept Queensland back. It will take us three years to clean up the horrible mess that they left behind them. This is only one of the things that we will have to clean up.

Mr. Aikens: Are you going to give the big graziers freehold tenure?

Mr. DEWAR: With freehold tenure I believe we should go no further than living areas.

Mr. Graham: What is a living area?

Mr. DEWAR: That is easily determined but I do not intend to develop it now, firstly, because I do not know enough about it, and I will admit it and, secondly, because I want to deal with soldier settlement because it "stinks".

The ex-Minister referred to loans by the Agricultural Bank. Certainly the Agricultural Bank gave concessions on interest, but its loan maximum was £5,000 and it lent only up to 90 per cent. of its own valuation. Remember, that was not the market value but the bank's value. The result was that the security required was approximately the same proportion as would be required by a private trading bank. The ex-serviceman had to command finance in order to go on the land. Apart from the rent concession, it was ordinary good business for the Agricultural Bank. The only loss it sustained was the slight loss in interest.

Of course preference was given to ex-servicemen in grazing ballots, and that was very helpful but in all cases the settler had to find his own finance. Imagine how tough that would be for a young man who had joined the forces in his 20's or early 30's. He would not have had time to accumulate any money before the war and during his four to seven years of war service, as many had, he may have been on the pay of a 1st class private—6s. 6d. a day. What chance would he have to accumulate any money? In many cases the drawing of the grazing ballot was only an embarrassment.

The Queensland scheme was poor in comparison with Victoria's. In addition to participating in the War Service Land Settlement Scheme in which it has done an excellent job, Victoria ran a single-unit farm scheme. It lent up to £8,500 to settlers who were buying their own properties at 1½ per cent. over 30 years. Compare that with Queensland's lending up to 90 per cent of the bank's valuation with a maximum of £5,000! Moreover, in Victoria, if the farm warranted it, it was possible to borrow the whole of the purchase price. The ex-Minister claims that Queensland did a magnificent job in soldier settlement. I do not know of any field of Government activity that has been so shockingly misrepresented as soldier settlement in Queensland. The ex-Minister should be on the stage of the Theatre Royal talking about the Government's magnificent job. He could earn much more money there than here. The continual bleating about a magnificent job is clearly designed to camouflage the past Government's poor effort to settle ex-servicemen. It could be said that the banks lent money to a great many, that the insurance companies insured a further number and that many other ex-service personnel participated in land ballots and cane assignments at no extra cost to the State. Does this excuse the ex-Government from giving ex-service men who applied for settlement under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme reason to believe that they had a chance? Does it excuse their settling only 453 out of 3,200 who applied? Does it excuse their turning down the Commonwealth offer to provide money to complete the scheme when they were claiming that they were financially unable to carry on? Does that excuse them from this indictable thing? Not on your life! It is a national tragedy so far as this State is concerned, and vicious political partisanship, which has permeated the Government of this State ever since I have been in this House. Queensland ex-service men have suffered and this State also has suffered because two or three thousand more men properly and adequately settled on the land would have increased the production of the greatest things that we produce in Queensland—the food and wherewithal of this State, and the primary products that build up overseas credits for Australia. That is where the ex-Government have failed in not approaching this scheme in a proper manner and adequately settling at least 2,000 more men, thus adding to the national income of Queensland. It is an indictable, shocking, and disgusting thing.

At Wandoan, 72 settlers have been settled outside the scheme, but the fact is that those blocks were completed in 1952. They were opened for group settlement. However, afraid of public reaction, at the last minute ex-service men were not given preference. By opening outside the War Service Land Settlement Scheme, Queensland forfeited no less than £125,000 which could have been claimed for half the cost of roadwork.

Mr. Aikens: A mere bagatelle.

Mr. DEWAR: It would have built a lot of houses. That is just one instance of money being repudiated by Queensland because of its approach to the War Service Land Settlement Scheme on the agent-State basis. You fellows over there on the official Opposition might not know of these things, but you contributed to them.

Mr. Walsh: Whom are you talking about?

Mr. DEWAR: I said "the official Opposition."

Mr. Walsh: You said, "you fellows over there."

Mr. DEWAR: I said, "you fellows in the official Opposition." By allowing this, you denied Queensland £125,000 which could have been claimed as half the cost of road works, and you also denied the settlers their right to living allowances and rent and interest concessions. That is what was done to the ex-servicemen who were settled at Wandoan.

Let us now look at the records of the other States of Australia when referring to this alleged magnificent job done by Queensland. Victoria settled 3,000 ex-service men at a cost of roughly £40,000,000. New South Wales, which, like Victoria, is a principal State, settled 3,000 at a cost of £40,000,000. The three other States—Western Australia, South Australia, and Tasmania—settled 400, 250, and 200, at a cost of £63,000,000 on an agent-State basis. New South Wales and Victoria, as principal States, spent together £80,000,000, but £63,000,000 was the amount of money poured into those three other States by the Commonwealth Government to develop the War Service Land Settlement Scheme.

In Tasmania, they reclaimed swamp land, and in South Australia they reclaimed desert land.

Not only did Tasmania settle all the people they had to settle but they actually took the overflow from some of the other southern States. By 1960 all the ex-servicemen who applied and were approved will have been settled in these States. Victoria and New South Wales will have almost achieved the same thing by 1960. In other words every ex-serviceman who applied and was approved by the local committees was satisfied under the scheme in the other States of Australia. Between them £143,000,000 have been spent on war service land settlement. To the everlasting disgrace of the Labour Government Queensland settled 453 men out of the 1,900 approved by the committee. About 25 per cent. of the 453 who were settled were really "settled". They were settled at Clare—settled for good. There is no way in the world that they can get out of trouble unless they are given a sugar assignment. They have suffered all sorts of hardships—droughts, cyclones, nutgrass and now they tell me there is a new grub this year. When

I was at Ayr assisting to win the seat for the Country-Liberal Party I was told by a man who knows the cane industry backwards that the Burdekin can produce the greatest variety of pests of any part of the world. That man has been on the Burdekin for 10 years. There is no doubt that the Labour Government "settled" the Clare tobacco farmers. Every year a new grub or a new problem turns up. The nutgrass is in and it is there to stay.

Mr. Aikens: Are you a northern knocker?

Mr. DEWAR: I am knocking Clare tobacco. I know that there are problems but I urge the granting of a sugar assignment. There is no reason in my book why a number of ex-servicemen should be the scapegoats for the mistakes of the last Government. That is what is happening at Clare. If sugar is the only thing that will save them then sugar has to be grown at Clare. I do not care how it gets there. If that is the only answer—the sugar should go there.

The hon. member for Carnarvon said that in 1954 it cost £10,000 to £13,000 to settle one man at Wandoan. The admission is that it should have cost these amounts to settle a man properly but no soldier settler has gone beyond the loan of £7,500, the statutory limit set by the State under the War Service Land Settlement Act. That is why settlers are bogged down at Wandoan. That is why they are years behind their counterparts in other States of Australia. At present-day cost levels you cannot clear brigalow, fence, make water improvements, provide stock, plant, residence and other buildings for £7,500. The ex-Minister indicts himself. The amount of £7,500 is the limit set by the Act yet he said it would cost £10,000 to £13,000 to settle a man at Wandoan.

In the case of the agent-State there is no statutory limit and reasonable sums are available for development and settlers are adequately supervised and husbanded during the early period. Queensland spent £4,000,000 on war-service land settlement and the Commonwealth spent £800,000 for that purpose in this State. The £4,000,000 is invested in State-owned land or is recoverable. The exception to this is where losses are involved and the Commonwealth shares on a 50-50 basis. All the money spent by the Commonwealth is a grant, and no part is recoverable. All this revenue is lost to Queensland and could have been used elsewhere. The strain would have been eased on the Loan Funds, and it could have been applied to housing and other projects. Another indictment against the Government is the amount lost to this State owing to their ineptitude, which probably would run into £100,000,000.

Opposition Members: Oh!

Mr. DEWAR: I gave an instance where £35,000,000 was lost which could have been put into the common pool of housing by a

savings bank guarantee to terminating building societies. I also referred to the millions that the Government lost in relation to war service settlement.

Mr. Hilton: It is the most fantastic speech you ever made.

Mr. DEWAR: The hon. member has yet to answer it.

Two methods operated for the settlement of ex-service men—agent or principal State. The Commonwealth offered Queensland agent leases in 1952, but they were refused. If Queensland had fought a little as the other States did, she could have become an agent State from the beginning. As a principal State there was no means whereby the Commonwealth could pay a greater share than they did. It would be interesting to know how many of those who got Agricultural Bank loans whom the ex-Minister claimed benefited from bank loans were borrowers under the Re-establishment and Employment Act. Loans of this nature were made by the Agricultural Bank for the purpose of establishing ex-service men in agricultural occupations from moneys made available in advance by the Commonwealth. These totalled about £800,000. It would be interesting to see how many of the Agricultural Bank advances were made available out of that fund.

In addition the Commonwealth assisted 2,500 ex-service men outside the War Service Land Settlement Scheme with living allowances for 12 months while getting into production. There is the answer to the bleatings of the hon. member for Carnarvon, who gave a long harangue last week on war service land settlement. The facts I have stated are an indictment of the previous Government. I sincerely believe the figures I have given are correct. I obtained them from a source that the hon. member should know. He was administering a department with plenty of problems with it. I do not suggest that he had time to learn all that there was to know.

(Time expired).

Mr. POWER (Baroona) (12.14 p.m.): The hon. member for Chermiside has exhausted everybody else as well as his time. We have heard the same speech from him time and time again. He has a borer complex and if there were no housing settlements he would not be able to make a speech.

I congratulate the Treasurer on his appointment to this very important position. His party's choice was an excellent one in view of the hon. gentleman's knowledge of financial matters. I am prepared to give him all the assistance I can so long as he does not work against the best interests of the useful people of the State.

A number of promises that were made by the present Government will give him some headaches because he will not have the

money to carry them out. Perhaps the Commonwealth Government will be more generous to this Government than they were with the previous Government.

The manner of presenting Queensland's case at the Premiers' Conferences and Loan Council meetings has been criticised. On the other hand, however, it must be admitted by all hon. members that on more occasions than one we heard that Queensland's case was very sound, and had been very ably presented.

From their speeches I conclude that Government members are of the opinion that their policy was acceptable to the people of Queensland and that is why they were elected. They got fewer votes on this occasion than in 1956 which indicates that they do not enjoy the confidence of the people. The Government were elected because of a split in the Labour movement. I shall not take up much time on that aspect, but on the number of votes cast it is clear that the Government are a minority Government and I hope that the breach within the Labour movement will be healed.

Mr. Herbert: The election was conducted under your system.

Mr. POWER: The hon. member may be all right when it comes to increasing prices, but he cannot escape the cold fact that the combined Opposition vote was greater than the vote for the Country-Liberal Government. Their policy was not acceptable to the people of Queensland; they polled fewer votes than in 1956.

Mr. Aikens: How would you suggest that the breach in the Labour Party should be healed?

Mr. POWER: That is a matter for further consideration.

Mr. Herbert: Do you reckon the A.L.P. and the Q.L.P. are the same?

Mr. POWER: You would not know. You have a university complex. You are a la-di-da who would not know anything about working conditions.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to address the Chair.

Mr. POWER: The hon. member for Sherwood is asking for it. I am one of those who lead with the left and cross with the right. I ask for no quarter and I give none. If he wants it, I will give it to him.

I am disappointed that the Government started as the last anti-Labour Government did by budgeting for a tremendous deficit. No provision has been made for increases in the basic wage and that leads me to believe that they will freeze quarterly adjustments.

Mr. Ramsden: That has already been denied.

Mr. POWER: They said they were not going to do it, but by the same token they said they would not interfere with price control. In view of what they have done already, I am fearful that the workers' conditions will become much worse under this anti-Labour Government than they are at present, that there will be a freezing of the quarterly adjustment of the basic wage and an increase in commodity prices with the abolition of price control on a number of commodities.

Already we have seen a steep increase in the prices of fish, fruit and vegetables.

Mr. Aikens: Everything.

Mr. POWER: Every commodity that is not controlled.

The policy of the previous Government was price control of commodities that a man earning £15 would have to purchase. The workers are going to be very sorry for themselves before this Government vacate office.

I visualise a repetition of the events of the 1929-1932 period. The first Budget presented by the Treasurer is for a deficit of over £1,500,000. Next year the deficit will be greater, and the following year greater again, so that at the end of three years the record deficits of the Moore Government will be exceeded.

Mr. Hiley: Do you think we should spend less?

Mr. POWER: No, I do not, but the juggling with these matters is worthy of an act at the Theatre Royal. I am fair in my criticism and I congratulate the Treasurer on his desire to speed up the building of homes in Queensland. I give him full marks for his intentions provided the Government will not suffer by the guarantees to co-operative building societies. I hope that close investigations will be made—

Mr. Hiley: New South Wales and Victoria have lent £180,000,000 on that basis and have not been called on for one penny.

Mr. POWER: I am pleased to hear that.

Mr. Aikens: Why didn't your Government do that?

Mr. POWER: I shall deal with that later. People in Queensland and particularly in the metropolitan area are in dire stress. Ejection orders are being made against people and there are no homes available for them because of certain work being undertaken at the Zillmere housing scheme. I hope action will be taken to prevent the courts from making these orders at a time when accommodation is not available. The time is overdue for the abolition of all temporary housing settlements. It may be asked why the Government of which I was a member did not do it. The answer is simple, the Government did not have sufficient funds. Those temporary housing settlements served a

useful purpose in the early days. The time has come when they should be removed because they are becoming an eyesore, particularly those on Gregory terrace and Victoria Park. Only the minimum is spent on repairs. We do not want to see money spent on repairs of buildings that will eventually be eliminated. Every effort should be made by the Government to get money from the Commonwealth Government for the building of homes not only in Brisbane, but throughout the State. I see no reason why the Commonwealth should not be able to give the State Government money for the purpose as they are not short of funds. I hope the Treasurer and the Premier, when they go to Loan Council meetings, will put up a case for a special advance for the building of homes. Queensland is a large State and the cost of home construction varies in different parts. Freight rates come into the question. The worker is not in a position to pay the rents being asked by the Queensland Housing Commission which are fixed on cost-of-erection basis. The cost of developing the land must be added to the cost of the home. The position of the worker is untenable because he cannot pay the high rents asked for.

The hon. member for Sherwood spoke of Inala and it is true that rents are high there; high fares have to be added for those going to and from the city to work. Inala was to be a satellite town and every endeavour was made to encourage industry to go there. I know of no more suitable place for a satellite town, one that would not disturb people engaged in farming. That is why both Inala and Zillmere were selected. It would not be right to resume farming land for home-building.

Home building costs and rent must be seriously considered by the Government. Under the previous agreement with the Commonwealth Government rental rebates were allowed in certain circumstances but under the new agreement they have been discontinued. How can an age pensioner and his wife, on a little over £4 a week in pension, pay £3 or £3 10s. a week for rent? The rental rebates should be reintroduced without delay. If they are not, I charge the Commonwealth Government with a callous indifference towards the aged.

Mr. Herbert: What about the tremendous amounts that the Commonwealth Government give to church organisations to build homes for the aged?

Mr. POWER: I do not want to see anything taken from the religious organisations. As a matter of fact, the Queensland Government over the years have given them much more than the Federal Government. The Treasurers of Queensland have not sought notoriety or cheap publicity for it. However, whenever a cheque has been handed over to a religious organisation to help it in housing the aged, a representative of the Federal Government has always been present to get publicity.

Mr. Aikens: The State Government even gave money to local authorities for the purpose.

Mr. POWER: That is so. This is the only State in Australia that has subsidised local authorities for the purpose.

The Commonwealth Government are the taxing authority, and they are collecting much more money from the States than they are handing back to them. I am making this plea on behalf of people who are living under sub-standard conditions. Only the other day I heard of the case of a man with a wife and three children, one a girl aged seven, another a boy aged five, and another a child of two. The three children sleep in one bed and the whole family sleep in one bedroom. That should not be tolerated. There is no shortage of money for war. If money can be made available for the destruction of human life it should be made available to provide decent homes for the people. Many men who are without decent housing were prepared to sacrifice their lives in the defence of this country; many of them are maimed and crippled. The Commonwealth Government should be ashamed of themselves when such men are without decent housing.

I sincerely hope the Treasurer will pay particular attention to the difference between the contract and day-labour methods of building homes. I was Minister for Housing for a period, and it is my opinion that homes can be built by day labour much cheaper than by contract.

Mr. Hiley: There is a shade of difference, about $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. POWER: Let me deal with this so-called shade of difference. Has the Treasurer taken into consideration the overhead charges that are added to day-labour costs? Has he considered the supervision costs? We have evidence of what happened because of lack of supervision. When I was the Minister for Housing I had to take strong action because materials were being stolen from Housing Commission projects through lack of supervision. Do not forget that you have to be on to contractors all the time. When I was Acting-Minister for Housing, on one project a contractor made some big mistakes and they had to be corrected. What happened? Before any money was paid a gang had to go out to correct this work that had been done by contract. Remember, I am not opposed to the contract system while there is a shortage of homes.

Mr. Hiley: If you have proper inspection, that should be only a trifling factor.

Mr. POWER: I agree, but you must have a man on the job all the while. Take a case in point with concrete stumps. Some had been poured and, while the inspector was away on another job, more were put in. When he made the contractor dig them out it was

found that they had not been reinforced. The Government should not do away with day-labour projects because the work done by day labour is much better than the work done by contract.

Mr. Hiley: I have already indicated that as long as their efficiency and cost are level they will continue.

Mr. POWER: I thank the Minister for that. I know, however, that some people are anxious to destroy day-labour projects, but the Minister, with his analytical mind, will be fair. I pay him that compliment. I ask him to examine the overhead charges now being put on day-labour jobs.

Mr. Hiley: If you take that attitude, you would also agree that it would be fair to take into account the fact that for day-labour jobs the Housing Commission buys its motor vehicles free of sales tax, and buys its petrol several pence a gallon cheaper than the outside contractors do. Day-labour jobs get many side benefits. Even then, it is hardly able to bear up.

Mr. POWER: I know it does with the number of vehicles bought in a year. The Housing Commission has a transport officer. Why is he there? Each inspector has his own motor vehicle and then there is a transport officer with one. All that is charged against day-labour.

Mr. Hiley: Did you tell the Minister that when you were in the Cabinet?

Mr. POWER: I told other people that. I am speaking now of what I learn from time to time of what takes place. The Minister perhaps would not know about them.

There is a Cabinet minute that says that every Government motor vehicle must be inspected in the Government garage from time to time. Now we have a man supervising the transport section, and driving round seeing what is being done. It is ridiculous.

I initiated a scheme to have all Government vehicles branded. One officer drives a cream-coloured car with the words "Irrigation Department" painted on it in the same colour as the car. There is no chance in the world of seeing the department's name at night.

Mr. Aikens: What is he doing with the car at night-time?

Mr. POWER: I do not know. The name should be printed in large letters in such a way that it can be seen who owns the vehicle.

I put in a plea for day-labour because I know that the work done by day-labour is far superior to that done by contract. The Minister has spoken of the concessions given to day-labour. I am not prepared to admit those things, but I ask him to examine very carefully the charges against day-labour to see if that they are equitable.

Mr. Hiley: During the last 12 months of your Government's administration there was a gradual drop in day labour and a greater use of contractors. Are you condemning the action of your own Government over the last twelve months?

Mr. POWER: I say that I support day labour as against contract labour, and I want to make that quite clear. There has been an attempt to whittle down day labour in the Queensland Housing Commission, and I say that houses built by day labour are much superior to those built under contract. I ask you to examine all the overhead charges placed against day-labour work and the costs placed against maintenance. I do not want to see day-labour projects destroyed because do not forget that when we first decided to build homes and tenders were first called the prices submitted were exorbitant. The Government of the day, led by the late E. M. Hanlon, said, "We will not accept these tenders but will erect the houses ourselves by day labour. Further tenders were called and what was the result? The next prices for the same types of homes were thousands of pounds lower than the first ones. That is where contractors set out to exploit the people.

Mr. Hiley: I find it hard to follow this because in fact we have maintained in employment the same level of day-labour operatives, but your Government put off 452 day-labour men in March and April last.

Mr. POWER: Because we had no money. We could not break the contracts that we had. However, I am now dealing with the next financial year, and I ask for sufficient money to be made available to keep these men. They have to give reasonable service and production, of course, and I say that they are prepared to do that.

From information that I have, I felt that an attempt was being made to do away with day labour and I appeal for the continuation of it. I appeal also for an investigation into overhead charges being placed against day labour to see if they are being properly apportioned.

Mr. Aikens: If the Minister puts a stop to the abuse of Government cars, he will save hundreds and thousands of pounds a year.

Mr. POWER: The cost of developing a housing area is extremely high, and the cost of a home is high as well. I say that you should make some attempt to get the Commonwealth Government to vary the Commonwealth-State Agreement to allow for the rebate system to be brought in. How is a widow with two or three children going to pay the rent that has to be paid today? Under the other scheme, they had the opportunity to grant rebates.

Mr. Hiley: We always try to put

pensioners and people on low incomes into the rebated homes.

Mr. POWER: I appreciate that.

Another matter that concerns me is a statement by the Minister for Agriculture and Stock which appeared in the Press on 16 October. He said—

"To assist wheatgrowers the Government would grant a drought loading of 1s. a bushel on all local wheat from the country crop."

I asked the hon. gentleman what authority he had for granting that increase? If it is granted, it will mean an increase of 1s. a bushel for wheat, which will mean an increase in the cost of bread, flour, and poultry food. The hon. gentleman did not answer my question; he dodged it. I am glad to see that he is in the Chamber. If he agrees to that increase it is a repudiation of an agreement made by me as Prices Minister with the Wheat Board and the growers' representative.

On 29 March, 1957, I met a deputation consisting of Mr. McKeon of the Wheat Board, and Messrs. Armstrong, Todd and Bligh, growers' representatives. They wanted to get a premium on their wheat. They were already getting 2½d. and they said they would be satisfied if it was increased to 6d. If it were increased to 6d. they said they would see that no wheat went out of Queensland. The additional premium on the price of wheat fixed under the Commonwealth-State agreement was to operate on next year's crop, as from 1 December. When I read about the increase in the paper I asked the Minister for Agriculture and Stock whether he had held a conference about the matter. He did not answer me. I know something about the price of feed because I keep a few fowls and show them. Shortly after the statement was made by the hon. gentleman I was informed by a produce merchant that wheat was going up 1s. a bushel. That made me ask my question.

Mr. Madsen: Only speculation.

Mr. POWER: It could have been speculation but the hon. gentleman has not told me yet whether it is going up or not.

Mr. Madsen: I told you it was under discussion.

Mr. POWER: The hon. gentleman has no authority to put the price up. Since when has he assumed the position of Commissioner of Prices?

Mr. Madsen: I have not assumed it.

Mr. POWER: He has taken over from the Minister in charge of prices. From time to time hon. members opposite accused me of fixing prices but now the Minister for Agriculture and Stock admits that he is going to try to fix prices by increasing the price of wheat by 1s. a bushel.

Let me give the history of what the Wheat Board has done and how the people of Queensland have been shabbily treated. I am not opposed to a reasonable return for any section of the community but what has happened? The Wheat Board should have a knowledge of the people's requirements but 4,500,000 bushels of wheat were sent to Japan for which they received a premium of 6d. a bushel. What happened? Queensland was short of wheat and we had to pay approximately 4s. 8d. a bushel to bring wheat back into the State. This meant an increase in the price of flour, bran and pollard. I believe in organised marketing, I believe in commodity boards, but at the same time I believe that the commodity boards have a responsibility to Queensland consumers. The Board did not even make a survey of Queensland's requirements but allowed 4,500,000 bushels to go to Japan. They got an extra 6d. a bushel for it but 600,000 bushels had to be imported into Queensland. Any attempt now to give these people another shilling is a repudiation of the agreement I entered into.

Mr. Madsen: When did they export that 4,500,000 bushels?

Mr. POWER: The hon. gentleman knows when it was exported, and that 600,000 bushels had to be imported from South Australia at an additional cost of 4s. 8d. a bushel. That was the result of the action of the Wheat Board. The Queensland consumers are entitled to some protection. They told me they would see that no more wheat went out of Queensland, if they got a premium of 6d. a bushel, but now the Minister has told them that he is prepared to give them an extra 1s. a bushel. The hon. gentleman has no authority to do that.

Mr. MADSEN: I rise to a point of order. What the hon. member has said is not correct. The production for last year was about 6,000,000 bushels and 4,500,000 bushels could not be exported.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member for Baroona to accept the explanation of the Minister.

Mr. POWER: I cannot accept it; I have the evidence that it was exported. The hon. gentleman knows it was exported. Will the hon. gentleman deny that 600,000 bushels had to be imported to Queensland from South Australia. Will the hon. gentleman deny that the ex-Premier asked the Wheat Board to pay the cost of the transport of the wheat to Queensland and it refused to do so? I am fearful of the actions of the Government about price control and what will happen to the workers. The Minister in charge of prices is not in the House. I ask him to table the report of a deputation which I received, consisting of Mr. McKeon, representing the Wheat Board, and Messrs. Armstrong, Todd and Bligh representing the growers.

They stated they were satisfied with 6d. and would not send any more wheat out of Queensland if they got that. The minutes are in the office of the Minister, and I ask him to table them.

Mr. Madsen: That was a quality premium; we are talking about a drought loading.

Mr. POWER: A drought loading for the wheat people? I never heard of it before. The Government are not going to give a drought loading to the wheat farmer. They will ask John Citizen to pay for it. I have no objection to the giving of drought relief to the wheat farmer, but I strongly object to the consumers' being asked to pay the amount of 1s. a bushel. Let the Government tender the agreement that was entered into because there has been a repudiation of it. The hon. gentleman is going to ask people to pay 1s. a bushel extra.

Mr. Madsen: Give us some idea how you would cope with the situation.

Mr. POWER: I handled the situation very well for some time. I did not see any wheat-growers going through the insolvency court.

Mr. Madsen: You drove the poultry industry into the ground, and the other industries relying on wheat.

Mr. POWER: The hon. member was not prepared to answer my question because he knew that I knew a little bit about the business. When I read the paper I could see the nigger in the woodpile. If it is drought relief, why should the consumer have to pay for it? Why should the price of bread go up 1d. or 1½d. a loaf because of the payment of drought relief? Let the Government pay for it, not the consumers of the bread. What will this mean? It will mean an increase in the price of flour, the price of bread, and the price of poultry foods, and they are dear enough now.

Mr. Madsen: Your policy made poultry food dear.

Mr. POWER: I wanted the hon. gentleman to come in on that point, because I wanted to state that during my period of office as Attorney-General the price of flour was increased and the price of bran and pollard reduced.

What is going to happen now? The increased price for poultry food will cause an increase in the price of eggs. The poultry-farmer today is finding it hard to exist.

Mr. Madsen: Because of low prices.

Mr. POWER: The price of eggs is not controlled in Queensland and has not been for many years. The plight of the poultry farmers to-day cannot be laid at the door of the previous Government, but blame for it could be attributed to the present Government if they increase the price of wheat by 1s. a bushel.

Mr. Nicholson interjected.

Mr. POWER: For the benefit of the hon. member who has just interjected, I read a letter received by me from the Redcliffe Poultry Industry and Primary Producers' Association in February 1957.

Mr. Nicholson: The Secretary was the A.L.P. candidate.

Mr. POWER: It was written on behalf of the members of that organisation. It reads—

“Members of the abovenamed Association wish to express their appreciation of your efforts to keep the costs of fuel, especially petrol and power kerosene, within reasonable limits, as transport costs for the primary producer for his produce are already a major item of expenditure.

“Thanking you once again and wishing your efforts every success.”

Mr. Nicholson: It was written by Krause.

Mr. POWER: That expresses the views of members of the Redcliffe Poultry Industry and Primary Producers' Association. I have forgotten more about poultry than the hon. member will ever learn. I have bred fowls and I know a lot about them. He would not know the difference between a white hen and a black hen.

Egg prices will continue to rise and eventually eggs will disappear from the table. The prices of fish, fruit and vegetables have already been increased. We will soon be back to the corned beef-carrot-and-damper days if the Government have their way.

If the Government are not going to abolish price control, at least they intend to make it ineffective. As the Leader of the Opposition said, an emasculated system of price control will be of no value.

I am satisfied the Government intend to destroy price control at all cost. During my term of office as Attorney-General I was approached by various people who said, “Whatever you do, do not abolish price control.” I asked those people, “What is your reason for that statement?” They told me that the cartels would increase the price of every commodity, that the cartels would set the price. The manufacturers of Sitruce tell the people selling this line that if they sell for less than the set price they will not receive any further supplies.

In Queensland a person who refuses to supply a commodity he has for sale can be dealt with under the Profiteering Prevention Act. Once price control is abolished the cartels will fix prices. That is what will happen. We know the attitude of the Government. The Deputy Premier said that he would do away with price control tomorrow if he had his way. He is the gentleman who is running round Queensland discovering lots of things. His latest idea is to employ an inspector to inspect the motor vehicles belonging to the police to see that they have sufficient tools in them. What a ridiculous

statement to make! Surely the inspector in charge of a police district should be able to control his men and see that their vehicles have plenty of tools. No, the hon. gentleman is going to have an inspector—a nose parker going round and opening the boots of motor vehicles to see what tools they have.

Mr. Aikens: He might get a surprise when he opens some of the boots.

Mr. POWER: He is the hon. gentleman who wants to abolish price control.

It is in the mind of the Government to vary rent control. Representatives of property owners demanded an increase in rentals but I warned my Government that when the control of rents was lifted in another State rents went up by £2 and £3 a week and workers were unable to pay them. The result was that rent control had to be re-introduced. This will happen in Queensland. There is no doubt that the lifting of rent control will impose an additional burden on the workers. As a matter of fact I do not know how they are existing today on the wages they receive when they have to pay rent and meet the high cost of living. I am sure many homes go without. I live frugally the same as the ordinary worker. There is no champagne or wine on my table; I have ordinary meals. I know the cost of living. I have no children to rear and I really do not know how people are managing today. I will not stand idly by and see workers suffer from the lifting of rent control. Rents were fixed on a proper basis and there is no justification for a variation of it. I warn the Government that rent control was lifted in Western Australia and had to be re-introduced.

I intend now to deal with the statements of the hon. member for Mount Gravatt and the hon. member for Kurilpa on the inability of stipendiary magistrates to decide civil actions. I have already referred to this matter in the debate on the Department of Justice Bill.

On 8 October, I asked the Attorney-General the following questions—

“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?”

The Attorney-General replied—

“1. 2,347.

“2. 83.

“3. 80.

“4. 28.

“5. 44.”

Of 2,347 civil cases heard by stipendiary magistrates, 83 appeals were lodged against the decisions and only 44 were upheld. That entirely destroys the allegation of the hon. member for Mount Gravatt and the hon. member for Kurilpa that stipendiary magistrates are not capable of hearing and determining civil actions.

Mr. Connolly: That does not prove a thing.

Mr. POWER: It may not prove anything to a man of limited intelligence. The hon. member for Kurilpa comes in here trailing his coat and attacking people from all angles. He makes no secret of the fact that he is ultra-conservative. He attacked the previous Government and accused them of being Socialists. I challenge him to name one industry that the previous Government socialised. The only socialisation that I can remember in Brisbane was when a former Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Sir John Chandler, removed the metropolitan bus services from the control of private operators and gave it to the Brisbane City Council.

The Attorney-General's answer to my question proves that the majority of people whose cases were heard by magistrates were satisfied with the decisions.

The hon. member complained because a Labour Government increased the jurisdiction of magistrates. I think the hon. member for Mount Gravatt said that an agreement had been entered into between barristers and solicitors that a solicitor would not appear in a Magistrates Court in an action in which £600 was involved.

Mr. Hart: Why don't you get your facts straight? The amount mentioned by me was £100. That was before the new Act was introduced.

Mr. POWER: The legal fraternity decided that there was to be no cheap litigation. The Government should give consideration to merging solicitors and barristers into one body.

Mr. Hanlon: Has that been done in South Australia?

Mr. POWER: Yes.

I also asked a question about appeals from the decisions of Supreme Court judges, and I was told that out of 58 appeals 16 had been successful. Anyone who knows anything about litigation is aware that there are appeals from magistrates' decisions to the Supreme Court, from Supreme Court decisions to the Full Court, from Full Court decisions to the High Court and, if the High Court gives leave to appeal, from the High Court to the Privy Council. It could be logically argued, therefore, that as appeals are made from the decisions of judges, they are comparable with magistrates.

The hon. member referred also to my administration of the Department of Justice. I do not wish to pat myself on the back, but I quote a letter that I received.

A solicitor practising in Brisbane wrote me the following letter on 30 September last—

“Hon W. Power, M.L.A.

“Dear Sir,

“I am taking this opportunity of expressing my sincere appreciation of the work performed during your period of office as Attorney-General.

“I feel that a great many positive steps were taken during your term of office and you were never afraid to at least do something in order to remedy any position which required attention, which had called for legislation or a decision in your Ministerial capacity.

“For myself I have always steered well clear of ‘Politics’ and this letter is addressed to you personally, but by being addressed to you personally it does not mean to be a reflection upon any of your colleagues for whom I have a great deal of respect.”

Hon. members know that I have had commendation from the Law Society on my work as Attorney-General and it is absurd for the the hon. member, who is a political fluke, to attack me in this Chamber.

Some considerable time ago the present Government agreed that action should be taken to erect a new school at Petrie Terrace. The infants' and opportunity school has been in existence for over 80 years. The buildings are about the oldest we have. They are all higgledy-piggledy and supervision is difficult as classrooms are scattered all over the place. I understand that plans are being prepared by the Department of Public Works and I hope that the Government will not jettison the project.

We are very fortunate in the type of New Australians, as they are sometimes called, or fellow Australians, as I prefer to describe them, from other parts of the world. I urge the Government to review the attitude adopted towards their professional diplomas and certificates so that they might be allowed to follow their callings in Queensland. In New South Wales certain diplomas and certificates are recognised but they are not in Queensland and many New Australians suffer in consequence. I do not suggest that all of them should be allowed to practise unless they are qualified, but a committee should be set up to investigate the whole position so that we might avail ourselves of the services of some of the skilled artisans and professional men among them. I know there are people who want to make their profession a close preserve so that others will find it hard to enter. There is a desire to tighten up examinations and make the subjects for examination harder. If it was good enough for them to be admitted through qualifying examinations of a certain

standard, it should be good enough for the New Australians who have become fellow Australians through naturalisation. We should do all that we can to encourage them to become good citizens. It is very sad to think that a qualified surveyor, for example, should be required to work as a labourer in a coke works or gas works or some other such place. There is evidence within the legal profession of the desire of certain people to keep others out. We were short of legal men in the Crown Law Office and I wanted to have a number of young men trained as solicitors there. I was told we could have only a certain number. In my view the Government should not be restricted by the actions of any law society or bar association. In this case it was the Law Society. While there is a shortage of legal men or skilled artisans every opportunity should be taken to train more men. No Crown instrumentality should be in the position of being told, "You cannot have that number of men." I had intended to discuss the matter with the Law Society and amend the law dealing with the matter. When there is a shortage of legal men, there is no justification whatever for any organisation to tell the Government that they cannot put on any more men because they already have their quota. I should say that when there is a shortage there should be no restriction on the number of lads who may be articled to a solicitor, provided they can be properly trained.

Mr. Hiley: That limitation was put in because some solicitors were making too good a thing of it. One solicitor at one time had eight articled clerks, which was quite unfair.

Mr. POWER: I agree. If the Crown Law Department, for instance, had 10 or 11 solicitors, they should be allowed to have 10 or 11 trainees.

Mr. Hiley: One for one.

Mr. POWER: It should be more than one for one, but that is not the position. When there is a shortage, it should be, say, one to two, or three. If the opportunity to train these men is there, we should avail ourselves of it.

Those are just a few matters that I desired to bring before the Chamber. In conclusion, I hope that the Government will take whatever steps they can to have the Commonwealth Government agree to the reintroduction of rebates in rents for Queensland Housing Commission homes. There should be no attempt to abolish day labour and the question of drought relief for the wheat-grower should be examined carefully. I am not opposed to drought relief but I oppose very strongly any attempt to grant drought relief by increasing the price of wheat by 1s. a bushel. It would mean an increase in the cost of living to the worker. The workers will have to pay more for bread and flour, and the poultry farmer more for wheat.

Mr. DIPLOCK (Condamine) (2.28 p.m.): I should like to congratulate the Treasurer on his elevation to Cabinet. He has the qualifications necessary, but, if he is to live up to some of the promises made during the election campaign, it will be necessary for him to be more or less a financial wizard. However, I wish him well.

I did not speak on the Bill to change the name of the Department of Public Instruction because, like you, Mr. Chairman, I did not consider that there should have been a general discussion on matters of education. The change of name actually does not mean a great deal. There is the old saying, "A rose by any other name smells just as sweet." The work of the Department of Public Instruction is such that, no matter what the name is, it will reflect the great interest that Labour Governments have taken in the education of the children of the State.

Education is unique in that experts give their lives to study, research and travel, in order to develop a system and establish and improve the standard of education. They well know that there is plenty of room for improvement and plenty for them to learn, but there are people with no educational background, who have not evinced any great interest in education, who feel themselves competent to criticise the education system. They feel competent to pass an opinion on the system and on the standard. I previously made the point in the Chamber that such criticism was not in the best interests of the State. Most teachers will agree that their big job is to interest parents sufficiently in education to induce them to give their children the opportunities they are entitled to. While we sell the idea that the State's education system leaves much to be desired, we can expect parental apathy. Therefore, I say quite sincerely that as long as the Government are trying to do a good job for the children of the State I would not be acting in the best interests of the children by voicing hostile criticism of the work being done.

I was amazed to read an article in "Truth" on 13 October, wherein the Premier was alleged to have said that there was scandalous neglect of school children because they did not have votes. He further said—

"The damage done to our educational service and prestige during the war and post-war years cannot be rectified overnight."

"Even a most junior Minister should have known of the hopeless overcrowding in a principal suburban school, such as Nundah."

The Premier was either deliberately trying to mislead the people or was not in full possession of the facts about the Nundah school. I do not think he was trying to mislead the people; he has not been told the full facts. Before I assumed office the accommodation necessary to meet increased enrolments at Nundah consisted of three rooms at the primary school and one in the

infants' section. My predecessor, the late Hon. G. Devries, was aware that the accommodation was necessary. It was provided just as I assumed office. Even if my predecessor did occupy a junior position in Cabinet it showed that he was well aware of what was going on in the education field. During my term of office I approved of three additional classrooms at Nundah. They were occupied within the last few weeks. I also approved of one additional classroom in the infants' school. This was occupied early in the current school year. That should prove that both Mr. Devries and I were fully aware of the position at Nundah. I recognised the desirability of another school site. Just after I took over I spent a day with officers of the Department of Public Instruction examining alternative sites. I was well aware that a school the size of the Nundah school was not in the best interests of the children of the area. I arranged for officers of the building and site section of the department to approach the Council about the only suitable site. The Council refused to negotiate so I directed that the full facts be put before the Land Administration Board.

Mr. Knox: When was that?

Mr. DIPLOCK: About August last year.

Mr. Herbert: After Mr. Dewar made his remarks to the House.

Mr. DIPLOCK: Not after Mr. Dewar made his remarks in the House. It was brought under my notice by Mr. Hadley, who accompanied me on the inspection. The Land Administration Board advised that as the land in question was a reserve the views of the Brisbane City Council should be obtained. As the Brisbane City Council was not prepared to move I asked that the Land Administration Board take steps to resume the land and that is where the matter stands now. By no stretch of the imagination, I feel sure, would the Premier have passed that criticism if he had been in possession of those facts.

Mr. Walsh: The present Government will get the benefit from the previous Government's plans.

Mr. DIPLOCK: That is right. The Government made promises during the election; but to date they have done nothing but cover up their inactivity by enlarging on the supposed weaknesses in the different departments and in their publicity campaign they have been ably assisted by the Press. Unless something of a constructive and definite nature is done they will find that you cannot fool all the people all of the time. No amount of publicity will convince the people who have lost their jobs since the election, particularly in my electorate, that the Government are honouring their promises. I refer to the men on Main Roads work.

Mr. Hiley: Be clear about the Main Roads employees. You know the condition of employment is that when they finish their job you have to pay them off and re-engage them. Do you suggest that the net total employed is less? If you do you are wrong. On the total there are more men employed. Those conditions were laid down by the union—as the job is finished you have to put the men off.

Mr. DIPLOCK: The men in my area have not been re-engaged.

Mr. Hiley: The total in the State is greater. The hon. member for Mirani will tell you there are more men employed.

Mr. DIPLOCK: All right. Get over this one. It would be hard to justify the sacking of about 40 men from Napiers Limited at Dalby, after the Premier in reply to a question during the election campaign had said that the suggestion that men would be put off was sheer nonsense, and instead of sacking people from the Railway Department and other works they were anxious to find jobs and put men in work. Napiers Limited has been developed on sound lines and has done an excellent job over the years in the repair of railway wagons. This sacking of 40 men is a direct blow at the economic stability of Dalby. These men have gone to the West and hon. members opposite have preached from the platform that they believe in decentralisation, yet they have 40 men there representing an annual pay of £30,000 who have absolutely no chance of being employed in the rural areas at the present time because of the drought.

Mr. Hiley: Napiers Limited is dominantly an agricultural machinery concern.

Mr. DIPLOCK: That is not quite right.

Mr. Hiley: Yes it is.

Mr. DIPLOCK: Napiers had 190 men, and 140 were on railway works representing £180,000. In view of the answer of the Premier to the question during the election there is no justification for the sacking of these men.

Referring to education, I wish to pay a personal tribute to those experts who were referred to a little while ago: the Director-General of Education, Mr. Watkin, the Director of Primary Education, Mr. Murphy, the Director of Technical Education, Mr. Evans, and the late Director of Secondary Education, Mr. Powell. I pay tribute to the energy, enthusiasm and industry of those men. Their work, knowledge and ability would ensure there was not very much wrong with the education system. I feel sure that the Government at the end of this term will find that they have not improved very much the terrible position they pretend they have found.

Mr. Hiley: We will have the textbooks printed. Our officers complained bitterly that they could not get any Cabinet help to get them printed.

Mr. DIPLOCK: That definitely would not be right. That is not what the officers told me.

Mr. Hiley: Some of the matter had been in the Printing Office for four years.

Mr. DIPLOCK: That is not the fault of the Department of Education.

Mr. Walsh: That would not be true.

Mr. Hiley: The Government Printer said it was true.

Mr. DIPLOCK: The Minister referred to the expenditure on education by the Labour Government, particularly building costs for one year, 1954-55. He did not mention that the building cost per square in other States was considerably higher than in Queensland due to the higher cost of materials and wages, and the fact that in other States more brick buildings are erected than in Queensland. That is only one tiny phase of the expenditure. The Government, if fair, must admit what Labour Governments have done for education. The total expenditure rose from £3,100,000 in 1947 to £11,347,054 in 1956, an increase of approximately 265 per cent., whereas the population increased by only approximately 25 per cent. That is not a bad effort. Take the expenditure over the last three years as a standard or yardstick by which the Government should measure their success. In 1952-53 the expenditure on education was £7,175,279, and for the year ended 30 June, 1957, it was £11,347,054, an increase of approximately 58 per cent. If that increase is maintained during the next three years, I shall be one of the first to congratulate the Government and the Minister on their fine work.

It is worthy of mention that unadjusted costs per head of population in Queensland have risen from £2 16s. in 1947 to £6 10s. in 1953 and to approximately £8 4s. in 1956. They do not disclose any desire on the part of the previous Government to shelve their responsibility for education.

The Minister for Education was reported in "The Sunday Mail" as saying that the Government recognise the need for more high schools. I agree that the need exists, and my Government was not blind to it. Since 1954 that Government embarked on an expanded building programme to meet that position.

Mr. Gair: More has been spent on secondary education in the last 10 years than in the history of the State.

Mr. DIPLOCK: Since 1954, 11 new high schools were erected and 19 secondary departments established in primary schools. Additional high schools and primary schools were planned for this year. If the Government

in the ensuing three years can create a better record by building more than 11 new high schools and establishing more than 19 secondary departments I shall be one of the first to congratulate them on a job well done.

One of the great problems of the post-war period has been to match the growing school population with adequate teaching staff. In 1952 the former Government embarked upon a recruitment programme under which the most generous allowances payable in Australia were offered to young people in secondary schools to proceed to the Senior Public examination. That plan is now bearing fruit which unfortunately for the former Government the present Government are going to get the benefit of. We have 1,100 students at the Teachers' Training College and over 1,400 students in secondary schools who are Junior scholarship holders.

Mention was made by an hon. member of the Government of school amenities and the help given to school committees. Generous help has been given over the years by Labour Governments to school committees. These committees have taken advantage of the different subsidy schemes. The amount available was increased from £20,989 in 1953-1954 to £47,000 in the last financial year. In a similar way a subsidy on a £1 for £1 basis was given on the purchase of library books, duplicators, radiograms, projectors and typewriters and other essential school equipment. It may be just as well for me to quote what other Governments are doing and then hon. members will have some realisation of the fact that my Government did not fall down on their job. In New South Wales subsidies are paid on school film projectors but it is only 20 per cent. of the cost of approved equipment. We, on the other hand, paid a 50 per cent. subsidy. For libraries the New South Wales Government find 8s. in the £1 for books. A pound for pound subsidy is payable in Queensland. That Government provide a subsidy on radio equipment to one-teacher schools only and it is up to 50 per cent. with a maximum of £15.

Mr. Ramsden: How many schools are there in New South Wales compared with Queensland?

Mr. DIPLOCK: I am making the point that the former Government in this State did not fall down on the job of assisting school committees. I shall give the hon. member the figures relating to other States if he wants them. Continuing with New South Wales, that State gives a 20 per cent. subsidy with a maximum of £60 on pianos. On new typewriters 20 per cent. subsidy is available for schools conducting commercial classes. We pay a subsidy of 50 per cent. We supply, free of cost, typewriters for Commercial classes.

Mr. Gilmore: A Labour Government.

Mr. DIPLOCK: What sort of Government are in power in South Australia? In that State subsidies are paid on library books,

radio equipment and projectors. I am quoting from the latest edition of Review of Education in Australia by the Australian Council for Educational Research, which publication was quoted by the Minister for Education. Labour did not fall down, as was suggested, in its assistance to school committees.

Road transport services were made available by Labour to school children in country areas. At present there are almost 400 daily road transport services and over 100 weekly services to vocational centres. The cost to the Government of those services is over £250,000 a year.

Before my Government were defeated I had data prepared on the free transport of children to secondary schools. I am sure that the Premier and the hon. member for Southport will agree that I had data prepared on the provision of free transport services for children attending the Nambour and Southport High Schools. The previous Cabinet decided that they would be introduced after the election and they were introduced by the present Government. It has not been headlined in the Press that the Government have approved of free transport services to the high schools at Nambour and Southport. That is simply because the Government have not yet agreed to provide free transport for school children in the more remote areas of the State. If the Government think it right to provide free transport for children attending the secondary schools at Nambour and Southport, why is it not equally right to give the same service to children in centres such as Roma, Dalby, Charleville, or any other outback town?

Mr. Coburn: It should be uniform throughout the State.

Mr. DIPLOCK: It should be. That is something that the Minister for Education should examine at an early date.

Recently the following article appeared in "The Courier-Mail":—

"Education of Handicapped Children under Review.

"A State Government committee is reviewing the work of educating Queensland's physically and mentally handicapped children.

"The Education Minister said this in Brisbane yesterday.

"Mr. Pizzey said the committee had been very impressed with the work of the centre, which had been described by overseas education authorities as one of the finest in the world."

The centre referred to in the article was the Spastic Centre at New Farm.

I am very proud of the previous Government's interest in the education of handicapped children. The more that the Minister and the committee referred to in the article that I have just read move round, the more they will be amazed and impressed by the work that has been done by Labour in the education of handicapped children.

Mr. Gair: Professor Schonell told me that more had been done by Queensland's Labour Government than by any other Government in the Commonwealth.

Mr. DIPLOCK: The Labour Government have a record in the education of handicapped children of which any Government might well be proud.

For instance, great progress has been made with the education of handicapped children by the establishment of opportunity schools for the mentally retarded in Brisbane, Bundaberg, Rockhampton and Cairns. Plans are in hand for the extension of the service. The Minister for Education spoke of spastic children.

The school for the deaf and blind offers free tuition and board for country children while the excellent oral school for deaf children at Dutton Park, where partially deaf children are taught by oral methods, offers the latest teaching practices in that field of education. I advise hon. members to visit the school. They will gain a higher regard for the work that has been done by it over the years.

Mr. Coburn: I have been to all of them. They are doing excellent work.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I thank the hon. member. Indeed, the Queensland Labour Government over the past few years set up a record for the amount of money spent on the primary and secondary education of mentally handicapped children and the interest taken in it. If the new Government do a better job, they will earn the respect of all. However, the starting point for their educational programme is much further forward than they would have the people think.

I commend the previous Government for setting up the Queensland Conservatorium of Music.

I often told the Minister for Transport of the previous Government that, while I realised that the Westlander was a long-distance train, I could not see why it should be run more or less as a white elephant in respect to its sitting coaches. If they are required for passengers beyond Dalby, I concede that people from remote areas should be given preference but I cannot see any justification for letting those coaches run from Dalby to Brisbane almost empty. I have asked the new Minister to study the position and I await an answer from him. I cannot see any justification for charging people who travel on the Westlander beyond Dalby but not as far as Roma a surcharge simply because the places to which they travel are not as far west as Roma.

Mr. Coburn: They do the same on the Sunlander.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I refer to places like Drillham and Dulacca. The train has to stop there to change the staff, yet people

are asked to pay a surcharge for the privilege of having it stopped. It is unfair and I ask the Minister to examine it.

I stress, too, despite what the Treasurer said in connection with roads, that the necessity to continue arterial roads to the West still exists. In my opinion, there is still no justification for closing down those jobs. I was amazed to find a leading member of the Government reported in the local paper as saying that he was surprised and worried about the number of men who had been stood down from jobs in his area, and he was also reported to have said that this could be the cause of the defeat of the Government at the next election.

There is an obligation, too, on the Government to carry on hospitalisation plans in the West. Very often these towns in the remote areas are cut off from Brisbane and, unless there is a programme designed to make first-class hospitals available, I feel sure that we will never have people ready, willing, and prepared to go to the West.

Before resuming my seat, I should like to touch on a comment that was made yesterday by the hon. member for Ithaca. He said that he had been told that I had made an approach to join the Country Party. I want to tell the hon. member that I joined the Australian Labour Party before he was born and have had my ticket since 1919. I want to tell him also that I defy any member on the Government side of the House to prove that I made any advance, either oral or written, to join the Country Party.

Mr. Hanlon: The hon. member seems to be protesting a bit too much.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I tell you also that for 35 years I was prepared to work for the Party without asking for the privilege of receiving a paid job. I first contested an election and came into Parliament as the result of a direct approach by the Premier. I have also never sought, by contesting a plebiscite, to oust a man who I considered was doing a good job. I am not saying that the hon. member for Ithaca did that, either.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (3.3 p.m.): I am afraid that I cannot congratulate the Treasurer on his Budget, mainly because I feel that it is not carrying out the election promises put forward by the various Liberal and Country Party candidates. It is a fact that the Treasurer has had little time to prepare the Budget, but, knowing the possibility of his Party's becoming the Government, I feel that he had plenty of opportunity, from the end of June till the present time, to bring down a Budget more in line with the policy of his Party.

However, we find, in going through the various departments, that attempts have been made in at least three departments to put their policy into effect, either in the State or Federal field. The three departments to

which I refer are the Department of Health and Home Affairs, the Department of Education, and the Railway Department.

In the Department of Health and Home Affairs, we see an increased expenditure of just over £1,500,000, and an increased expenditure of just under £1,000,000 in the Department of Education. I will deal with those two first. In the Department of Health and Home Affairs, we find that £1,250,000 extra will be provided for hospitalisation and hospital equipment. It is a move in the right direction. Although it complies with the Country-Liberal Party policy of providing the most modern hospitals in the Commonwealth, indeed throughout the world, it also fully complies with the policy of the Australian Labour Party. As science makes modern equipment available we must use it for the benefit of our people. I congratulate the Treasurer on that part of his Budget. On the receipts side I notice an estimated increase of £150,000. That brings to mind the policy of the Federal Liberty-Country Party under which they have advocated for years that hospitalisation should be paid for.

I know that several statements have been made that free hospitalisation will be continued in Queensland, but when I see an estimated increase in receipts of £150,000 it makes me wonder whether there will be a reduction in the number of free beds, thus forcing people into intermediate and private beds. Perhaps the Minister will give the Committee more details of that £150,000. I am glad to see that a large amount is to be allocated for mental hygiene. Again that is in line with our policy and I have no fault to find.

Mr. Lloyd: As long as it is carried out.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is the point.

There is very little alteration in the appropriation for the Queensland Industrial Institution for the Blind. I have noticed that blind men and women are expected to work under conditions at the institution which would not be tolerated by people who had their sight. Conditions are well below what are considered to be normal working conditions for the average Australian. An even worse feature is that the blind male over 21 years of age is not paid the basic wage, but receives only £10 a week for his labour. He helps to manufacture brooms, baskets and other articles equally as efficiently as people with sight. During the war I saw women winding armatures. They displaced people who could see, not merely to find a job for the blind but because they could do that work more efficiently than people with eyesight. It was found that people with their full faculties did not work as consistently as the blind who had no outside distractions. I know the foreman at the institution and he assures me that they were doing a mighty job. I cannot see any reason at all why they should not be paid the

minimum wage in industry. I hope the Minister will take heed and bring justice to these people.

Mr. Ramsden: Have those conditions arisen only since 3 August?

Mr. HOUSTON: No, they existed before. I make no apology for any Government for allowing them to exist. By the same token, that is no reason why it should be allowed to continue. I hope that in the near future the matter will be remedied. It is true that the blind men are paid a pension of £4 a week which, added to the £10 in wages, brings the total to above the basic wage. Ex-service men receive a pension, but they receive the same wage as anyone else in the industry in which they work. The object of a pension for blind people or ex-service men is to compensate them for their incapacity. The amount that a blind worker receives is not governed by the work he does, but by whether he is married or not. That does not apply to any other section. A single blind worker receives a total of £9 4s. 6d. and when he is married he is given an extra 15s. 6d. a week. Is that justice in any shape or form? If a worker in industry becomes blind the pension is not sufficient for him to live on and he goes to an institution where he learns some method of production. After three years he receives £8 10s. 6d. if married and if single he gets less. It depends on a progress report as to whether he gets the full amount, but if he begins to train when he is under 21 he receives the full amount of 10 guineas when he reaches that age. The whole system has a pension-wage relationship. The pension should not be taken into consideration and the blind worker should be paid the same wage as any other worker.

Mr. Gair: I do not know what the position is now, but a few years ago we could have given them the basic wage and closed it up and saved money. It started as a place that provided occupational therapy.

Mr. HOUSTON: I suggest you have a yarn to the people who work there.

Mr. Gair: They happen to be in my electorate.

Mr. HOUSTON: Perhaps the hon. member has failed to bring the matter up in the House. I urge the Minister to look into the matter and see that these people get justice—the basic wage. Over the years the education system has progressed, but that does not mean that we are satisfied and that there is not a lag in some sections.

I have referred previously to the technical education section, but the ex-Minister did not mention the technical education side. The Treasurer has made no provision in the Estimates for technical education improvements.

The Estimates reveal a peculiar state of affairs in the field of technical education. The planned increase in teachers at the Central Technical College is 12. That is to be expected, because with automation and the establishment of new industries a greater number of children will require technical education, but under the great developmental programme foreshadowed by the Government an increased number of teachers in country centres also would be required. According to the Estimates the number of country teachers will be reduced. There is a reduction in the number of teachers for the technical correspondence school, from 87 to 79.

Many Government speakers have said that the Government will develop Queensland, that we have never seen development to date, but how can the Government claim to be sincere in their desire to develop the country and at the same time reduce the number of teachers? Hon. members opposite can talk till Kingdom come about what they would like to do and what they intend to do, but unless they do those things no good purpose is served. If the North and West are to be developed by the establishment of industries in those places, population must be increased and with increased population there will be more children and a need for improved training facilities.

The reduction in the number of teachers at the technical correspondence school would indicate a reduction in the number of students. It would appear that the Government envisage that reduction, because the classifications being advertised are for a lower division than previously. A reduction in the number of correspondence apprentices would not be significant if there was an increase in the number of country colleges, but that is not mentioned in the Estimates and has not been forecast by any Government member. I agree that Queensland has a great potential for development, but some positive action must be taken.

The previous speaker mentioned the increase of 481 in the number of primary school teachers, of 8.4 per cent. The Government are to be commended on that, but I venture to suggest that it is less than the increase in the last three years under the previous Government.

Under Labour Governments a large number of high schools have been constructed. The Estimates provide for only one extra high school teacher. That does not indicate an increase in the number of high schools.

It is very hard to follow the policy of the Government, unless they think, "We will talk about it and think about it but will not do very much about it; if we do not do very much about it we cannot be criticised or go far wrong."

Mr. Baxter: Forget about action.

Mr. HOUSTON: Action is lacking in the various departments of technical education and particularly the technical correspondence

school. I suggest the Government should bring country apprentices to a main training centre for three weeks each year.

Mr. Coburn: It was suggested before.

Mr. HOUSTON: But I want action; suggestions are no good. Lads at country correspondence schools receive a training in theory second to none. Those who wish to study by correspondence do better than city lads in theory but on the practical side they get none at all. They should receive practical training. It is a practical suggestion to bring country lads into main centres from the end of October right through November when the country colleges are free of oral classes. They only have the job of keeping equipment in order. Three weeks' training could be given to country lads.

Mr. Coburn: An excellent suggestion.

Mr. HOUSTON: It could be brought about without much expense to the State. The State should bear the cost of transport for the boys to the city and the employer should pay the wages due to them for those three weeks and the cost of board. I am not placing a burden on the employer because in the city every apprentice is given a half day a week or one full day a fortnight off from work to attend technical colleges. That works out at 20 days a year. The country employer loses no time at all. It is therefore justified to ask that the country lads be given 15 days' training, the remaining five days to be occupied in travelling to and from the country. I urge the Minister to look into that. The scheme is workable and it should be given favourable consideration by the Director of Technical Education. Some time ago when the apprenticeship inquiry was held I put forward the suggestion. The idea died a natural death although I think the Director viewed it with favour.

In the pamphlet put out by the Minister he recommends to parents that their lads follow one of the various agricultural courses—agriculture and veterinary science and rural occupations. How can we recommend to parents that their children follow such a course if there is only one State school to which they can go? If you advocate something you have to provide the wherewithal to carry it out. I suggest that the Minister consider the establishment of an agricultural college in the Brisbane area. I think there is land in the Wynnum district off the Manly Road which would lend itself to the building of an agricultural high school. Water is available, there is plenty of local transport and the soil is fertile. It seems strange when we want to train lads for these callings that such a college has not already been established. If a parent wants to send his boy for training in one of the agricultural callings he has no alternative but to send him to a boarding school. Working people cannot afford to send their children to boarding schools, even if they

are available. The Government should set up a school within the Greater Brisbane area or close by where transport is available so that children can live in their own homes and go to college as day students.

There is no indication in the Estimates that it is intended to increase the number of welfare officers in the Apprenticeship Office. I think there are five at present. They are doing a magnificent job, but unfortunately there are too few of them and they are not fully conversant with the various trades that they have to deal with. It is often the case that where an apprentice fails to attend the college it is because of something peculiar to his own trade. The only person who can give such lads and their parents reliable advice is one who has been associated with that trade. Not only should more welfare officers be appointed, but those who are appointed should have a background of industrial experience. Moreover, they should have been trained as trade teachers. After all, the apprentices are the nation's tradesmen of the future and it is on them that we rely in both peace and war.

I mentioned earlier that one Government department was budgeting for a reduction in expenditure and an increase in revenue. I refer to the Railway Department. The Estimates show that the lower expenditure will come from a reduction of £403,000 in wages. On the average tradesman's wage rate, that means that the Government intend during the coming year to dismiss at least 500 men from the Railway Department.

Mr. Ramsden: It means nothing of the sort.

Mr. HOUSTON: What does it mean?

Mr. Windsor: It is overtime.

Mr. HOUSTON: It is not overtime. The figures given are £403,889 for wages and £241,184 for overtime. It is wages, and the only men in the Railway Department who receive wages are the workers on the railway track and those associated generally with the running of the rail services.

Mr. Windsor: We are not putting them off, we are putting them on. It was you who put them off.

Mr. HOUSTON: There is no way in the world that the hon. member can get round the reduction in expenditure that I have referred to. It would appear that at least 500 men will be dismissed from the Railway Department.

Mr. Ramsden: It would not.

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member can get up later and argue about that.

This is the first written evidence I have seen that the Government intend to dismiss men. We have heard a good deal about the need to develop the State, but you cannot develop it without railways. The hon. member for Mount Gravatt has decried any suggestion of nationalisation, but it is necessary

to have railways to develop the State. If you dismiss men from the railways, you cannot lay new tracks or maintain the rolling stock in first-class condition. I warn the Government that if they start dismissing men from the railways and other Government departments, the impact will be felt throughout the State. I have referred already to the dismissal of men at Cairncross Dock. I was surprised at the number because, both with the Government and with private enterprise, the policy over the last few months has been to sack not in large numbers but in ones and twos. If Government members talk to some of their own people they will learn that. That is exactly what happened in 1927. As workers are paid off, their purchasing power is reduced and it has a snowballing effect throughout industry. I urge the Government to review the Railway Estimates and ensure that there will be no sackings whatever.

Railway revenue is estimated to rise by £667,000. That sounds a great deal, but it is really only a 2 per cent. increase. How does that fit in with the great developmental programme? In view of the Government's promises one might reasonably expect a far greater increase. It seems to me that the only development in the State will take place in Brisbane.

Mr. Hooper: And Bulimba.

Mr. HOUSTON: Bulimba is all right. Bulimba will be well represented.

I did not want to speak on housing at this stage but the hon. member for Chermiside congratulated me for saying we should maintain our own backyards and I must repay him for the compliment by warning him to check his facts carefully before making a statement. Earlier he said, that in 1954 there were 21,000 vacant homes in Brisbane. I checked the figure both before I spoke and afterwards. Although it appeared in the Government Year Book, and although there were 21,000 homes on the market, people who should know, such as house agents, assured me it was mainly due to the owners waiting to transfer from one home to another because of change of employment or for some other reason. In fact there are fewer than 100 vacant homes in Brisbane today.

The other day the hon. member for South Brisbane spoke of three weeks' leave. I am concerned about employment. We appear to be travelling on different roads; our views differ on the effects of three weeks' leave on employment. Years ago when the Labour Party advocated the reduction of weekly working hours from 48 to 44, and then from 44 to 40, the argument always was—and I agree with it—that as machinery displaced men the hours of work should be reduced. That is logical. After all, modern science should be used in the interests of the people by making the housewife's lot easier and by reducing the hours of work for those employed in industry. However, increasing

the amount of leave also reduces the number of hours worked in the year, therefore more men are employed. The only catch would be if industry could not stand it, and I do not think that anyone would say that industry, not only in this State but elsewhere, is not in a very healthy position.

Mr. Gair: The State Government could not stand it.

Mr. HOUSTON: What extra would it cost?

Mr. Gair: In the vicinity of £1,000,000.

Mr. Aikens: A mere bagatelle.

Mr. HOUSTON: That statement of approximately £1,000,000 is totally different from the statements made by the candidates in the hon. member's party during the last election.

Mr. Aikens: They put up the same argument against the eight-hour day.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is point No. 1. My second point is that the Government pay salary or wages for 52 weeks a year irrespective of whether the men are at work or are on holidays. The cost to the State would not be any more in actual money.

Mr. Ramsden: That is an illogical statement.

Mr. HOUSTON: The State will lose a week's production, which is vitally different from an extra £1,000,000 in wages.

Mr. Windsor: They get five weeks in my industry now. Do you want to go back to three?

Mr. HOUSTON: I congratulate the hon. member on giving his men five weeks' leave. I need say no more than about three weeks' leave, as I daresay that his industry is one of the most prosperous in the State.

Mr. Hooper: What is wrong with the Industrial Court?

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes, you can get it from the Industrial Court, if you wish.

There is one thing that I would like to mention regarding the tourist trade. Queensland today is blessed with some very beautiful scenic and natural recreation reserves. Unfortunately, I am afraid that some of them are going to be taken away from the ordinary people. It is a fact that we have to bring tourists to the State and we must have the most modern conveniences at the tourist resorts. However, the cost of a holiday in some of these places, particularly the Gold Coast, is getting far beyond the reach of the ordinary people.

I urge upon the Government, in the development of these seaside or scenic reserves, the setting aside of suitable areas for campers because a camping holiday in this climate is one of the natural things in life. When they go ahead with tourist development, I urge

the Government to make provision for these people who cannot afford to pay the high rents of the more modern flats and boarding-houses.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (3.39 p.m.): I think it was one of the new members of the House who said that he felt that a great deal of time was wasted in debates in this House. After he has been here a little while I feel that he will gain the impression that there are so many things to be talked about in the State's economy that he will probably find he has not sufficient time. However, that is as it should be. I think he will agree, since making those remarks and following the debate on the Financial Statement, that there are so many subjects of interest to members—having regard to the fact that only the debates on the Address-in-Reply and Financial Statement allow a member to wander over the world, as it were—that there is not too much time allowed to hon. members, provided they make use of it and give some constructive suggestions. Of all the debates covering all sorts of subjects probably the most important is the debate on the Financial Statement. In effect it presents the picture of the State's finances and economy. I am not merely speaking about what governmental expenditure may mean because governmental expenditure is so widely reflected in private enterprise. That will become more apparent in the three years that the present Government occupy the Treasury benches.

Mr. Hiley: Three or more.

Mr. WALSH: Three. It is becoming more apparent every day. We hear arguments from hon. members of the official Opposition about how the Government prior to their defeat were emphasising the difficult times ahead and the possibility of wide-scale unemployment. It is the official Opposition who are drawing more and more attention to the many unemployed in the State. The pity is that these things were not taken notice of when they should have been taken notice of. It is tragic today to hear hon. member after hon. member outlining the position as he sees it in his territory, and as I well know it to be in mine, telling the Committee about the considerable number of men thrown out of work. The greatest of all industrial diseases is unemployment. In his very effective speech the hon. member for Condamine drew attention to the dismissal of men employed by Napiers in Dalby. The Treasurer wanted to convey the impression that Napiers was a firm that applied itself more particularly to the manufacture of agricultural implements. I have been through the factory myself, I have seen the men at work and the number of railway wagons pulled down by the employees. If every employee throughout the State, whether Government employed or employed by private enterprise, gave as good a return for wages received as the employees at Napiers, it would be much better for the State's economy. That is why I sound a note of warning at this stage. The Government

want to make sure that they do not centralise all the employment of skilled tradesmen in Ipswich, Townsville or Rockhampton railway workshops. In my term of office as Minister for Transport I had to make that point particularly clear to the unions. The Government as a Government were just as much interested in maintaining skilled tradesmen in employment in any other part of the State as in the Ipswich Railway Workshops. If we are to talk about decentralisation that is the way it has to be approached. In its output of repaired locomotives the Bundaberg Foundry has proved that it can do the work as cheaply and as good as any other firm in the State. I have that from railway men who drive the engines. While many people argue about how many men were going to be dismissed prior to 30 June and how many have been re-employed by the Government, few are taking notice of the 12 here, the 20 there or the 50 somewhere else being put off by private enterprise. It will happen just as it happened in the period 1929 to 1932. Unless there is a realistic approach, not only by this Government but by the Federal Government, we could be faced with the same danger that faced the country then.

Coming to the Financial Statement, I want to make it clear, that the suggestion from both sides of the Chamber that this Budget is a budget of the previous Government, and what is submitted here is largely determined by the previous Government, are not true. The reporting, as the Treasurer rightly pointed out, in connection with the transactions and finances of the State in the period prior to 30 June, covered the activities of the Government of the day; but it was within the power of this Government to readjust the Budget if they so desired and arrange for their allocation of the finances in any way they thought fit. As a matter of fact, the Treasurer, seeking a little publicity, proceeded to show how he was going to do that. I shall mention that later on. The hon. gentleman said that to give housing a shot in the arm he made provision for £200,000 to be transferred from the Workers' Homes Fund. They could do that with any other trust fund. What I want to be clear on is that as far as the works programme is concerned, the Loan Fund figure was determined by the Loan Council prior to the present Government being elected. It is true, as the Treasurer pointed out, that the works programme is the programme recommended by the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works. To that extent the Government of the day can say that they were committed to a programme that was determined largely prior to the defeat of the previous Government. Let it be understood that the allocation of the various moneys from Consolidated Revenue or from Trust Funds could have been done by the present Government

as they saw fit. I refer to the following statement on page 2 of the Financial Statement—

“Before I present the figures for the year that has passed, may I say something to hon. members concerning the form of presentation which has been followed. For some time I have doubted whether our form of presentation is sufficiently clear. The charging of capital works against revenue; the placing of some interest earnings direct to the credit of a reserve fund; the blending in the common Trust and Special Funds of moneys which are entirely the property of the State with moneys which the State holds only as a trustee for others—all of these things have tended to perpetuate distortions in our accounting presentation which I propose to correct.”

I have no doubt the Treasurer will provide many devious ways of juggling the figures to present a different picture. But let it be understood, despite the “*Courier-Mail*” sub-leader on this Statement, and the comments made by others, that it is not going to put one penny more into the Consolidated Revenue fund, or any other fund. It does not matter how the Treasurer may seek to present the accounts to this House, it will not produce one penny piece more. If I may remind the hon. gentleman, this practice that is followed in Queensland is to some extent followed by the Federal administration. The evidence of a very prominent financial expert before the Commonwealth Public Accounts Committee a year or so ago was that after an examination of all the budgetary systems of Australia including that of the Commonwealth Government, the Queensland system appealed most to him. It may be that the picture produced by the Treasurer will not be as clear as previously, and that hon. members will not be able to trace the expenditure of money as easily as under previous documents.

Queensland has more trust funds than any other State, created by Statute or by Government policy, but hon. members have been able to follow the placing of money to those trust funds and the expenditure of it. I ask the Treasurer to mention any other State that presents its financial accounts as clearly as the financial accounts presented by the previous Government. It is obvious, and the Treasurer understands this, that it would be impossible in a Financial Statement to include all details of the financial transactions. It is so much bunk to say that a clear picture of the finances of the State is not available to hon. members or to people outside. Anyone who cares to peruse the report of the Auditor-General will find every detail of every transaction in every fund administered by the Government and many other funds administered by other bodies under statutory authority. It would be impossible to include all those details in

the Financial Statement. I am sure the Treasurer would not attempt to undertake the task of doing so.

The Treasurer referred to the placing of some interest earnings to the credit of a reserve fund. Is there anything irregular of improper about that? The Treasurer knows that under the Post-War Reconstruction Act it is competent to pay into the particular trust fund interest earned from the investment of those moneys. That is a definite provision. The Treasurer may want to alter that method.

He then referred to the charging of capital works against revenue. I cannot see how that can be avoided. There is a definite loan allocation and if the Government desire to supplement works expenditure from some other source the money must come from some trust fund or consolidated revenue. I do not see anything wrong in that. The Treasurer is fully aware of some of the arguments advanced by representatives of the previous Government at Loan Council meetings, arguments he will be presenting when he attends those meetings, that the Federal Government for many years have financed capital works from revenue. The Treasurer may say the practice was introduced by a Labour Government. That is so. It was introduced by the Chifley Government at a time when for very good reasons that Government thought it was a more effective means of financing capital works than loan money. Approximate figures come to my mind. In 1955-1956 the Federal Government allocated £104,000,000 from revenue for this purpose. I do not recall whether they expended the full amount, but next year £109,000,000 was allocated, an increase of £5,000,000 out of revenue at a time when they were dictating to the States the necessity to curtail expenditure. The States were doing the real developmental work which returned the income from which the Commonwealth Government got revenue. After having held this State out to £19,000,000 out of a loan allocation of £200,000,000 they have this year allocated from revenue £122.4 million. In other words, they have gone up by £13,000,000 over and above the allocation of last year. I am not concerned whether they spent it or not. I am proving that the Federal Government have over the years carried out the whole of their capital works out of revenue. I know that the Treasurer might ask what would be the position of the State if the Commonwealth were to take their share out of loan raisings. The answer is—and the proposition was put up by representatives of the Labour Government in Queensland—that the Commonwealth Government should share the surplus revenue available to them and the loan raisings undertaken by the Commonwealth on behalf of the States. The Commonwealth should come into the pool and take their share.

In addition to the figures I have quoted there is a very substantial amount on defence capital expenditure, and that comes from

revenue. If one follows the document presented the other day by Sir Arthur Fadden, one sees that after allowing for £122.4 million for works out of revenue the Commonwealth Government budget for a surplus of £119,000,000. They are the people who are dictating to this and the other States with all the developmental work still remaining to be done particularly in this State.

I warn the Government that they have to be on their guard for any agreement with regard to the development of Mt. Isa and the other mineral resources of the State. The Government will have to watch that they do not undertake the substantial portion of the financial liability when the Commonwealth must benefit either internally or externally because of the greater volume of export.

There has been much talk about reserves. The Treasurer has made a little adjustment in the way in which he has presented the picture to show that there is something like £2,000,000 in net reserves available to the State. This is shown in his Financial Statement, not that I like the way in which it is presented. I do not think the Treasurer will expect me to agree with it. I mentioned before that during the 1956 campaign, the present Premier aided and abetted by the Treasurer and others, claimed that there were £26.3 million in reserves available to the State.

Mr. Hiley: I never did.

Mr. WALSH: I am saying "aided and abetted." If the hon. gentleman was the financial adviser to the then Leader of the Opposition I would not give him marks for tendering that advice.

Mr. Hiley: I do not confuse total funds with reserves.

Mr. WALSH: I would not expect the Treasurer to do that. However, regardless of his denial I cite another authority, Sir Arthur Fadden, who took part in the campaign. He supported the statement of the present Premier that those reserves were available. I immediately replied that if that was to be accepted as the standard applying to State finances, the Federal Government had £773,000,000 available in their various reserve funds. It is stupid to make such suggestions. The money just is not there. Although the Treasurer may have great difficulty in convincing the official Opposition, as it is described, that the money is not available, he knows as well as I do that it is not.

The Treasurer well knows that when he made his statement about the allocation of £200,000 from the Workers' Homes Fund, the money was not simply lying idle in that fund. It was part of the total cash resources of the State. To the extent that he makes that £200,000 available, a smaller amount is

available to him for other purposes unless his cash resources are made greater by increased revenue.

No doubt many hon. members noticed the article in "The Sunday-Mail" of 20 October headed, "Canberra's Harold Cox Delves into Facts and Figures on Taxation. Harvest Survey in Wake of Government's Eighth Budget." The figures in the article are very revealing at a time when the States are being starved of funds by the Federal Government. I say that advisedly, although hon. members opposite might quote figures purporting to show that the Menzies-Fadden Government have granted the States more than their predecessors did. That is not the answer. The States are not getting their legitimate share of the revenues received by the Commonwealth from the work being done by the States in developing their resources.

The article that I referred to reads—

"Mr. Chifley's last Budget, inherited by the Menzies Government in December 1949, imposed income tax on individuals at a rate averaging £24 6s. 11½d. per head of population.

"It had risen to that level from £21 4s. in 1944-1945, the last full year of the war, when the burden of wartime finance reached its ultimate peak.

"After eight years of the new low tax policy per capita, payments by Australians in personal income tax alone are estimated this year at £47 13s."

That is almost double the figure in the last Chifley Budget.

The article continues—

"Customs, excise and sales tax, the three indirect taxes which most affect the family budget, were taking £15 ls. a head from Australians when the war ended.

"This had increased to £23 2s. 11d. a head when Mr. Chifley handed over.

"For the current year the per capita payment of these indirect, but very burdensome taxes, will be £44 11s.

"The total tax burden per head when the war ended was £47 7s. When Mr. Chifley handed over it was £60 8s. This year it will be £120 11s. 2d."

Mr. Gilmore: It would be at a lesser rate.

Mr. WALSH: That is what the hon. member for Tablelands may think.

The article continues—

"There is an interesting moral in these facts.

"They mean not only that the Commonwealth Government is the greatest financial beneficiary from inflation, but that it is gaining from inflation twice over.

"In the first place, it gets an automatic increase in personal income tax collections every time wages and salaries take a jump in their hopeless race to catch up with inflation, because incomes are going up.

“What is not quite so obvious to the average Australian is that at a time when tax rates are supposed to be stable, they are actually rising steadily.”

Mr. Hiley: You know that is a basic reason why the greatest borrower in the community should never control currency and currency matters.

Mr. WALSH: That may be so. I was interested to hear the arguments that the Treasurer proposes courteously to present to the Loan Council. If I am any judge, I shall be surprised if, before his term of office expires, he does not use more vulgar language than Sir Thomas Playford. I have heard many who were not members of the A.L.P., or Labour Premiers, or A.L.P. representatives, present their case and the three most aggressive I have heard in my time around the Loan Council table have been the representatives of Victoria and South Australia.

Mr. Morris: You are just being too modest; that is all.

Mr. WALSH: We learned long ago that it does not pay. It will not pay the present Government, either.

I come now to an item of interest that the Minister for Transport might raise as he takes matters to Cabinet from time to time for approval. Again it shows the effect of taxation. The previous Minister for Transport, the former member for Toowoomba, took this item along to Cabinet providing for the purchase for the railway refreshment rooms of 25 hogsheads of rum containing 1,502 gallons at 6s. a gallon. The cost worked out at £450 12s. The duty on the 2,027 proof gallons at 82s. a gallon was £8,310 14s. After adding the cost of the rum and the duty together, sales tax at 12½ per cent. was applied and it amounted to £1,095 3s. 3d. The rum that originally cost £450 12s. ended up costing £9,856 9s. 3d. Now hon. members know where the Commonwealth Treasury gets a large slice of revenue from the pocket of the worker, the man who smokes and has his drink.

On page 4 of the Financial Statement the Treasurer set out the liabilities and possible commitments of the State. He says—

“Losses and other debit balances which have direct relation to, but have not yet been reflected in, the Consolidated Revenue Fund are:—

Accumulated losses to 30th June, 1957—

State Coal Mines—		£	£
Collinsville	255,124	
Ogmore	73,638	
Mount Mulligan	170,158	
		498,920	
State Coke Works	115,047	
Irvinbank State Treatment Works	40,888	
		654,855	
Debit Balance in Banana Industry Fund		21,320

Having made the calculation he incorporates it in the Budget and uses it to give an estimated deficit of over £1,500,000. That might be all right in the private accountancy world but I think he will find as he goes along that many of the methods applied in the presentation of private financial statements cannot be applied to public finance. The Treasurer may have his own ideas on this, but it will not, I think he will agree, provide him with one penny more. My claim is that it presents a picture, and gives a more realistic view of, the position of the State's finances. I have already indicated that that is fully outlined in the report of the Auditor-General.

The Treasurer then gives what he claims to be a summary of the overall position, and ends up showing that the net available reserves are £2,099,772. He then makes this observation—

“The reserves which were built up during and after the war years have been substantially drawn upon until they have become almost exhausted.

“Against this net figure of approximately £2 million can be set the present deficiency in the capital equivalent of the sum the Government will have to meet in respect of current superannuation schemes for its employees. It has been calculated that this deficiency is approximately £12,835,000, made up as follows:—”

The Treasurer then proceeds to give the figures in his Statement. Where does that lead you in a proper examination of the State's finances? You might as well go so far afield as to take in all the guarantees that have been given to local authorities, secondary industries, and banks by the Government, where the accounts have been guaranteed by the Government to foster and develop industry in this State. You might just as well argue that if one of those industries breaks down, the State is faced with that position. Of course it is, and there has been at least one instance of that when we were called upon to adjust that position in respect of the Cairns cannery. Superannuation fund commitments for the Public Service and the Police Force amount to £14,000,000, but over how many years is this going to take place? Do not let us be led astray by the figures as the are presented here in this Statement. If I had recommended that the report submitted by the actuary be accepted, it is true that we would have been paying £5,000,000 into the Police Fund at that time to make it actuarially sound. The thing is so much eyewash to me, and I think the Treasurer will agree. However, I suppose he has to bring in some new ideas, and I will watch them with interest.

I do not think that the hon. member for Tablelands has shown as much interest in the pineapple-growers up there as has the hon. member for Cook over the years. I do not expect that he will be able to squeeze as much out of the present Treasurer as the

hon. member for Cook was able to get out of the previous Government, through me as Treasurer.

The Treasurer may have his ideas about the more courteous presentation of the case for Queensland. I have heard the Treasurer make some very interesting contributions to the various debates in this House, and the only ones that I know him to have spoilt are those in which he proceeded to use extravagant language. Particularly was that the case two or three years ago when I left it to the plumber from Kurilpa to reply to the various misstatements that he made about irregular transfers of funds, and so on. He was able to do sufficient research to show, from the pages of the Estimates where the particular notings were made at the bottom, that various adjustments had been made in accordance with the relevant sections of the Audit Act. For political purposes, he wanted to adopt other methods. It is unfortunate that the Treasurer should convey any impression that there has been any discourtesy so far as the Queensland representatives are concerned. That has not been so. I venture the opinion that the people the Federal Treasurer will miss at the next Loan Council meeting will be the previous Queensland representatives.

Let me issue another word of warning to the Treasurer based on my experience in attending Loan Council meetings with the hon. member for South Brisbane. Local authority finance plays a very important part in the economy of Queensland. At the last Loan Council meeting we attended, although the Commonwealth Government still pegged the State at its £19,000,000, local authorities were increased to £19,500,000. That is not what the State asked for; we asked for over £25,000,000. The Treasurer will find that they have various types of pruning knives down there. He will be surprised at the different daggers they can pull out when they prune financial submissions. He will have to watch for attempts by the Commonwealth authorities to enter the domain of local authority finance control. We have seen many instances where they attempted to get as firm a grip on local authority loan raising as they have on the States. The Treasurer will become aware of that as he examines the cases submitted by Queensland in the past.

The Government and every hon. member must support a policy that aims at full employment. All the bunk in the world can be talked about maintaining men in employment but without the financial resources it cannot be done. That applies as much to the present Government as it has to any previous Government. If the Government made their allocations for this financial year on the basis of the finance available to them and on the recommendation of the Co-Ordinator-General, bearing in mind the man-power and materials available, what more can be done? If because of dry seasonal conditions the Main Roads Department were able to go

full steam ahead with machinery all over the State and spend their full year's allocation in nine months, what are they going to do then? Who is going to find the money? It is all so much nonsense to say that the plight of the present Government is going to be any different from the plight of the previous Government. If they have not got the money, off go the men. The difficulty may be that the Government might direct much of their funds through avenues that do not provide full employment or large-scale employment like Forestry and other works that absorb a fair proportion of labour. That has to be watched. No matter what the Minister for Transport may say about who gave authority to dismiss 650 men, no matter how the hon. gentleman might be supported by the Leaders of the official Opposition in trying to drag down the name of the previous Labour Government, which they supported, into the gutter, the fact remains that decision would have been made by his own department having regard to the finance available to it. Well does the Commissioner for Railways know that towards the end of the financial year when the revenue position was shown to have improved, not as a result of railway activities but because of revenues from other sources, I personally asked the Commissioner how much more he could expend before 30 June, and a further £100,000 was made available. That money continued in employment a number of men on the various re-laying gangs throughout the State. A further £100,000 was made available to enable him to finance railway repair works undertaken by the Commonwealth Engineering Company at Rocklea, which was pleading that unless it got further financial assistance through the railway it would have to dismiss about 120 men. The same applies to Evans, Deakin & Company and other firms who are affected by the expenditure of governmental moneys. That is why I say although we boast about the part private enterprise plays in providing employment, and accept the statement that governmental and semi-governmental bodies account for 20 per cent. of employment and private enterprise 80 per cent., a large proportion of the number employed by private enterprise are maintained in work because of the volume of money spent through various governmental activities. Whether it be the supply of bricks, cement, or timber, the fact remains that governmental expenditure is reflected in those industries. I cannot see any easy time ahead for the Government. I said so in this Chamber previously. I tried to point out the difficulties that lie ahead of this State. I did not wish to assume the role of a pessimist when I said I was not looking to 1956, much less 1957. Let me say now that I cannot see any improvement in our economy until the end of next year, when it will be brought about largely by Central Bank credit through the Commonwealth Government on the eve of the Federal election. If it has to depend on actual production, exports and internal production and consumption, it must go down. We heard the pathetic

news over the air that the State of New South Wales that produced an average of over 56,000,000 bushels of wheat a year—the largest production of any State in Australia—with a maximum production of over 90,000,000 bushels in one year, is expected to yield 5,000,000 bushels this year.

Mr. Hiley: Now 3,000,000 bushels.

Mr. WALSH: That makes it worse. However, there is the position. It may be that Australia will have to import wheat from overseas. Surely none of us will argue at this time about three weeks' annual leave and all the other adjustments that could be made in the industrial economy during times of prosperity. What is the good of arguing about adjusting your industrial economy to provide further improvements if you have thousands of men walking about with no income at all. That is the position which stares us in the face. It is all very well for some people and the Press to say that that may be a pessimistic view. They have to keep their share marketeers and advertisers. The amount that is expended in advertising in the Press is a clear indication of the times that are with us now—the struggle to get business.

On the engineering side firms that have not for a long time had to seek work are now looking for orders in other States. It is not a bright picture. Let us be big enough to face it and do something about it. It is useless to argue about it. The Government that gave so much to the country were destroyed by arguments over a petty week's leave because they wanted to preserve full employment for many of those who are now looking for jobs. It was said by some, "What does £1,000,000 mean? Give it to them. Give them an extra week." But would not £1,000,000 be better employed in providing full weekly wages, even for only six or nine months. That is my understanding of Labour policy. The first principle is to keep men in jobs, keep income going into the homes. The sufferer in the long run is the woman who day after day and week after week has to balance the family budget, the mere pittance given today by way of unemployment insurance or other social welfare benefits.

Mr. Adair: Was ministerial approval given to the sacking of 650 railwaymen?

Mr. WALSH: No ministerial approval was sought. The departments have to work on their eternal economy according to the available finance, despite the hooey about some Minister authorising this or that.

I warned the Treasurer earlier in the session that he would meet many people who would spend his money, and many of them in the Cabinet. They have fantastic ideas about how it should be spent. But he will find very few who will submit proposals for increasing revenue. As Treasurer he may have to alter his opinion. There is an old saying that distant pastures look green.

Now that the former Opposition Parties occupy the Treasury benches they realise the difficulties of giving effect to what they supported and the promises they said they would honour if returned to office.

It was said recently that the lifting of restrictions on transport from 15 miles to 75 miles may cost the Government £500,000. Of course it will, but £500,000 can easily be dragged out of the Treasury!

Mr. Chalk: It cannot.

Mr. WALSH: I shall deal briefly with the proposal to guarantee loans to building societies. Do the Treasurer and the Government really believe that they are going to solve the housing shortage by this method?

Mr. Hiley: It will help.

Mr. WALSH: I wish them luck. The position has been analysed in this Chamber previously. The statistics reveal that the housing position in Queensland has been better than in any other State. That has not been contested.

Mr. Coburn: That depends on the basis of comparison.

Mr. WALSH: Whatever basis of comparison is used, it would be comparable. I take it the Statistician does not choose a special formula for Queensland to prove that the housing position is better here.

Mr. Hiley: This is one instance when you would gladly accept the Commonwealth figures.

Mr. WALSH: I am very sorry to learn that the Government have handed over even that simple power. I remind the Treasurer of the position in the State that has guaranteed loans to building societies over a long period—New South Wales. The housing position there is worse than in any other part of Australia. What is the answer? The Government should not delude themselves into thinking that by guaranteeing something they will produce more income. The total amount will not be increased by taking something from one pool and putting it into another. The Treasurer knows that.

Mr. Hiley: Yes, truly.

Mr. WALSH: The first thing you want is production and output.

Mr. Hiley: We have the productive capacity.

Mr. WALSH: I am pointing out to the hon. gentleman that the guaranteeing of loans to building societies has by no means solved the problem in New South Wales. In Queensland we have reached the stage when 72.3 per cent. of home dwellers either own their homes or are in the process of purchasing them. I ask any member of the Government to name any other part of the world where home-ownership is higher than in Queensland. If that is the case we have

got along pretty well with our workers' dwelling and other housing schemes in this State. But I say to the Treasurer that there is a possibility of his getting increased revenue if the Government give effect to the new land policy of converting perpetual lease to freehold. It could be a political three-card trick. Except on the Gold Coast I doubt whether many will accept it. It will not be any good to the farmer with the larger property. If the policy is given effect to the Government might get a substantial increase in land tax. To the extent that they might loose the 3 per cent. rental on perpetual lease, it may be that many will come within the category of the land tax schedules which attract a high rate of tax.

Mr. Gair: They promised to abolish land tax.

Mr. WALSH: I am prepared to wager that during the next 20 years they will not abolish land tax.

The hon. member for Aubigny spoke about Cecil Plains. It happens that I dealt with this land when I was Secretary for Public Lands. I recall that in one particular case brought to my notice the capital value of £4 an acre was regarded as being excessive. The land that the hon. member was referring to is not Crown land in the ordinary sense. It was purchased by the Denham or Kidston Governments. They had to pay the capital cost. As I now have only five minutes left, I will leave that subject for the time being as I have other matters to deal with.

I refer to the attitude adopted by the Official Opposition on questions they have asked about the expenses of Ministers. The idea is that they might unearth something which might bring into the public eye something improper or some irregularity concerning Ministers. The mere fact that I did not claim my expenses had nothing to do with anybody else. With the exception of a small amount I can produce cheque books and receipts. And then there was a question of contracts. I suggest they peruse some of the records and find out the association of the hon. member for Brisbane with the Queensland Tobacco Agency when he made certain sales to the State Stores. It is all very well to drag these things up. As far as I am concerned, they can drag the river. Whatever they may bring up in the way of dead bodies, I shall be happy to meet them. But they should not drag their own stinking carcases around here, particularly when we remember some of the things that they have buried.

Those who think that the Queensland Labour Party is not a force to be reckoned with have another think coming. Never in the history of Australia can it be shown that a party with only three months' organisation was able to capture over 23 per cent. of the total votes cast and nearly 44 per cent. of the total Labour vote. A performance such as that is not to be scoffed at.

As far as I am concerned, there can be no reconciliation within the forces of Labour until the influence of the Communist Party is eliminated from the Australian Labour Party.

A.L.P. Members interjected.

Mr. WALSH: Members of the official Opposition can bark and talk as much as they like. If any member of the Country-Liberal Party appeared on a public platform advocating my return as a member of Parliament, my loyalty to Labour principles could be held suspect. Similarly, when avowed Communists support A.L.P. candidates their loyalty to the principles of Labour can also be held suspect.

Mr. Hanlon: What happened to the £10 bet that you had at Longreach?

Mr. WALSH: Dawson went out there. I left my £10 there and he can leave his, too. He was there, just as he was in Bundaberg. The hon. member for Ithaca knows that his name was linked with the Fabians. Joe Bukowski suspects the Fabians now. Let the hon. member read what he says about them in "The Worker."

Mr. Hanlon: The president of one of the Q.L.P. branches was president of the Fabian Society five years ago.

Mr. WALSH: I know nothing about that. All I am saying is that Joe Bukowski suspects the Fabians. He suspects many other people, too. It is very serious when the leader of the Executive of the Australian Labour Party describes the president of the Trades and Labour Council as a "front" man. What is he a "front" man for? What is to be unearthed later on? Is he a "front" for the Communist Party, or what?

Nobody will take from me my Labour principles. I remember what happened in previous years when elements similar to those that split the Labour Party in this State threw the Scullin Government out and wrecked it, just as the combination of the influences backed by the oil companies and the Communist Party wrecked the Labour Government of Queensland. That cannot be denied. The division list is there for anybody to see. The charge that I am making today against the official Opposition is that they lined up with the then Opposition to defeat the Labour Government.

(Time expired.)

Mr. KEYATTA (Townsville) (4.39 p.m.): At a time when the Labour Party is divided, it is reprehensible for members of the Queensland Labour Party to accuse members of the Australian Labour Party of being in league with the Communists. I have been opposed by a Communist Party candidate in seven election campaigns, but I can remember many occasions on which members of the Queensland Labour Party were supported by the Communists. I protest strongly

against suggestions that the Australian Labour Party is in league with the Communist Party. Hon. members opposite well know that they were returned to power on a minority vote, on a split vote, and I do not think that is anything to be proud of. Still, it is the will of the people and they have a majority in accordance with the Elections Act.

Mr. Ewan: We are here in accordance with the provisions of the Elections Act.

Mr. KEYATTA: That is quite true; I do not deny it. I said it was the will of the people in accordance with the Elections Act and if the hon. member had been listening he probably would have heard me say it.

I strongly urge the Government to do all they can to make homes available to those who want them. Family life is the basis of civilisation, of contentment and of morality. Past Governments have helped greatly with home building. It is pleasing that Queensland has the highest ratio of home ownership in Australia.

It is well known that home-building costs are continually spiralling upwards. In 1948 the cost of the average home was £1,133. Now it is more like £3,016. Not only are homes hard to get; they also cost more. It is vital that the Commonwealth and State Governments get together and in a co-ordinated effort devote as much of their resources as possible to home building, perhaps with a subsidy such as they give to local authorities. It is important that the initial cost of the home should be within the purchasing power of the worker and the repayments within his earning capacity. Home-building costs have risen even since 25 March, 1957, and as time goes on homes will be beyond the reach not only of those on the lower incomes but also of those in the middle bracket. Unless the State builds the houses or provides the wherewithal for the people to purchase them, there is one of two alternatives—either reduce costs or provide a subsidy. I strongly urge that the people should be allowed to obtain their own homes to give them security, a better outlook, and something in life worth living for.

Mr. Gilmore: On freehold land, too.

Mr. KEYATTA: That is a matter of policy; we believe in perpetual lease and the hon. member believes in freehold. The hon. member for Warrego has outlined the differences between perpetual lease and freehold land. I suppose it makes very little difference to the individual whether it is freehold or leasehold land, except that rent has become the bugbear. If the State should ever desire to resume freehold land, that can be done easier and quicker than if the land were perpetual lease. The State must predominate when land is required for any purpose.

An hon. member attacked the late Government about the neglect of co-operatives. The provision is written into the Act. Under

the Act, anybody can form a co-operative, and that provision has been in operation for many years. It is a matter for the individuals. An individual or individuals cannot be compelled to launch any project if they do not so desire, but the machinery is there for it and has been there for many years.

We have heard a lot about borers. Attacks have been made on the ex-Minister and the late Government. It does not matter what precautions are taken, borers will appear. The only really effective method is the old process of sun-drying and seasoning the timber. With the strong demand for homes, green timber had to be used; it was a matter of that or having no houses at all. It was a case of Hobson's choice—selecting the most expedient way of going about it.

Even if a house is built, borers can be treated once they manifest themselves, but it is a slow process. I know of one house in Townsville, built of green timber, in which borers were treated successfully with a liquid or acid process. It is very slow, but it has been most effective.

The attack on the Department of Public Works was really an attack on its efficient staff. It was an attack not necessarily on the Minister or the Government, but on an efficient staff of responsible officers. It cannot be denied that their record stands paramount; we have in Queensland a very fine Housing Commission. Those people, who are not only efficient but highly qualified, have been loyal to their trust. They are victims of circumstance. It is not the fault of the Government or even the department, as it was the great demand of the people that was responsible for the building of those homes.

Unfortunately, timber which was not suitable to our climate was imported, but who was to say that it would be infected? It was more moist in France than it was in Brisbane, and, as the process there was quite effective, we expected that it would be quite satisfactory and effective here too. We know there are shortcomings. Many of them will manifest themselves as time goes on. I do not care how efficient an organisation is, accidents will happen. The European borer is an accident. In our personal affairs and businesses we have accidents. The home ownership ratio in Queensland is the highest in the Commonwealth, indeed something of which Queensland can be proud. It is the duty of any Government to ensure that every person has the opportunity of owning his own home.

Queensland has the greatest potential of any State in the Commonwealth. Land, agriculture and mining are very big factors. When I spoke on the Address in Reply debate in 1939 I referred to an area of 500 miles square in Queensland which contained practically every known mineral. I said that nations would fight over a small portion of it. Irrigation is a very big factor too. In his annual report, Mr. F. B.

Haigh, Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply, refers to the vital importance of irrigation. You, Mr. Taylor, realise its importance and in the past you have agreed with the previous Government's irrigation policy. Speaking at the annual congress of the Queensland Co-operatives, Mr. Haigh said—

“Queensland eventually could support a greater population than any other Australian State. Queensland has the greater proportion of Australian water resources.”

That is an important factor.

Water is one of the most valuable commodities provided by Nature but we must have the intelligence to impound it for irrigation and the generation of electric power. Water is important for treating certain metals. Mr. Haigh further said—

“The State also could develop a larger area for irrigation than any other State. However, these resources were meagre by world standards and conservation and utilisation must be well planned and careful.”

We have heard criticism about the cost of the Burdekin dam. After years of investigation, highly qualified men selected the Burdekin River Valley as an area of great development for Queensland. The scheme was evolved for three purposes—flood control or flood mitigation, hydro-electricity and irrigation and water supply for domestic purposes. Unfortunately the Chifley Government were defeated. The Menzies Government would not carry out the promise made by the Chifley Government of financial assistance to carry out this project. The Burdekin River scheme is an economic possibility of tremendous importance to Queensland's development. It will harness one of the largest rivers in the Commonwealth. It will bring about effective flood control that will save life and prevent tremendous damage to property in flood time running into millions of pounds. It will supply water for hydro-electricity and irrigation purposes. There are not many rivers in Queensland or Australia that have such a potential water supply. The damming of the Burdekin would impound water at the 90-mile site 16 times greater than the quantity in Sydney Harbour. When the dam is built the water will back up 70 miles along the Suttor River and 50 miles along the Burdekin. As the height of the wall is increased the volume of water is increased too. The supply would be sufficient for the needs of Mackay and Townsville, and for the establishment of a hydro-electricity plant at Townsville. The scheme will eventually be one of the greatest in the Commonwealth. It has been said that the project is not economic. The same was said about the Snowy River Scheme, which now supplies portion of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. In Scotland, and particularly in Germany similar schemes have

operated for about 50 years. Another scheme that was overlooked was the one suggested by Dr. Bradfield. His plans of the Sydney Harbour Bridge were ridiculed, as were his plans of the Story Bridge. We should all be proud of this brilliant Queenslander.

He suggested diverting the water of northern coastal streams through the range near Hell's Gate to what is referred to as the dead heart of Australia. Millions of gallons of water rush into the sea every hour during the wet season. Those rivers could be dammed. Dr. Bradfield said it was economically possible and in time he will be proved right. There are many monuments to this great Queenslander.

I do not suggest that his scheme could be undertaken by the State Government. It should be built by the Commonwealth Government as a national project. It would be of benefit to States other than Queensland. The Federal Government would recoup that expenditure from increased taxation on the extra development that would follow.

I have consistently advocated the holding of wool sales in Townsville. At one time over 100,000 bales of wool were shipped through that port. From the days when Mr. W. H. Green represented the electorate, efforts have been made to have continual wool sales at Townsville. As wool sales are not held there many of the properties of the North now run cattle whereas formerly they ran sheep. The Australian climate suits merino sheep, and Australia produces the best wool in the world. It brings very high prices. The Northern and Central Graziers' Association and the Townsville Harbour Board made representations to the Commonwealth Government on the holding of wool sales at Townsville, but their request was rejected. The Townsville Harbour Board was prepared to build a shed to house 100,000 bales of wool. Townsville is the best port for the area and with a woolshed right at the pier a more favourable site could not be selected. Wool sales are held at small centres such as Albury.

Mr. Morris: The Government cannot decide that point.

Mr. KEYATTA: The Government may be able to influence those who make the decision. The previous Government supported the move.

Mr. Morris: We have done so.

Mr. KEYATTA: I am pleased to hear that. It would be another step towards a policy of decentralisation.

I made representations in 1947 on behalf of the Townsville City Council for the protection of the banks of the Ross River from erosion. It was said at that time that a survey would be required of the area on the northern bank. This is of great importance to Townsville because silting has reduced the margin of clearance from 20 ft. to 10 ft.

over the years. The swirl of flood waters not only causes erosion but if the bank should break there will be great loss of homes and properties and perhaps the loss of the experimental station. There could be a serious loss of life and property at Oonoonba. A great danger exists. The Townsville City Council has made a strong appeal to the Government and I again submit the matter to them for consideration.

It should be the policy of the Government to build swimming pools at new schools. Every child should be taught to swim. Many would volunteer to assist. I was Acting Chairman of a Swimming Week when the Y.W.C.A. played a very important part. Life is often lost through drowning. The Premier recently referred to the importance of swimming and I repeat that every new school should have a swimming pool and the scholars should be taught not only to swim but also life saving and resuscitation. Knowledge of the art makes a child self-reliant. If children were taught resuscitation their knowledge might be the means of saving lives. Recently we learned of a child of 14 saving two adults from drowning. I trust the Minister for Education will consider the matter.

I am pleased that he is considering the elimination of the Scholarship examination. A child could have an attack of nerves on the day of the examination, become frustrated, and not pass the examination. It is not fair. I think a certificate should be given based on the aggregate of his results during the school year. It is not always the lad who passes the Scholarship and attains other high qualifications who is the most successful in life. There are in this Parliament and in other walks of life many who never passed the Scholarship or got a Leaving Certificate but they have made good by the application of common sense. We have seen that demonstrated time and time again. I instance the case of one hon. member opposite who was at one time a cane-cutter. He now owns a tobacco farm. He is chairman of the Tobacco Board as well as being a member of Parliament. I knew another hon. member opposite in Gordonvale many years ago which was then known as Nelson. In addition to being a member of Parliament now, he owns two farms and is the chairman of directors of a sugar mill.

Mr. Watson: What is his name?

Mr. KEYATTA: Bobby Watson.

It is possible for a child to be driven into a state of despair at school. That could quite easily affect him in his future life. Teachers can play an important part in shaping the destinies of our children, and they should be paid highly for their work. They should be chosen not only on their qualifications but also their tolerance and temperament. Some children cannot grasp things as quickly as others; they are plodders. That type of child should not be belittled in school and given a fear complex. That is where the

teacher can play an important part. It is pleasing to know that teachers in State Schools supervise the children in the playgrounds. This ensures that bullies do not stand over the other children.

A pleasant school environment is very important, and I am happy to know that efforts are being made to make schools attractive to the children. If a child is happy at school he is sure to be successful in life. We must do everything to ensure that the initiative of the children is not crushed or their self-confidence destroyed.

I appreciate the efforts of officers of the Department of Agriculture and Stock to encourage the conservation of fodder. I suggest that they compile a list of natural grasses and lucernes that are suitable for this purpose. I strongly recommend the use of Townsville lucerne in fodder conservation. It is one of the finest lucernes in the world. It has been proved that its nutritional value is greatest in time of drought, when it is most needed. It was produced years ago at the Townsville Showground, which was then a quarantine station. I had a report that was published about it many years ago but unfortunately I cannot find it now. They crossed an imported fodder with couch grass and Townsville lucerne was the result. Graziers and farmers from all over the North, the West and even the South of Queensland swept up the grain, sand and all, and sieved it to get the small black seed.

An area has been planted at Wumalgi on the line near Rockhampton. Mr. Frank Frazer of Ingham was responsible for collecting the seed and sending it down. It is vital that fodder be conserved and stored at various strategic points in Queensland against times of drought. Records show that the cycle for minor droughts is between three and four years and for major droughts between seven and eight years.

The Department of Agriculture and Stock and the Department of Public Lands and Irrigation have issued pamphlets appealing to primary producers to conserve fodder. The cost would be very small compared with the millions of pounds it would save. The creation of a pool for the conservation of native grasses, and Townsville lucerne in particular, would greatly reduce the impact of droughts on the State's economy.

Mr. Waugh, who lives on a property between Roma and Charleville, stored lucerne in his silo 18 years ago and when the silo was opened the lucerne was just as good as it was when the silo was sealed down. It would be just as successful on a national basis. Why fodder conservation has been overlooked is beyond my comprehension. I have repeatedly seen articles published by the Department of Agriculture and Stock and the Department of Public Lands and Irrigation appealing for it to be done and I think the time has come for the Government to make conservation compulsory and levy graziers so much in the pound for the pool.

In Victoria vast areas are under lucerne. It is baled in the field, stacked and later stored away in silos for use in time of drought. In Queensland some graziers do it but it is not a general practice. Self-preservation is the first law of nature but graziers seem to ignore it and in time of drought they appeal to the Government for relief.

The time has come, too, for women to be given more responsibility in the affairs of State. The idea may be ridiculed by some hon. members, but who is more capable and who is more adapted to life generally than the mother? She brings children into the world and shapes their outlook. Some of the greatest scientists in the world were women. The outlook in the home is a very big factor, and women are entitled to their place in the world. Women, the makers of men, are the makers of the world. It is true that the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world and they should be allowed to play their part in life. I have met very able and capable women in many organisations. Years ago, on the Hospital Board, there was an ex-nurse who stood head and shoulders above any other member of the board in her outlook. She was a very fine person. That satisfied me that having a prejudice against women is a lot of nonsense. They are entitled to their rights. There should not be that prejudice and oppression against them; they do not get the support that they are entitled to. Remember, however, that they are a big force in this State. There are over 500,000 women and they are a vital force and should be encouraged to play a greater part in the affairs of State.

There is another matter that I wish to touch on. I remember reading years ago a report of the Japanese Fishing Department concerning tuna fishing. There is an abundance of tuna off our coast and the Japanese have been fishing for it for many years. Recently the Whittaker brothers, with their large boat, "Trader Horn," fished from Cairns to Thursday Island inside and outside the Barrier Reef, and a large photo in "Pix" showed the tuna they caught. Tuna is there in abundance, but it is specialised fishing. You have to study the migration of the fish, which I understand the C.S.I.R.O. is doing now.

An area was found in Torres Straits where apparently tuna breed, which makes the outlook very hopeful. Tuna is a very important commodity and one for which there is a world-wide and unlimited market. It is a commodity second to none. It is a remarkable fish because it is better when preserved than in the fresh state. It has a pinkish flesh and is like tender chicken, although, of course, we are not really educated to it.

Fishermen are quite prepared to launch out on this industry, but it is a big project and will require a subsidy from the State and Commonwealth. I do not care where a start

is made, but Townsville seems to be a central point and there are approximately 100 licensed fishing boats there.

I have written to Mr. Keith Bryson, the secretary of the Professional Fishermen's League, asking him to send me particulars regarding tuna, turtles and prawns. Professional fishermen have told me that there is a lot of tuna to be caught, but it is mainly outside the reef and beyond their resources, as large boats are needed. There is an unchanged demand for turtles, but I have since heard that turtles are more or less protected as such inroads were made into them and they were depleted to such an extent that it caused alarm in the department. Probably turtles could be cultivated. The prawn is a great seafood which travels from place to place. Since Mr. Eric Riding's visit to America there has been an unlimited prawn market in that country, particularly for banana, tiger and king prawns.

Mr. Watson: What do you think about that pineapple cannery?

Mr. KEYATTA: I have a summary of the report on the prospects of canning and processing tropical fruit by Harold J. Williams. Who is Harold J. Williams?

Mr. Watson: We ask you.

Mr. KEYATTA: He was manager of the Leeton Irrigation Scheme. He is an outstanding authority; a man of world-wide reputation. He selected Townsville as No. 1 priority, Cairns as No. 8.

Mr. Dewar: What do you think of these canned mangoes?

Mr. KEYATTA: Fifty years ago they were canning and bottling mangoes. People had a prejudice against them. They said they were not the same if they were preserved, they carried a sort of poison. The canning of tropical fruits can mean much to Queensland's economy. There is an unlimited, unassailable market. The summary of the report states—

"Mr. Williams is of the opinion that it should be possible progressively to establish medium-sized canneries in other parts of the State. He has listed in order of preference on economic grounds the following districts as offering 'potential' sites for such medium cannery establishments, the priority being determined by the area offering the soundest combination of field supply areas and cannery establishments:—Townsville, Bundaberg, Ayr, Mackay, Bowen, Gympie, Rockhampton, Cairns, Innisfail, Maryborough."

Townsville is the main centre of a huge area. At one time the Herbert River district was the largest citrus fruit-growing area in the Commonwealth. The Burdekin River district was also noted for fruit-growing. The best rough-leaved pineapple in the world is grown on Magnetic Island. The smooth-leaved pineapple grown at Woodstock is the best

on the market. The papaws grown in the South are much inferior to the northern papaws. The former taste like a piece of cardboard but the northern papaw is tasty and juicy. North Queensland should be given a marketing quota for its tropical products and there should be a limit on the area under production in the South. The bananas grown in the South are very inferior to those grown in the North.

Mr. Dewar: There are some good ones in my electorate.

Mr. KEYATTA: The soil has to be specially prepared to make them develop here. A market should be provided for the products of the fruit farmers in the North. When they lost the pineapple market they went in for potatoes. I quote further from Mr. Williams's report—

"I make the general statement now, that under the regulated expansion which I visualise as being possible during the next ten years you may find it economically possible and, indeed, very desirable to create five or six cannery plants, of the dimensions shown in this statement, and in the case of Townsville, Bundaberg and Ayr provision should be made for early expansion in the size of the buildings, boiler house and processing plant, and temporary forms of walls kept in mind when building any canneries at these locations."

"I especially draw your attention to the fact that in the vicinity of Townsville there are two meatworks, while at Ayr there is a very efficient sugar mill operated by the Kalamia mill interests."

It can be converted into a fruit and vegetable processing and canning factory. We have three units already. Swifts works were at one time prepared to process tropical fruits and vegetable by-products, but lack of markets prevented this. Since then the population has grown to two and a-half times the number, thus providing a market for the output of canneries. Townsville's geographical situation gives it priority for the establishment of a fruit cannery. A cannery could be built if the project was subsidised by the Commonwealth and State Governments.

There is an unlimited demand in Canada for pineapple juice marketed by the C.O.D. The previous Government played an important part in that venture.

Mr. Williams in his report deals with—

- (a) Canned pineapple, including pineapple juice;
- (b) Tropical fruit salad;
- (c) Tropical fruit products, such as canned mangoes, canned papaws;
- (d) Chutneys and sauces manufactured from tropical fruits;
- (e) Canned citrus products, including citrus juice, canned mandarins, marmalades, &c.

(f) Canned tomato products, including juice, sauces, &c.

(g) Canned berry fruits, including strawberries, cape gooseberries.

He also touches on the growing and canning of citrus fruits and vegetables including carrots.

At the present time our products are sent south for canning and processing.

The high rainfall, climatic conditions and the soil of the area tend to the production of fruit of high quality. Granadilla and soursop of high quality are also produced in abundance. The juice of the soursop is acid in flavour and of great benefit to sick persons.

This further strong point was made by Mr. Williams—

"There are sound reasons for saying that the whole market for canned pineapple products could absorb about 1,100,000 cases of fresh pineapples, and export markets in Britain and Canada another 600,000 cases of fresh pineapples."

There is unlimited land in North Queensland for the growing of tropical fruits. Approximately 20,000 cases of pineapples are grown each year on Magnetic Island. Swenson Bros., who have now sold their farm, produced 5,000 cases a year.

(Time expired.)

Mr. TOOTH (Kelvin Grove) (5.38 p.m.): I join other hon. members in congratulating the Treasurer on his appointment and on the interesting and informative way in which he presented the Budget and ancillary papers.

I express my personal sympathy and I am sure the sympathy of every hon. member with the Treasurer in the magnitude of the task he has undertaken and the difficulties he has inherited. The severe drought which is affecting the whole community must inevitably make the problems of Government much more difficult. It is unfortunate that the Treasurer and other members of Cabinet should have this added difficulty in the early stages of their administration. I should like to return at a later stage to the Budget, as I now want to pick up the threads of something I was saying in another debate, concerning the Literature Board of Review. What I said on that occasion was reported in the Press in the way in which it usually reports these things owing to the shortage of space and the need to report other matters of interest. The Press might have given the impression that my views about the Board were unrelieved criticism—much the same as that expressed by the hon. member for Kurilpa. I do not agree entirely with what he said. That statement might startle some members of the Opposition, because they might think that we take our orders from some remote source, some backroom office, some big boss who sits and dictates what we shall and shall not do or say. There could be nothing further from the truth. The habit is growing of

judging other people by what we do ourselves. Our Party is one of freedom of thought, of speech, of expression and the right to disagree amongst ourselves. I can assure hon. members opposite of that and I can assure them also that our disagreements are not likely to run deep. There will be no deep schisms or cross-benchers amongst us.

Mr. Graham: Did you ever hear about Artie Fadden stabbing Menzies in the back?

Mr. TOOTH: The Opposition are getting back to the legendary stages; let us come to the things of the moment. I want to impress upon hon. members opposite that we as a Party have freedom of thought, of speech, and the freedom to express ourselves openly and not merely in the party room. This is not granted to us as a privilege, but is a right we will zealously safeguard. I have made that preamble because my views on the Literature Board of Review are different from those of my friend the hon. member for Kurilpa.

Mr. Thackeray: Not really.

Mr. TOOTH: Yes, really. The point at which I stopped, when talking of this matter previously, was when I was showing that the Literature Board of Review was ineffective because magazines and undesirable literature, cheap second-class glossies in unlimited quantities, got onto the bookstalls and were there for weeks and months before they came to the notice of the Board. I quoted the extraordinary situation of one publication which was banned after the wholesaler had called in the unsolds. I explain to the Chamber for the benefit of those not acquainted with the trade that these things are sent out to newsagents for sale or return and they stay out for two or three months and at the end of that time those not sold are recalled by the wholesale agents and destroyed, or something else is done with them. The retailers get credit for the returns. On the same notice of recall of certain literature there was the notice that the particular item was banned. That is a very vivid illustration of the ineffectiveness of the Literature Board of Review.

Expiry of my time prevented me on the previous occasion from saying what I thought should be done to help the Board. As far as it goes, the work of the Board is quite satisfactory and I have nothing but commendation for it. To that extent I disagree with the hon. member for Kurilpa. I think he misunderstood a section of the Board's report. He complained about that part of the report in which the Board said that its activities were guided by the principles that it thought a wise and prudent parent would apply in similar circumstances. I think the hon. member for Kurilpa misconstrued that statement to mean that the Board was adopting a paternal attitude towards the public at large. Although the Board has blanket powers its purpose obviously is to

protect the young and the adolescent. I am sure that it was of the young and the adolescent that the Board was thinking when it wrote that paragraph of its report. I have no doubt that the members of the Board have no desire to censor in any way the reading of any hon. member or of any other adult person who can look after himself and accept responsibility for his own reading and the effect that it may have upon him. Surely the objective of the Board is to protect people who, before they have had a chance to develop certain standards, are likely to be subjected to the influence of undesirable literature.

We must find some way of reinforcing the activities of the Board so that the time lapse between the distribution and the discovery of undesirable literature can be bridged.

Mr. Graham: Are you in favour of the Board's continuing its activities?

Mr. TOOTH: I am in favour of the Board's activities generally, although there are ways in which they can be altered or improved. I certainly do not think, as some hon. members seem to think, that the Board is a dead loss.

Mr. Thackeray: Have you an interest in a newsagency?

Mr. TOOTH: I have not. For the information of the hon. member, a brother of mine owns a newsagency and therefore I know something about the subject. If anything objectionable is on display the police have authority—indeed, it is their duty—to have it removed and to take court action against the offender.

Mr. Walsh: That has never been very effective.

Mr. TOOTH: It may not have been, but if the hon. member follows my argument he will see what I am coming to.

I do not think that the retailer is to blame. As I explained on an earlier occasion, he is bound by the contract that he enters into. Before he can get a newsagency with the right to handle these products, he must sign a contract. He cannot refuse to accept and sell whatever is sent to him. He is the victim of circumstances.

I suggest that the police should pursue the ordinary method of dealing with obscene or undesirable literature that comes under the ban of the law. However, the fine imposed upon the retailer should be purely nominal. A conviction must be recorded against him, but the fine should be purely nominal. Some of my legal friends could tell me whether what I am about to suggest is possible in law.

Mr. Walsh: They would not be much help to you, either of them.

Mr. Coburn: Three of them.

Mr. TOOTH: I am not prepared to argue the issue with the hon. gentlemen but I think they could be very helpful.

However, upon the conviction of a retailer and the imposition of a nominal penalty, I suggest that automatically the wholesaler who supplied the stuff should be subjected to heavy penalties. That would stop the trouble at its source. Every time a retailer was convicted, the wholesaler would know he was in for something really punitive, and before very long, instead of pushing out the stuff in a huge avalanche week by week and month by month, and saying to the retailer, "You put that up and sell it.", he would begin to look at it and ask himself, "Is this going to be expensive? Is this item dangerous?" It would not be long before the problem would be solved at its source. Of course, the ideal is to get at the publishers but in most cases we have no jurisdiction over them.

Mr. Ramsden: Is the wholesaler tied up with the publisher in the same way as the retailer is tied up with the wholesaler?

Mr. TOOTH: I do not know, but, without mentioning any names, I think it would not be so much that the wholesaler is tied up with the publisher as that the publisher is tied up with the wholesaler. The wholesaler is the man to get at in the problem, and it is a very real problem.

Mr. Davies: Don't you think the pressure tactics of the wholesaler in compelling the retailer to sell it should be condemned?

Mr. TOOTH: That is my story. That is why I say the retailer is the victim of circumstance. The wholesaler is the man to whom we should devote our attention. He cannot properly be reached through the retailer.

Mr. Davies: They are pretty strong pressure tactics.

Mr. TOOTH: That is right. The issue is important because most of this material is being sold to young people, whose literary tastes at any rate are in my opinion being degraded thereby.

Mr. Lloyd: Most of it would be imported publications?

Mr. TOOTH: No, most of it is published in the South.

Mr. Jesson: Most of it is printed in Australia.

Mr. TOOTH: Printed under licence—copies of stuff printed in America or Great Britain but printed under licence in the South. Take the series produced by a man called Carter Brown—lurid stuff. I understand that its contents are now somewhat less salacious than they were three or four years ago. I am informed that about 10,000 copies of every issue with the name of Carter Brown on it are sold in Queensland and about three or four of them come out each month. Where are they going? I do not think hon. members

are buying them. They are junk—trashy stuff. I do not think the average adult buys them. They are definitely bad for anyone who reads them for any length of time. They are degrading of literary taste and undesirably stimulating in other directions.

There is another matter with which I also dealt on a former occasion, and that is the tremendous shortage of scientific and technological man-power in Australia. I felt on the first occasion on which I had the honour to address the Chamber that that should be a major point in the remarks that I submitted for the attention of hon. members. I spent a considerable amount of time in getting material together but I felt that what I had to say made little or no impression on hon. members and that possibly it was a wasted effort. I do feel, nevertheless, that this is a thing to which we must return and return continually.

Of course, it is easy to talk about it now because since then the satellite has gone up and attention generally has returned to this particular problem. I said on the first occasion that it was no new thing. I was aware that I was merely adding one more voice to the many already raised on this particular problem. However, the plain truth of the matter is that, although there has been a complete chorus of warnings on this matter, the powers that be and the community at large are still—or were up to the time that the Russian satellite appeared—treating the matter as if it were of no importance whatever.

It is rather interesting that prior to the launching of the satellite Professor Messel, head of the School of Physics of the University of Sydney, issued a paper which I think all hon. members have received. It would be interesting to know how many hon. members have read it and read it with care. With the avalanche of literature which pours onto our desks throughout the week, I know that it is practically impossible to make a detailed perusal of everything sent to us, but this one is, in my opinion, of supreme importance and I beg any hon. member who has not yet read it to peruse it with the utmost care.

Mr. Jesson: He gave a lecture over the air about a week ago.

Mr. TOOTH: He did. There has been a sudden awareness, since the launching of the satellite, of the situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. Jesson: The A.W.U. and Mr. Bukowski got Professor Messel to come here and lecture the people of Queensland.

Mr. TOOTH: Yes.

Mr. Jesson: They did not get any praise for that.

Mr. TOOTH: How much interest was taken?

Mr. Jesson: Very little.

Mr. TOOTH: I think that the average scientist is accustomed to receiving little or no praise.

Mr. Lloyd: He has received recognition from the Australian Labour Party for the work that he is doing.

Mr. TOOTH: I compliment the Labour Party on that. I brought this sheet into the Chamber and, with the permission of the Chamber, I propose to read from it. I know that that is regarded as an easy way to avoid the responsibilities of debate, but that is not my object. I want some record of what the professor said to go into "Hansard."

I do not propose to read at any great length but there are one or two things that Professor Messel says in his paper that I would like to put permanently on record. He says—

"From an international point of view it is now definitely known that Russia is turning out more scientists and technologists than the remainder of major powers in the free world put together. It is also known that these men are trained and have attained a standard equal to and in some cases—especially engineering—even higher than ours. In 1954 Russia turned out 72,000 scientists and technologists—the major powers of the free world turned out about 71,000. Is it surprising in view of this that Russia is leading the free world in many and an increasing number of technological fields such as aircraft and missiles, etc.? No, it certainly is not, and unless we wake up quickly and match their technological progress we cannot hope to remain free for long."

"America, England and Continental Europe are making a tremendous effort to meet the threat which is obvious from these figures."

He further says—

"Hundreds of millions of pounds are being spent during the next few years in an endeavour to rectify what, at best, is a serious and dangerous situation for the free world. Now, what about Australia? Are we pulling our weight as a member of the more advanced nations of the free world?"

He shows that Australia on a per-capita basis is turning out only half the number of scientists and technologists as Britain, only one-third the number of America and one-quarter of the number of the Soviet Union. These comparisons are made on a per-capita basis; in actual numbers the figure in Australia is indeed very small.

Later he says—

"There is a tremendous shortage of science and mathematics teachers in our schools."

Here he comes to one of the most important points. We cannot hope to overcome the lag until the problem is overcome in secondary schools and universities. He says—

"There is a tremendous shortage of science and mathematics teachers in our schools, yet little is being done to alleviate the situation—to encourage decline in the teaching of science and mathematics teachers. Most of our ablest young schoolmasters are non-scientists and they inevitably persuade hundreds of their pupils to follow in their footsteps, although many of these men might have done well in science had they gone into it."

"At present there are, for instance, about 745 science teachers in the departmental schools of New South Wales, of these only about one-half have a science degree. The Office of Education has estimated that our Australian schools will require a yearly intake of about 450 additional mathematics and science teachers during the next few years—yet in 1956 there was a total output for all purposes in Australia of only about 350 science graduates."

I ask hon. members to note that that number is the total output for all purposes, not merely for teaching. He continues—

"A particularly serious problem exists in regard to the teaching of science in girls' schools. In Russia, for instance, approximately half of the students enrolled in science and technological courses are women. In Australia, it is a rarity to see more than a few. The main reason for this can probably be traced back to the fact that science is simply not being taught in the girls' schools and for the good reason that there are few or no science mistresses to teach it! Furthermore, we have practically no women coming forward for science mistress training."

He deals with salaries and says—

"In a recent survey carried out by Melbourne University Appointments Board the professional incomes of various groups of individuals were analysed. From this survey the already known fact emerged that the three highest paid professions in Victoria were, Medicine, Dentistry, and Law and amongst the lowest ones were Engineering, Chemistry, Agricultural Science and Physics."

"Again who produces what? What are our sense of values? The above order should be completely reversed. We shall continue having a deplorably small number of scientists and technologists until such time as they are. Note that I am not advocating the lowering of the salaries of Medicine, Dentistry and Law—nothing of the sort. These people are getting the salaries they deserve; however, I am saying that the scientific and technological disciplines should be getting even more than they."

This is a very important section—

“It is now well known that in Russia there has been no compulsion put on students to enter this or that discipline. However, the financial and other rewards for entering into science or technology—the more productive disciplines—are so extremely high that students have come forward in enormous numbers. I am sure that the same explanation applies to the large number of students entering medicine and pharmacy in Australia, and that if our scientists and technologists and science teachers were properly encouraged and rewarded we will have gone a long way towards the solution of our difficulties and that we would have fewer shortages in these disciplines. The rewards in Russia are already exceedingly high; for instance, the heads of the leading scientific and technological institutes are getting salaries in the range of £15,000 per annum, plus many other services. The scientists and engineers form the bulk of the aristocracy in that country. In America the salaries are now likewise attaining the level they should.”

Then he makes a startling comparison between the salary paid to the average good scientist compared with the average unskilled worker.

In Australia the average good scientist gets twice the amount paid to the average unskilled worker. In America he gets five times as much, in England seven times as much and in Russia 25 times as much.

That does not give any indication of what the average unskilled worker gets in Russia, but that is the ratio. In Russia the scientist gets 25 times what the unskilled worker gets. Those are a few quotations from that most important paper which I sincerely commend to the attention of hon. members. I think it deals with a matter of supreme importance. In considering these problems and scientific dangers, we must face up to the necessity of loading the salaries of science graduate teachers as against those of other teachers irrespective of the difficulties that may be inherent in such a proposal. We must get teachers and in order to get them we must make it worth their while.

When I commenced my speech I said I was very happy to join with other hon. members in commending the Treasurer on the work he is doing. I was particularly happy to hear the encomiums passed on the Treasurer by members of the Opposition. I do trust that they did not sound too hollow in the Treasurer's ears. I repeat that, because for a long time the standard propaganda slogan, the stock in trade of Labour propaganda was the story that the leaders of the Country-Liberal Party in Queensland were incompetent, were incapable of assuming office, were lacking in experience, were divided, were disunited, were a rabble unable to co-operate. Time and time again during the last 20 years we have been told from the platform and on the hustings that the public could not afford

to trust the Country-Liberal Party with the reins of office. Their inability to do the job was so obvious that no sane and sensible group of electors would ever dream of returning them to office. The compliments paid to the Treasurer show a change of heart.

Mr. Power: Members of the previous Government always gave him full marks for ability.

Mr. TOOTH: The Treasurer is a member of the team, and the team is an excellent one. The Treasurer would not want to arrogate to himself any credit for what the Government as a whole do. This commendation of the Treasurer shows that even members of the Opposition, except for the hon. member for Baroona, are being converted and that their attitude is in conformity with the general public attitude towards the Government.

I am sure the Treasurer would be the last to claim all the credit for this transformation. The public atmosphere surrounding the Government and their activities is excellent and a tribute to the Ministry for the policy they have pursued, and the vigour, the energy, the drive and determination they have displayed, which are unprecedented in recent times. By their actions they have been able to give the lie direct to the propaganda of the last quarter of a century on the inability of members of the Country and Liberal Parties to accept the responsibility of government, and to carry out the work and duties of government.

This balance of enthusiasm and caution—there are both in the Government—and indeed, of adventure and realism, will justify the overwhelming vote of confidence that the Government secured at the general election, and which was subsequently confirmed in the recent Gregory by-election.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. TOOTH: Attempts made from time to time by spokesmen of the official Opposition to decry the results of both the general election and the recent by-election leave most thinking people cold. The fact is that an overwhelming majority of the people demanded a change of Government and in consequence the Country-Liberal Government came into power.

I agree that the obvious and outstanding ability of the Treasurer was further justification for the faith expressed by electors in the Country and Liberal Parties. With his colleagues in the Cabinet he will continue to justify the faith placed in the Government.

Mr. Mann: There are a lot of green bananas over there.

Mr. TOOTH: I cannot understand the relevance of the interjection, so I shall proceed.

I shall deal with the reiteration by Opposition members of the story that the Government are a minority Government, that they are governing under false pretences, as it were.

I ask a fair question, "Was the Q.L.P. vote in the last election a vote against us?" Silence!

Mr. Power: It certainly was not a vote for you. That is a most stupid question.

Opposition interjections.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. TOOTH: I ask another question, "Did this new party come into being as a protest against the Country or Liberal Party?"

An A.L.P. Member: No.

Mr. Wood: They are your meal ticket.

Mr. Roberts: I think they are your meal ticket.

Mr. TOOTH: I put a third question, "Would you say that the appearance of the Queensland Labour Party represents a move of a considerable group of political thought to the right or to the left?"

Mr. Wood: Right.

Mr. TOOTH: There was a move of over 20 per cent. It is a movement from bondage to freedom. The people have seen the light on the hill and it is a blood red light. There was a movement of political thought in Queensland and over 20 per cent. left traditional allegiance on a principle. They have left their traditional allegiance because they could no longer accept membership of a party that had departed from the standards laid down by Dave Bowman, Andrew Fisher, Jim Page, and John Story, and the rest of them. At present they are in the political wilderness and are looking for a home. I am sure of that. There is a home for them with us.

Mr. Power: With you? Never in your life! (Laughter.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask hon. members to allow the hon. member for Kelvin Grove to proceed with his speech.

Mr. TOOTH: The hon. member for Baroona apparently misunderstands me. I am speaking of the great mass of electors outside this Chamber who supported the Q.L.P. in the recent election. I say sincerely they are in the political wilderness because they are supporting a party which ultimately must wither away. I do not often agree with the A.L.P. nor quote their speeches and slogans, but I do agree with them on this, that 20 per cent. are supporting a political party which must ultimately wither away. These champions of freedom of thought and expression are electors who are opposed to a system which is growing up

amongst us whereby a number of people come into this Chamber pledged to behave as so many marionettes. I say that they will ultimately come to us because we are the democratic party in the community in this generation. Now let me talk about the A.L.P.

The whole community knows that the present situation resulted from a revolt against the leftward drift in the A.L.P. Do hon. members deny that?

Mr. Mann: Yes.

Mr. TOOTH: What a weak and uncertain denial! I have said that it resulted from a leftward drift, but I think "drift" is not an apt description. It was in reality a surge to the left, a determined and deliberate movement and was the result of an alliance with the Communist Party. "Alliance" is a misnomer. "Bondage" is the true description. The A.L.P. shows great anxiety to dissociate itself from the Communist Party, from the Leftist section of political thought, but unfortunately it is in such complete bondage that it cannot. As a matter of fact, on Friday last the Leader of the Opposition presented himself at the Trades Hall.

Mr. Wood: That is right.

Mr. TOOTH: It is right. The A.L.P. shows great anxiety to dissociate itself from the Communist Party, but actions speak louder than words. The events of the last election proclaim the real truth.

These are the reasons on which I base my statement: First of all, unstinted support was given to the A.L.P. by the Communists in the last election.

Mr. Graham: You would not expect them to support you, would you?

Mr. TOOTH: Certainly not. I would expect them to support the hon. member's party.

The second reason is the complete absence from the election of Communist candidates. That was very unusual. It had not occurred in Queensland's political history for at least 10 years. My third is the impassioned pleas by Comrades Dawson and Hanson over Station 4KQ for the people to support the A.L.P. in the election.

Can these things be denied? Have they no significance? Only one logical interpretation can be placed upon those events. I know that on the hustings A.L.P. members said they did not desire Communist support. They said, "We cannot help it if these fellows appear to support us." But the plain fact is that the Communists attached themselves to and supported the Australian Labour Party. Therefore, the excuse offered by A.L.P. members is of no avail. If they accept the favour and comfort of the Communists, they must in some way be serving the Communist Party's purpose. The success of the A.L.P. must in some way be part of

the Communist Party's plan. That is obvious to any student of politics. Nobody queries it, except of course members of the A.L.P.

For what purpose does the Communist Party plan to use the A.L.P.? I do not think it is interested in the processes of Parliamentary democracy. It plans to use the A.L.P. to re-establish its influence in the trade unions, which are the key to their plans. They are not interested in Parliamentary institutions; in fact, they have a contempt for them. Nowhere have they gained power by a majority vote. They have always seized and held power by force. Those are hard words and I feel it in my heart to be sorry for hon. members opposite. They are the victims of the machine to which they have attached themselves for so long.

This year marks the fortieth anniversary of the birth of the most diabolical tyranny of all times, modern or ancient. Communists everywhere have seized power by stealth or force and held it by force. Today is an anniversary, too. Twelve months ago the gallant people of Budapest rose against oppression and exposed the whole sorry sham of the People's Democracies. One of the greatest weapons the Communists have used over the last 40 years is the prostitution of the plain meaning of common words. They use a word that has a general acceptation but apply it in a completely different sense from that in which it was ever used before. "Democracy" is one of the words they have so misused. This day 12 months ago revealed to a stunned world the true face of this most monstrous tyranny and it is a day on which every true democrat should stand with head bowed in reverence for the courage and unexampled grit shown by the people of Budapest.

Mr. Mann: What are you talking about?

Mr. TOOTH: Even the hon. member should be quiet on this issue. We should stand with our heads bowed in shame because we in the democratic world could not help the oppressed. We should bow our heads in humiliation because there are people in this country who support the Communists in this very day and generation. It is fitting, too, that today we consider the danger in which we ourselves stand. We cannot be oblivious of the fact that Communism is again on the march in the great industrial unions of Australia and that the Communists have as their immediate objective the elections in the great Federal unions next year.

Opposition Members: What are you going to do about it?

Mr. Houston: Give us something constructive.

Mr. TOOTH: We shall see what hon. members opposite do about it.

It is in the big industrial unions that the greatest danger lies because that is where the Communists try to lay the foundation of the structure of tyranny and oppression

that they propose to erect. That is where they try to forge the weapons to destroy parliamentary democracy. The return of the Communists to places of power and influence in unions began immediately Dr. Evatt made his historic decision to throw in his lot with the Left. The movement continued until in recent weeks the very citadel of trade unionism, the A.C.T.U., fell under the Left-wing influence. That cannot be denied. The very citadel of trade unionism in Australia today bears a very different complexion from what it did three months ago.

Mr. Graham: The Liberal-Country Party would destroy the trade union movement tomorrow.

Mr. TOOTH: I will come to that. The hon. member for Mackay is repeating something that apparently was said on Friday last. It appears that the Trades and Labour Congress at the Trades Hall met over the week-end, or, at least on Friday.

Mr. Jesson: There again you are all wrong.

Mr. TOOTH: A day or two does not matter. The fact is that the trade union congress met during the week and the Leader of the Opposition waited upon them. He was received in audience by them. According to the Press—and I would be happy if the hon. member would correct the Press if they are wrong—the Leader of the Opposition was introduced by the President, Mr. J. Egerton, the gentleman who said on a famous occasion, "The time for logic is past." Mr. Egerton said, "This is an historical occasion for the trade unions of Queensland, because it is the first time for many years that a State Labour leader has visited us. It is also historical because it is the first time for many years that we have had a real Labour leader." I do not want to be unfair about anything but that is the summing up of the Leader of the Opposition by Mr. Egerton, and he should know. The report states that in his reply the Leader of the Opposition said that his acceptance of the invitation to address the congress was a demonstration of his unshakeable belief that the trade union movement was the core of the Australian Labour Party. What trade union was it that the hon. member was addressing? Because the trade unions of this country today are divided into a number of groups. I am interested to know which group it was. Was it the group of the Right, the group in the middle of the road, or the group to the Left? As I said before, by your company you have to be judged. I really resented personally some of the things that the hon. gentleman was alleged to have said. According to the "Telegraph" report he said that he was convinced that the Government and the Q.L.P.—apparently we are in cahoots somehow—were determined to introduce court-controlled ballots and that this was "just a step to try to destroy the trade

union movement." According to "The Courier-Mail" he said, "Court-controlled ballots were designed to destroy the trade union movement." As a trade unionist of 40 years' standing—

Opposition Members: Who?

Mr. TOOTH: Me. I am a trade unionist of 40 years' standing. There are other trade unionists on this side of the Chamber, we are not all beef barons, we are not all shell-backed Tories, in fact very few of us are. Let me say that as a party we propose to do what is essential in this modern age and generation for the industrial and economic organisation of our country. To say that we propose to destroy trade-unionism is just so much ballyhoo.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am sure hon. members wish to hear the speech by the hon. member for Kelvin Grove. I am sure he will listen to one interjection at a time as long as it is relevant. I ask hon. members not to turn interjections into just plain interruptions.

Mr. TOOTH: In conclusion, let me say that there is no danger of this Government's destroying the trade unions. What we propose to do, if it is humanly possible, is to return to the rank and file of the trade unions their control over their own affairs. That is the purpose of our policy.

Mr. HEWITT (Mackenzie) (7.50 p.m.): I offer my congratulations to the Treasurer on his presentation of the Budget. I fully realise his difficulties. The time in which he had to prepare the Budget was very limited. In future years the State will benefit greatly from the Government's activities. I am sure that the Cabinet and all Government back-benchers are wholeheartedly behind the Treasurer, and will do their utmost to assist in the progress of Queensland. My main purpose in rising was to reply to some of the criticism levelled at the Government, particularly by the hon. member for Port Curtis on drought relief.

Mr. Lloyd: Initiated by the hon. member for Port Curtis.

Mr. HEWITT: Initiated, if the hon. member likes it that way. Looking back over the previous Government's record we find they did very little for the people of Queensland by way of drought relief. A drought occurred in 1951 and in some areas it did not break until 18 March, 1952. The Labour Government gave an amount of £227,216. This Government have already assured the farmers that they will make available to them £235,000, and they have already made approaches to the Commonwealth Government to supplement that amount. If aid is not forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government this Government will provide more money and the total will be far in excess of the amount paid out by the Labour Government in 1951-1952.

Mr. Hanlon: There has been an inflationary trend since then.

Mr. HEWITT: If the hon. member cares to look up the records he will find that prices were higher than they are today. I recall a sale at Eidsvold where 200 bullocks were sold for an average of £51 2s. a head. No cattle are selling in that area for that price today. Labour members who are so critical of this Government are well off the beam. Labour's policy is destructive of the man on the land, and the worker, particularly the dairy farmer who enjoys no 40-hour week. Hon. members opposite have talked much about price control. In August, 1951, lucerne chaff was £46 a ton and by the end of December it had reached £75 a ton. Dairy farmers could not afford to buy lucerne chaff at that price. Hon. members who tell the people what they did for them in the past are merely engaging in dishonest propaganda. I have travelled over a greater portion of Queensland during recent weeks than most members and visited the drought-stricken areas. Unless rain falls within the next two or three months the State will be in a very serious position. It is not as serious as it was at the end of the 1951-1952 drought but if it continues and lasts as long as that drought the position will be far worse. Very few Opposition members ever go outside Brisbane. They have no idea of the conditions. Some were out in the Gregory electorate recently, and that will broaden their outlook.

Mr. Wood: You won it.

Mr. HEWITT: Our very good candidate won it, and no member of the Government wishes to take any credit from him. He did a good job and won the seat despite the forces of the A.L.P. and Q.L.P.

Criticism of the Government by Opposition members has not been constructive. It has been made for political purposes only.

This afternoon one of the official Opposition spoke of the previous Government's work over the years on irrigation. I have here a report on the Dawson Valley scheme, which was inaugurated in 1923. The report was printed in 1926 and stated that there would be 7,000 farms in the area and 100,000 acres of irrigation. Today, some 30 years later, there are approximately 40 farms in the area, and, as my friend, the hon. member for Chermiside, has said, those people are "settled." It is now up to my Government to give these people something definite regarding the future of this scheme.

Mr. Hiley: They published a school reader which described the Nathan Gorge Dam as the greatest irrigation scheme in Queensland.

Mr. HEWITT: With glorious illustrations and photographs of farms that were going to exist in that area. Since then the scheme has caused financial embarrassment to many farmers.

Much has been said in the Chamber about the land policy of the previous Government. The present Government do not deserve the criticism hurled at them, in view of the previous Government's neglect of the small man, particularly over recent years. There are many instances of exploitation of the workers by the previous Government. I am proud and honoured to be associated with the small and middle men. When we consider some of the advantages given to certain lessees by the Labour Government, we realise just how insincere they were in their leasehold policy.

Mr. Lloyd: Would you think of converting leasehold to freehold, particularly in the pastoral industry?

Mr. HEWITT: I am in accord with what has been done to date on conversion to freehold.

Mr. Lloyd: What about the pastoral leases?

Mr. HEWITT: I reserve my opinion.

Mr. Lloyd: Let us have your opinion.

Mr. HEWITT: At the right and proper time I shall express my opinion. If the Government adopted the attitude of the Labour Government over the years, it would not matter whether the land was converted to freehold or not, because the previous Government encouraged monopolies. I shall give one instance. A certain person who was once a member of the Country Party was given great advantages by Labour Governments over the years. The records reveal that he has interests in the Grassdale, Burke, Cunnamulla and Jimbour districts. He is also interested in Wentworth which got a new lease. Wentworth comprises Wuthung pastoral lease of 256 square miles. A new lease was granted as from 1 October, 1953. The holding was assessed on a cattle basis at an estimated 18 head per square mile or a total of 4,608 cattle as it was not then suitable for sheep. Netting and other conditions were imposed in the new lease ensuring the development of 120 square miles for sheep at heavy cost. This should have resulted in the establishment of four sheep living areas. That is one property. Furthermore, the lessees of Wuthung also hold Logan Downs, a holding of 57 square miles. The term of the lease of this holding commenced on 1 January, 1949, and it was acquired by the present lessees by transfer dated 25 July, 1949. They also hold Wyena pastoral development holding of 152 square miles. An application for a new lease of the whole area of this holding was refused in 1955. Furthermore, he or members of his family have interests in Russell Park, comprising freehold lands. I have no knowledge of the owners in the absence of a search in the Real Property Office. Russell Park is also thought to include Portion 4, Parish of Fairbairn, being expired grazing homestead No. 1877, Clermont district. It was held in a

different name. Logan Downs Pty. Ltd. also hold Cherwell pastoral holding, an area of 238 square miles. The term of the new lease which was granted in 1953 commenced on 1 July, 1953. This holding comprises part of former Logan Downs East expired holding and the whole of Cherwell and Yura surrendered holdings. That was the treatment that the former Government gave to this gentleman. Hon. members opposite who interject were a party to it, and if the then Government had been men of knowledge they would have known these things were going on.

Mr. Davies: What year was that?

Mr. HEWITT: In 1953. He got two new leases.

Mr. Lloyd: What is the date of the original one?

Mr. HEWITT: I have given the dates. Furthermore, let me say that a company adjoining this man applied for a new lease in 1953. There were four in the company. It was for a lease over country that would carry approximately 3,700 head of cattle, but the application for the new lease was turned down. I say that the then Minister for Lands and the Chairman of the Land Administration Board are equally responsible for these inconsistencies and no doubt they need exposing to the people of Queensland. This company was refused a full new lease but it was given one over country carrying 2,400 head of cattle, and that is in complete contrast with the treatment given to the lessees of Logan Downs, etc.

Mr. Power: It was suitable for closer settlement.

Mr. HEWITT: What about the other property? Was it not just as suitable for closer settlement? These applications must have gone before the Cabinet. We can all see what was going on in the Labour Party, which is so concerned about what we are going to do.

Mr. Jesson interjected.

Mr. HEWITT: The hon. member for Hinchinbrook is here on a minority vote.

Mr. Jesson: What about yourself?

Mr. HEWITT: I am not here on a minority vote. As a matter of fact, I increased my previous majority tenfold. If the hon. member was as desirous as I am of doing a good job for Queensland, he would be a much better member of Parliament than he is.

Under Labour's land policy, many people were penalised to the advantage of others. However, the present Minister for Public Lands will give justice to all. I can assure hon. members that if the Government do anything with which I disagree, I shall not hesitate to voice my disapproval. I am big enough to say what I believe.

Mr. Jesson: You are not saying it, you are reading it.

Mr. HEWITT: I have never read a speech in the Chamber. The hon. member for Hinchinbrook gets up for a few minutes and has to sit down again because he cannot read.

As I say, over the years many people have been penalised by Labour's land policy. Look at what happened on the Dawson River because of the delay in completing the Nathan Gorge scheme. Many of the Dawson settlers have been there for about 20 years on occupation licences. Surely it is not right to have people on the land with such an insecure tenure? The land has not been developed properly because the occupiers can be dispossessed on three months' notice. No-one can be expected to develop his country to its full carrying capacity with such an insecure form of tenure.

Mr. Hiley: That might explain why the Dawson has the worst burr infection in the State.

Mr. HEWITT: That is so. A good deal of cleaning up will have to be done by any incoming tenant. Even if the settlers had been given leases for a period of, say, 10 years, they would have felt much more secure than they do. They have been denied justice over the years. One thing that the Government must look into as early as possible is the Dawson Valley scheme. The settlers there must be relieved of their present insecure tenure. They have continued to exist because they are true Queenslanders, born and bred in a good district. They have determination and the will to get ahead in spite of the disadvantages under which they have laboured with past governments. Many of them have young families growing up and they do not know whether they will be on the land in 10 or 20 years' time so they do not know what sort of training to give their children.

Mr. Graham: You know you are painting a false picture of the whole situation.

Mr. HEWITT: I have never been a political centipede with feet in a few different parties and jumping around the country. I know where I stand.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HEWITT: My record over the years would stand against the hon. member's.

Mr. Davies: That is not justified.

Mr. HEWITT: And I would not have to set a very high standard.

The things of which I speak have done the State no credit. I want them on record because in three years' time hon. members opposite will race round the country trying to convince people that they never existed.

Mr. Davies: Is this the Dawson Valley you are talking about?

Mr. HEWITT: Yes. The hon. member for Brisbane knows a great deal about the area. He knows it is good country.

Mr. Davies: Never mind about that.

Mr. HEWITT: I would give him a few more marks than I would give the hon. member for Maryborough.

The Minister has not yet formulated his full policy but when he does it will give the State many advantages that it has been denied over the years. It will give equal treatment to all, justice to every section. It has always been my contention that each section, from the humblest to the most powerful, should be given equal opportunity.

The Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade throughout the State urgently needs an overhaul. Those of us who represent the more distant electorates know that with the present subsidy it is hard for some centres to carry on. I strongly support an increase in the subsidy. One small town in my electorate is Baralaba.

Mr. Jesson interjected.

Mr. HEWITT: The hon. member for Hinchinbrook is again interjecting and trying to rob people of justice. The Woorabinda mission settlement is in the area, too, and the Baralaba Ambulance Centre has to cater for the aboriginals there. Baralaba has a population of some 450 people whereas the mission settlement has a population of from 850 to 1,000. Over the past two or three years the Baralaba centre has had to find all the running cost and so on for service to the mission settlement. The anomaly, which existed throughout the last Government's term of office, should be removed.

Mr. Jesson: Have you put it up to the Minister?

Mr. HEWITT: I have put it up to the Minister. What actually happens is that they ring the Rockhampton Hospital. If the hospital says that the patient has to come to Rockhampton the ambulance from Baralaba has to go out to the Woorabinda settlement, bring the patient to the Rockhampton Hospital and then return to Baralaba, a distance of 240 miles. The people of the Baralaba township have had to bear this cost. Something should be done to alleviate the position and help the people in the district. Baralaba residents are very generous people. Only recently they raised £660 for an appeal for the Flying Doctor Service, a very creditable effort.

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Coorparoo—Treasurer and Minister for Housing) (8.17 p.m.), in reply: I am heartened by the fact that the reception of my first Budget has not been marked by any tension or bitterness and encouraged by the number of extremely useful suggestions from all quarters. Generally there has been an absence of either biting criticism or bitter

complaint. Personally I am very sensible of the very gracious expressions on my appointment coming from every section of the Chamber.

I propose to reply at some length to many of the observations that have been made and to use most of the time that the Standing Orders allow. Amongst other things I propose to show in greater detail the Government's plans to assist employment and to discuss some of the contemplated avenues for further Federal aid. I propose to outline some additional steps to be taken for further aid to housing. I do deplore the trend towards an alarmist attitude and the plain fear talk I have encountered from some hon. members opposite.

The Government are not unaware of the difficulties confronting the Government or the State, but we are not dismayed by them. We know just how real are the difficulties caused by drought. We know that the worst effects of the drought are by no means yet fully apparent and that they will not disappear when relief rains first fall. Drought is one of the periodic hazards that confront us in Australia and Queensland where apart from the damage during the period of drought there is a sustained capital loss, the effects of which carry on for months and sometimes for years afterwards.

No-one on this side of the Chamber seeks in any way to minimise the very real hazard and difficulty that confronts Queensland because of the severe drought we are now experiencing. There are major steps which can be taken and as they prove to be necessary the Government will take them. Our attitude towards drought and other difficulties is that it is not enough to cry "Wolf", it is not enough merely to present the appearance of despair. We are convinced that all difficulties constitute a challenge; that difficulties are something for resolute men to seek to overcome; and all our endeavour will be to assess whatever weaknesses emerge and do what we can to overcome them. I do not propose to occupy the time of the Committee tonight in replying in detail to the many matters that have been raised. I seek leave of the Committee to continue my speech on the next parliamentary sitting day.

(Leave to continue speech tomorrow granted.)

Progress reported.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

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

"That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 29 October, 1957."

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 8.22 p.m.