

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 1 SEPTEMBER 1960**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**THURSDAY, 1 SEPTEMBER, 1960**

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. D. E. Nicholson, Murrumba) took the chair at 11 a.m.

**QUESTIONS**

**APPORTIONMENT OF ROADS MAINTENANCE CONTRIBUTIONS**

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

“What was the apportionment of revenue by way of roads maintenance contributions by road-users to (a) the Brisbane City Council and (b) all other local authorities?”

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis—Minister for Education and Migration), for Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani), replied—

“Since first distribution was made in respect of collections to May, 1958—(a) £271,050; (b) £544,825.”

**SHOP RENTALS, ROMA STREET RAILWAY BOOKING HALL**

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister for Transport—

“(1) What were the highest and lowest tenders received by the Railway Department for the rental of four shops in the new £86,000 booking hall at Roma Street?”

“(2) Why was a fifth shop omitted from the advertised schedule?”

“(3) How many of the shops have been let, to whom, and on what terms?”

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

“(1) Highest, £728 per annum; lowest, £168 per annum.”

“(2) and (3) When tenders were originally called for the six shops only two were finally let. Several reasons were given by the highest tenderers in the other four cases as to why they would not proceed to consummate the proposed leases. Consequently, fresh tenders were called for the four remaining shops and a number of offers were received for each. All shops have now been let, the lessees and annual rentals for the first five years being as follows:—

Shop	Lessee	Rental £
“A”	V. McN. and D. E. Peachey	728
“B”	R. Oppelt	468
“C”	R. B. and M. J. Kerr	650
“D”	Syd. Hill and Sons Pty. Ltd.	702
“E”	Mrs. G. M. Pollard	624
“F”	Henry Evans	780

“All leases are for a period of 10 years, the rental to be subject to reappraisal by the Commissioner for the second period of five years. Lessees are liable for payment of rates and taxes and insurance of building.”

**SURVEYS, COLLINSVILLE-MOUNT ISA RAILWAY RECONSTRUCTION**

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) asked the Minister for Transport—

“In view of the fact that survey details of every inch of the rail route between Collinsville and Mount Isa are on record and available in railway offices, will he inform the House of the purpose and justification of the great expense involved of the flamboyantly publicised aerial and other surveys being undertaken in connection with the reconstruction of the Mount Isa line?”

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

“The Honourable Member is entirely misinformed in that no aerial surveys have been undertaken for the Mount Isa Railway Project. However, since Railway records do not include survey information in the detail necessary for the design of new steel and/or concrete bridges to replace existing timber trestles, and as it is essential to maintain traffic during construction, each of these new bridges will involve a minor deviation. Likewise, there will be some relocations of track to reduce ruling grades and, therefore, some general survey work has had to be undertaken.”

**COMMITTALS TO BRISBANE MENTAL HOSPITAL, GOODNA**

Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

“What procedure has to be followed before persons can be committed to the Goodna Mental Institution?”

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

“There are several procedures by which a person can be committed to the Brisbane Mental Hospital:—(1) As a temporary patient on the request of a relative supported by two medical certificates. The patient can only be detained for three months without further action being taken. (2) Private request by any person who shall make an application on the prescribed form which shall be authenticated by a Justice or a Minister of Religion and supported by two medical certificates. The patient is detained at the discretion of the Medical Superintendent. (3) Reception Order. An application may be made to a Police Magistrate by a person who has seen the patient within three days preceding the day on which the application was signed. This application should be accompanied by a medical certificate. The Police Magistrate will obtain the opinion of two medical practitioners, one of whom may be the person who gave the original medical certificate, and will make what enquiries he deems fit to determine whether he is satisfied that the person is mentally sick, in which case he makes a reception order.

(4) Procedure in emergency. An application is made to the Medical Superintendent supported by a medical certificate to the effect that the matter is one of emergency. The Medical Superintendent will admit the patient but within twenty-four hours he shall forward the request and the medical certificate to a Police Magistrate who proceeds as for a reception order. (5) The Police may make an application for a reception order. The procedure is much the same as in the private request for a reception order except that the Police would only intervene where a person is at large and suspected of being mentally sick."

SENILE ANNEXES; SOCIAL SERVICES PAYMENTS TO INMATES OF BRISBANE MENTAL HOSPITAL AND SENILE ANNEXES.

**Mr. GRAHAM** (Mackay) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"(1) How many senile annexes are in operation in Queensland and where are they located?"

"(2) How many persons are cared for in these annexes (a) male and (b) female?"

"(3) How many of the inmates of these annexes were inmates of the Goodna Mental Institution prior to being placed in these annexes?"

"(4) Are the inmates of the Goodna Mental Institution in receipt of income from the Commonwealth Social Services Department? If not why not?"

"(5) Are the inmates of the senile annexes in receipt of income from the Social Services Department? If so, what portion of this income is taken by the Government for their upkeep?"

**Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga) replied—

"(1) Seven—located at Chermiside, Dalby, Oakey, Toowoomba, Roma, Wondai, and Westwood."

"(2) (a) 272; (b) 432."

"(3) Approximately 514 of these patients were inmates of Mental Institutions, including the Goodna Mental Institution from which the majority of them would have come."

"(4) No. They are specifically excluded under the Social Services Act, 1947-1959, administered by the Commonwealth Government. On a number of occasions efforts have been made by the Government to prevail on the Commonwealth Government to grant Social Service benefits to inmates of mental institutions, but without success."

"(5) Yes. Of the total pension payment of £4 15s. received in most cases an amount is deducted for their upkeep based on the amount the Commonwealth Government determines shall be paid by that Government for the maintenance of pensioners in Eventide Homes. The present determination is £3 2s. per week."

UNOCCUPIED STATE RENTAL HOMES

**Mr. LLOYD** (Kedron) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"(1) How many previously occupied State rental homes are at present vacant in (a) the metropolitan area, (b) the Grovely project area and (c) the Clifford Avenue and Trouts Road, Stafford, areas?"

"(2) In relation to (b) and (c) of question (1), will he advise how long these particular houses have been vacant?"

**Hon. T. A. HILEY** (Chatsworth) replied—

"(1) (a) 33; (b) 1; (c) 5—(b) and (c) are included in (a). Of these houses 27 have been allotted. 10 of the houses were vacated from August 25 to 29, 1960."

"(2) The Grovely house from August 28, 1960. The Stafford houses one from July 17, 1960, one from August 9, 1960, one from August 20, 1960, one from August 21, 1960, and one from August 28, 1960. Maintenance is required on these houses before being re-occupied."

VISITS BY DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION TO TECHNICAL COLLEGES

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"When did the Director of Technical Education last visit the various technical colleges throughout the State?"

**Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY** (Isis) replied—

"Only colleges in the southern area have been visited during the past year. The absence on long leave of the Assistant to the Director of Technical Education has contributed to this. Visits have been made to all technical colleges during the past years by senior officers and technical college inspectors. Nearly all college principals have been interviewed in the office by the Director of Technical Education over a period of eighteen months. During the last twelve months technical training institutions both in Victoria and South Australia have been visited by the Director of Technical Education."

NORMAN CREEK POLLUTION

**Mr. BROMLEY** (Norman) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"Would the Government give consideration to the cleansing of the pollution that exists in Norman Creek, particularly in the region of the Buranda Boys' School, as this debris which floats on the tidal water is a menace to the health of the children who attend this school as well as to residents within that area?"

**Hon. T. A. HILEY** (Chatsworth) replied—

"I am advised that the accumulation of debris in Norman Creek is the result of drainage of surrounding areas. I feel it is a matter in which the Honourable Member might approach the Brisbane City Council. I do not feel it is a matter on which the

Government would be justified in expending revenue raised by the Port Authority for the maintenance and development of the Port. I might mention that capital work is being undertaken by the Brisbane City Council on Norman Creek in the vicinity of Stone's Corner. This work is being subsidised by the State, the subsidy paid to June 30 last being £16,865 12s. 10d. Whilst this work in the vicinity of Stone's Corner is primarily work of flood mitigation, the State will subsidise capital work where drainage is the predominate purpose to be achieved."

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

##### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SECOND ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 31 August (see p. 148) on Mr. Row's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

**Mr. DONALD** (Ipswich East) (11.18 a.m.): I am in full agreement with the glowing compliments paid to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Henry Abel Smith, and Lady May, by the Leader of the Opposition. Without doubt they have shown a deep interest in our State, our industries, and our people, and have rendered excellent service to Queensland, and Queenslanders, both at home and abroad. Consequently, they have won the respect of every section of our community.

To you, Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my sincere congratulations on your elevation to the important position of Speaker, and I sincerely hope that every member of the Chamber will do his utmost to assist you in your onerous task. I am confident that you will carry out the duties of your high office with dignity and impartiality.

I should like also to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the present Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation for the excellent and impartial manner in which he carried out the duties of Speaker during the life of the last Parliament.

I wish to thank the members of the A.L.P. branches, and affiliated unions in the old Bremer—now Ipswich East—electorate, for once again selecting me to carry the banner for the Australian Labour Party in that electorate. I am deeply grateful to the electors of Ipswich East for once again returning me with such a handsome majority. I assure them that I shall continue to serve them with the same zeal and enthusiasm as I have done over the years, without fear or favour, or prejudice.

I should be extremely ungrateful if I did not take advantage of this opportunity also to sincerely thank my campaign director, Mr. Jack Perrett, and Mr. Bill Haden, campaign secretary, and members of the campaign committee, and all who assisted the Australian Labour Party's campaign in Ipswich East during the election, particularly when I was campaigning in other parts of the State.

In extending my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I draw the attention of the House to the excellent contributions made as maiden speeches by hon. members on this side. They have shown without any doubt that they will be a force to be reckoned with and an asset to the debating strength of the Chamber. What we have seen and heard so far is only a sample of what is yet to come from hon. members on this side who are yet to make their maiden speeches.

We heard a great deal of talk in the Chamber last week about the privileges of the individual citizen, so I feel compelled to say something on the subject. Just how far the individual citizen should be allowed to do what he likes, and just to what extent the State should step in and restrain him, is a problem that has exercised the minds of many people throughout the ages and I take the opportunity this debate presents to express my personal view on this very important and contentious subject.

The power of the Government to suppress individual freedom is, of course, much greater under the arbitrary rule of a dictatorship than under a democracy where the Government have to face the people and where they can be dismissed by them. Nevertheless, it is a real problem in a democracy. In present-day society a great deal of authority over the individual is exercised by the State and by other organisations. Has this led to a reduction of personal freedom? If so, can it be justified by the gains to the community generally? That is to say, have we collectively, as members of society, gained more than we have lost as individuals?

There is constant criticism everywhere of high-handed action by authority. Let me give some examples of the impact of authority on private citizens.

A property-owner desires to have houses built on a portion of his land. The local authority, through its town-planning division, refuses the necessary permission. The property-owner appeals to the Minister, who, after making inquiries, decides against him.

To take another instance, the Railway Department, or the Department of Main Roads, decides that additional land is required for the purpose of building a new workshop or of widening a road or of laying a new track. Citizens may have their homes on the land the department wants. Even though they are compensated, and are able to build another home, and may not suffer any great financial loss, they are subjected to much inconvenience and worry through no fault of their own.

As a third example, a man joins a trade union so that his interests as a worker may be better protected, and he agrees to be bound by the rules of the organisation. He breaks those rules and is expelled by the organisation. He appeals to the court and is successful in having his expulsion quashed.

These cases involve clashes between individuals and authority. In the first two, property is affected and authority decides that the rights of individuals should be subordinated to the interests of the community. The third is an example of an authority intervening on the side of the individual but against the right of a voluntary organisation to conduct its own affairs.

What is the Australian Labour Party's attitude to personal freedom in an increasingly collectivist society? Can reductions in personal freedom sometimes be justified, or should the interests of the individual be supreme? Can the machinery for carrying out Government policy be improved so as to safeguard personal freedom while at the same time furthering the common welfare? What protection does the individual require at this time? The statement suggests some of the answers. Let us examine authority in some of the many forms it takes—the State acting through Ministers and Government departments, tribunals of various kinds, and the courts, public boards, private industry, professional bodies, and the trade unions.

Democratic socialists recognise and strive for two main groups of freedom for all—those liberal freedoms usually called civil liberties, and those freedoms that can exist only in a classless society. Our concept of freedom, therefore, is much wider than that of other parties. The parties of the Right, though they have been forced to concede civil liberties, have opposed the development of other freedoms. In contrast, Communism is supposed to aim at a classless society, but has subordinated the individual to an all-powerful one-party State, which is ruled by a privileged elite who in practice are responsible to no-one but themselves. Thus it has denied civil liberties without creating a classless society.

Personally, I believe that military, political and economic power should serve, and be seen to serve, the whole community, not dominate it; that the privileges of the few must be transformed into rights available to every citizen; that a fairer distribution of wealth and opportunity must be advanced by positive State action, with the assistance of a free trade union and co-operative movement; and that effective civil liberties and an independent judiciary must safeguard personal freedom against abuse of power, whether by the State or any other organisation.

The existence of privilege based on class prevents the growth of a really free society. By "class privilege," I mean rights and liberties enjoyed by the few, available only to a minority, that rest on wealth gained by inheritance or speculation. It is right that special ability and industry, including thrift, inventiveness, and excellence in the arts, should be specially rewarded; but such recognition should be on merit alone and should not be allowed to lead to a new privileged class.

We of the Australian Labour Party believe that the only political framework within which a free society can flourish is that of parliamentary democracy, with full rights of opposition.

One reason why we oppose Communism is because it rejects this method, or accepts it only when it suits its own purposes. It is our belief, therefore, in the method of political democracy that distinguishes us from the Communists. But we also reject the anti-Socialist illusion that the really free society will develop of its own accord. On the contrary, we maintain that it is necessary for a Government consciously to plan the economic system.

It is this planned advance toward an equal society, combined with a belief in the vital importance of common ownership, that primarily distinguishes Labour from other political parties. To us, freedom means something quite different from a mere absence of restraint. The welfare State and full employment would undoubtedly widen personal freedom. We reject as complete rubbish the view that this will sap the moral fibre of the nation, a point always made with indignant emphasis by our political opponents.

We believe that the State is made for man, not man for the State. We affirm that the individual, though a member of the community, also has an inviolable personal identity with rights of his own. We therefore agree that the ownership of personal property is a human right, but believe that this right is not absolute. First, the right to own property carries with it the responsibility to use and develop it in the interests of the community. Secondly, wherever the accumulation of property brings with it decisive economic control over others, the use of that power must be subject to public control. Thirdly, extreme contrasts between wealth and poverty are in themselves morally intolerable and obstacles to freedom.

Thus, our concept of the interests of the community is wider than that of our political opponents, and our policies may impinge sharply on rights associated with the ownership of property and the use of economic power.

I am well aware, however, that the authority of the State can damage personal freedom. The modern State exercises great control over its citizens, and it could quickly become oppressive if the safeguards of democracy were not carefully maintained. But the authority of the State can also be used to extend freedom in a very real sense. There is no more important extension of personal freedom than a publicly provided system of education that ensures that the capabilities of each person are developed to the full. It is very important that the best of education be made available to all. Freedom and equality are inseparable. If freedom with gross inequality is virtually not worth having, equality without freedom is worthless and is foreign to the objective of the Australian Labour Party.

Ever since its inception the Australian Labour Party has been concerned with personal freedom. The freedom of workers to join trade unions and to have the right to vote had to be wrung from reluctant Governments. We are often accused—indeed, we have been in the currency of this debate—of wanting centralisation of power at the expense of individual rights and liberties. This charge is in no way justified, nor can it be justified. We certainly do not recognise as a right an individualism that is harmful to the community. On the other hand, far from wanting an all-powerful State or excessive centralisation, we hold that many important decisions and activities should be left to voluntary and local effort, and organisations. For example, when adequate collective-bargaining machinery exists wage negotiations are best left to trade unions and employers' organisations. But the State at all times should be able to reinforce the work of voluntary organisations in promoting economic, social and cultural advancement.

The Australian Labour Party's idea of the State arises from its history. The Party grew out of the harshness and miseries of last century's industrialism, a largely unregulated society, with fantastic extremes of wealth and poverty, of security and destitution, of opportunities enjoyed by the few and a deadly, hopeless grind endured by the many.

We recognised that some of these inequalities could be removed only by State action. Only the Government were powerful enough, or sufficiently responsive to popular pressure, to begin the protection of workers in factories, to promote public health, to provide universal education, and to redistribute the national wealth more fairly.

Even in the last century we did not rely completely on the State. Workers had to escape by their own efforts from the degradation of the industrial revolution. They formed trade unions out of which grew the Australian Labour Party. No-one should forget when they criticise the trade union movement or the Australian Labour Party that the freedom of the people of Australia was extended by the success of the Australian Labour movement in improving conditions of employment and the status of the worker.

Thus the Labour movement clearly has not regarded State action as the only means of social progress. The development of self-help within groups independent of the State was an objective of the pioneers of the Labour movement. Apart from trade-unionism, self-help was practised through co-operative and friendly societies, many of the latter being attached to the unions. However, State action was necessary to provide conditions in which groups of individuals could function properly. Acts were passed, not only to make trade unions lawful, but also to grant them certain legal rights necessary to their practical operation. Friendly societies had to be controlled in the interests of their members.

In various ways our people have extended their freedoms both by actions within groups and directly through the State. But in the process of extending the freedom of the many, the liberties of a few necessarily have been reduced. What many employers regarded as their rights were restricted when they had to bargain with trade unions rather than with individuals, or when factory legislation prevented their being absolute masters in their factories.

So long as Labour was fighting for the bare essentials of life for the working class there was no need to bother about the respective claims of freedom, equality and fraternity in a welfare State.

Since the birth of the Australian Labour Party in the early nineties of the last century a quiet revolution has been taking place. Parliament has established social rights for the industrial worker. The trade unions, after a long and bitter struggle, had won their place as an indispensable part of the nation. That cannot be denied by the most rabid Labour haters. The Government's responsibility for full employment and higher production is widely admitted. The welfare State, even in its uncompleted form, has removed much of the anxiety and insecurity from thousands of middle-class people, as well as the working class. Full employment must bring not only improved living standards but a new dignity and a great extension of freedom to the people as a whole.

These are great advances, but we must not rest content with them. We are obliged and eager to think out the next steps towards our objective. The Australian Labour Party is convinced that only a democratic socialist Government can provide the climate of co-operation necessary for the growth of a sense of responsibility throughout society. Anyone who benefits from the welfare State, from full employment, or from better education, cannot contract out of the social obligations that must support these reforms.

Many people do work of tremendous value through voluntary organisations. Such organisations as trade unions, representing the workers of the nation, and following the legislation passed in this Chamber by an Australian Labour Party Government, the co-operatives working on behalf of the consumers, are excellent examples of voluntary bodies that offset excessive concentration of State power. Voluntary effort is also invaluable in fields in which the State must carry the main responsibilities; for example, in education and social welfare. Much voluntary work is also performed in caring for the aged and infirm, in assisting the hospitals and the ambulance, and in the cultural and sporting activities of the community. The citizen's sense of responsibility must keep pace with the increase in his rights and powers if society is to renew itself spiritually and materially.

I shall now quote from "The Courier-Mail" of 2 August, 1960, under the heading "36 Hours a Week is Forecast." That report reads—

"A Sydney company director said last night his company hoped to introduce a 36-hour week within two years.

"He is Mr. M. Herschon, merchandising director of the Hestia Brassiere Company, who arrived back in Sydney yesterday after a tour of Europe.

"Mr. Herschon said he believed his company could increase productivity by reducing the working week to 36 hours.

"The prospect of a shorter working week has produced tremendous esprit de corps among staff," he said.

"A 36-hour week after all is only a 10 per cent. reduction in working hours."

"It's Closer

"Mr. Herschon said there was a definite trend towards giving shorter hours and more money to employees in Europe.

"Manufacturers were working on the basis that an employee with more money and more leisure time had more purchasing power.

"The 36-hour week is closer in Australia than many people imagine." That is what union leaders have been advocating over the years, particularly during the last decade. They are the words of a man who is the manager and a director of a leading Sydney company.

**Mr. Windsor:** A Tory.

**Mr. DONALD:** Probably a Tory, but a sensible one.

That statement increased my disappointment with the action of the Queensland Government in opposing a shorter working week for mine-workers throughout Australia. During the last session of the previous Parliament, I addressed a question to either the Premier or the Minister for Mines asking if the Government or the Department of Mines would follow the progressive lead given by the Labour Government in New South Wales by reducing to 37½ hours the working week for miners employed in their mines at Collinsville and Styx. The Premier, or the Minister for Mines, in answer to my question, said that the Government believed in arbitration and that they had no desire to usurp the functions of the Industrial Court. If the Government were of that opinion during the lifetime of the last Parliament, how is it that they subsequently appeared in court for the purpose of opposing the claims of mine-workers, and joined forces with the coal barons of New South Wales in an effort to defeat the coal-miners and injure the Queensland coal-mining industry? If the Government had been sincere they would not have joined the New South Wales colliery proprietors and the Victorian Government in opposing the claim.

I give full marks to the Minister for Mines on the score of sincerity. I do not think the decision to take that action was his. I do not believe he had anything to do with it, because he has fought for the Queensland coal-mining industry against the New South Wales and Victorian interests. He has carried on his fight through the Press and through the mine-owners' official organ, and for that action I admire and thank him. But the fact is that in fighting on behalf of the coal-owners of New South Wales the Government were betraying not only the mine-workers of Queensland but also the Queensland colliery proprietors, because they must know, as the Minister for Mines knows only too well, that efforts are being made by the colliery interests of New South Wales to destroy the Queensland coal-mining industry.

**Mr. Windsor:** The Government gave the miners an extra pension.

**Mr. DONALD:** I would not say anything about that if I were the hon. member, because he knows nothing about this matter. In order to gain a pension the mine-workers of Australia had to engage in a national stoppage, not once, but on two occasions, and they were out of work for months.

**Dr. Noble:** Labour was in power in those days.

**Mr. DONALD:** A Labour Government were not in power in the Commonwealth, or in New South Wales. If the hon. gentleman who interjected had any intelligence he would realise that a State that produces over 80 per cent. of Australia's coal must have an economic advantage over one that produces less than 10 per cent., as Queensland was doing at that time.

The following newspaper extract covers proceedings before the Coal Industry Tribunal—

"Overall output per man shift at Box Flat (Parkhead) colliery had increased from 3.29 tons in the second half of 1952 to 5.79 tons in the first half of 1959, and 8.4 tons today.

"This was stated at the Coal Industry Tribunal last week by Mr. C. Vickers, Central Council member representing Queensland district, replying to questions from Mr. Parkinson.

"Mr. Vickers said he had worked at Box Flat, and described the introduction of mechanisation there.

"The first scraper loader commenced operation in June, 1949; by 1952 the whole mine had been equipped with scraper loaders. Skip transport and conveyor chains had given way to rubber belting. Scraper loaders had been replaced by 'conventional units 11BU' such as 14 BUs and 11 BUs since the beginning of the year and the Lee-Norse continuous miner.

"Recent increases in production could best be indicated by one word—'startling'.

"Total production for the colliery had increased from 43,838 tons from July to

December, 1952, to 87,919 tons from July to December, 1958. Daily production was now about 1,000 tons.

**"Further Mechanisation**

"Mr. Vickers said a second Lee-Norse was standing at the surface at Box Flat No. 7 tunnel, and the management intended to put it into operation with the minimum amount of delay.

"He knew of other proprietors, said Mr. Vickers, who intended to mechanise to be able to compete with Box Flat. Haighmoor have a plan to instal a continuous miner or miners. The Southern Cross group are going to instal advanced forms of mechanisation. New Hope colliery has purchased equipment from Liddell (N.S.W.) colliery that is standing on the surface waiting for installation. Rhondda collieries too have decided to be in the race.

"Such developments present the possibility of the closure of easily the great majority of contract mines on the Ipswich and Rosewood fields."

For approximately 18 months the New South Wales State mine at Lithgow has been working a 37½-hour week. Contrary to what Government members might expect, the reduction of the working week has resulted not in decreased, but in increased, production.

**Mr. Ewan:** How was that brought about?

**Mr. DONALD:** That was brought about by conciliation between the Government and the Miners' Federation. It is a pity that more use is not made of conciliation, and less emphasis placed on arbitration. If the present Government had negotiated and conciliated with the Miners' Federation, perhaps they could have seen the light and given the miners at Collinsville and Styx a reduced working week.

The Miners' Federation asked the Government of New South Wales to introduce a 35-hour week at their mine at Lithgow, but the Government were afraid, with the rest of the collieries in New South Wales operating on a 40-hour week, that their colliery would not be able to carry the 35-hour week. They offered a 37½-hour week, which was accepted by the Miners' Federation. The success of that compromise is reflected in the fact that not only has a higher production resulted, but the New South Wales Government, with the Tasmanian Government, appeared before the Coal Mining Industry Tribunal in support of the mine-workers' claims.

In the recent State election the Australian Labour Party polled almost 50 per cent. of the votes of the people of Queensland. The other parties could not come anywhere near that. The Government of Queensland, a non-Labour Government, and the Government of Victoria, also a non-Labour Government, are appearing on behalf of vested interests to oppose the reduction of miners' working hours. On the other hand, the New South Wales Labour Government, an employer of labour in the coal-mining industry, are

supporting the claim of the mine-workers; so also are the Tasmanian Labour Government.

During the last decade, particularly since 1954, there has been a revolutionary change in Australia, and in Queensland, in the method of winning coal. That has resulted in production being increased by millions of tons, with fewer mine-workers. In fact, the increase has been described by both the Joint Coal Board of New South Wales and the Commonwealth Government as dramatic. From that increase, the mine-owners have reaped a great benefit, and mine-workers feel with every justification that they are also entitled to share by increased remuneration and more leisure time in the increased productivity that has resulted from their effort.

On 1 January, 1917, the award provided for an eight-hour shift, bank to bank, including a half-hour for mealtime, from Mondays to Fridays, and six hours on Saturday and Sunday, and all holidays, with 11 shifts. The production in Queensland in 1916, before the reduction of hours, was 907,727 tons with 2,037 men. When the bank to bank provision was introduced in 1917, the production went up to 1,048,473 tons and once again the mine-owners' balance sheets showed the extent to which they had reaped the benefit. But they always oppose reforms, particularly in the working hours of the worker, and say that it will be impossible to produce the commodities that are necessary for the welfare of the country.

Perhaps I should explain for the benefit of Government members what "eight hours, bank to bank" means. It means that the working shift commences when the first man enters the cage to go down the shaft, or when the first man enters the tunnel on his way to the working face, and terminates when the last man returns to the surface.

Those hours remained until 1939, when the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Court reduced the maximum working hours underground to 40 hours a week, bank to bank, including the meal-time. The hours of the surface-worker was fixed at 86 hours a fortnight. There was no work on the Saturday following pay-day, and very few surface-hands worked on "back" Saturdays. Production rose to 1,285,328 tons in 1940, again proving the fallacy of the claim of people opposed to shorter working hours that they would mean decreased production. This is very important: In 1916 the hours worked in general industry were standardised at 96 a fortnight, and those worked in the mining industry were 86. In other words, the workers employed in the coal-mining industry were working 10 hours fewer a fortnight than those in general industry. Since then, workers in general industry have had their hours of work reduced to 40 a week but the working week for mine-workers remains at 40 hours, so the margin of five hours a week that they enjoyed in 1916 has disappeared. Reduced to percentages, it works out that workers in general industry have had their

working week reduced by 16½ per cent. while the reduction in the coal-mining industry has been only 7 per cent. To regain the margin they held in 1916, the mine-workers must have their hours reduced to 35 a week. As 86 hours a fortnight were to 96 in 1916, so 70 hours are to 80 in 1960. Increasing mechanisation and near automation demand a reduction in the working hours of mine-workers. That has been conceded by employers throughout the world. With increasing mechanisation, with the coming of automation, and with the consequent stepping up in production, anyone who has any feelings or humanity will agree that there must be a reduction in working hours.

Lest some hon. members, more particularly on the Government benches, think I have been quoting figures caught out of the air, I shall quote direct from the Queensland Coal Board's Annual Report for 1959 to show how production has increased with fewer men in the industry. I propose to quote figures for Boxflat and to give the production exclusively with scraper-loaders. I take the figures for Boxflat because it is the most highly mechanised mine in Queensland. I do not want to be misunderstood on this point. I am not condemning Mr. McQueen for modernising this colliery—in fact, I commend him for his enterprise and courage—nor am I taking any exception to any colliery company that mechanises its mine and brings it up to date. I realise, just as the companies do, that step is necessary to enable them to compete successfully.

Time will not permit me to confirm all that I have said, but suffice it to say that for the half-year from July to December, 1952, the Boxflat overall production per man shift exclusively with scraper-loaders was 3.29 tons. For the six months ended June, 1959, it rose by 2.5 tons. In the same period, production at the coal face rose from 10.02 tons to 18.54 tons, an increase of 8.52 tons. It will be noted that the increase was almost as great as the total production in the 1952 half-year. The total Boxflat production for July to December, 1952, was 43,838 tons, whereas the production from January to June 1959 was 79,371 tons.

Let us go back to the last year of contract miners at Boxflat colliery, as that will demonstrate clearly what mechanisation has meant. The last complete year of contract-mining at the Boxflat collieries was 1949. One hundred men produced 280 tons a day. The overall output per man per shift was 2.8 tons. With 40 men on coal, the output per man per shift at face was 7 tons.

By June, 1960, following the replacement of most scraper-loaders by conventional units and continuous miners, the average daily production had risen to 1,000 tons from 120 men. The overall output per man per shift was 8.4 tons. With 40 men at the coal face it was 25 tons.

The total output for the first six months of 1959 for the whole of the West Moreton district was 687,542 tons. The total output from the Boxflat collieries was 79,371 tons. That leaves 608,171 tons for about 18 other collieries. Boxflat is producing about 8.4 per cent. of the total production of West Moreton. When we take into account their determination to install another continuous miner and that the other companies, too, are determined to bring their collieries up to date by the installation of continuous miners or other mechanical means of winning coal, we will realise that the request of the miners for a reduction in the working week from 40 to 35 hours is not only reasonable and just, but is also in the best interests of the coal-mining industry and the community generally.

All that I have said about the output per man employed at the Box Flat Colliery, both above and below ground, and particularly at the coal face, applies with equal force, though not always to the same extent, to the output throughout Queensland. Production has increased greatly since 1916. I quote the following figures:—

Year	Tons	Men employed
1916	907,727	2,037
1940	1,285,328	2,660
1958	2,580,373	3,241
1959	2,853,000	—

I must confess that I cannot quote production figures from any mining journal or report by the Coal Board or the Mines Department for 1959; I am relying on figures published in the Press.

When one takes all these points into consideration, it is hard to see any justice in the action of the Queensland Government in joining forces with the coal-owners, particularly the coal-owners in New South Wales, in trying to defeat the application of the mine-workers in that State, in common with those in other States, for a reduced working week.

**Mr. Aikens:** And to deny them some of the benefits of mechanisation.

**Mr. DONALD:** To deny them any of the benefits of mechanisation.

But it goes further than that. The Queensland Government have been guilty of joining forces with the coal-owners, who are trying to increase the hours of work of men on the mining fields. They are endeavouring to make the working day start when the man gets to the face and finish when he actually leaves the face, and they are trying to make him take his lunch hour—his crib time, as it is called—in his own time, not in the eight-hour spread. This will mean an extension of the working day for many mine workers.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. SULLIVAN (Condamine)** (11.58 a.m.): It pleases me immensely to associate the people of Condamine and myself, as a member of the Government Parties, with the

expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen that have been voiced so spontaneously by members of this Assembly in speaking on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

I congratulate Their Excellencies Sir Henry and Lady May Abel Smith for the magnificent way in which they have shouldered their responsibilities as Her Majesty's representatives in our wonderful State. Ever since their arrival they have proved that they wish to get to know the people of Queensland as well as its resources and industries. In doing so, I believe they have done something that has not been done to the same extent by previous occupants of this high position, and they are to be heartily congratulated.

I also congratulate the hon. member for Hinchinbrook on his speech in moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and the hon. member for Bowen upon the manner in which he seconded the motion. Both the mover and the seconder of the motion have set a high standard to be lived up to by those who follow.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your elevation to your high office. As one of the back-bench members, I pledge to you my good behaviour in this Assembly at all times. Your predecessor, now the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, set a high standard in his role as Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. I think I am quoting correctly when I say that the "Telegraph" referred to him at one time as one of the best Speakers ever. He set a high standard but I have no doubt that you are equipped fully to follow in his footsteps.

I pay a great compliment to the Leader of the Government, the Premier. His good qualities are appreciated by hon. members opposite just as much as they are by the occupants of the Government benches. During the recent election campaign the esteem in which he is held was very evident, because never did we read in the Press or hear on the radio or from the public platform any attack upon him as a leader or upon his private life. As a new member coming into Parliament to serve with him on the Government benches, I consider that we in Queensland—irrespective of our political aspirations or views—are very fortunate to have a man of his calibre to lead us in the governing of the State.

Having been newly elected as a member of this Assembly, I pledge my support and sincerity to all who will be associated with me in the Government. At all times I am very conscious of the responsibility that has been placed on my shoulders, a responsibility firstly to the Government, secondly to the people of my electorate, and thirdly to the people of Queensland generally. I am very conscious of that great responsibility and I hope, please God, that I shall always be able to live up to what is required of me.

When the coalition Government took office in 1957 there was some conjecture about how

the new Cabinet would face up to its responsibilities. It had been stated for many years that the Country-Liberal Parties did not have material to form a Cabinet. Taking the Ministers one by one, and considering them for the positions of responsibility for which they were selected, I think that we have men of practical experience holding their respective portfolios. In their wise deliberations over the past three years they have proved beyond doubt that they were chosen wisely for the various responsibilities allotted to them.

The most recent addition to the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker—your predecessor, the hon. Alan Fletcher—is a man beyond reproach and one of vast experience. When we were called upon to select a new Minister for Lands, I felt there were at least half a dozen who could fill the position adequately. The hon. Alan Fletcher was selected and I feel that he, with his experience—he has brought himself up the hard way—and with the support and advice of many other men experienced in land matters and administration in various parts of the State will do an excellent job. There are to advise him men from the intensively-farmed areas, the sugar cane areas in the North, the coastal dairying areas in the North and on the Downs, and men engaged in the pastoral industry. Thus, I feel that the very important portfolio of Public Lands and Irrigation will be very well administered.

In my initial address, as in all addresses I hope to make in the future, I wish to talk about subjects of which I know something. I hope that I never am guilty in this Assembly of rising and talking about matters of which I have no knowledge. We have seen, since 1957, great development in North Queensland.

**Mr. Graham:** Where?

**Mr. Ewan:** In Mackay.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** That was most evident in the recent election. Since this Government took office, rarely have we heard a call for a separate State in North Queensland and, knowing well the man who was at the head of the new-State movement for many years—Dr. Chapman—I can conclude only that the people are at least satisfied with the development that is taking place in the North.

**Government Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** The Condamine electorate, which I have the honour to represent, could possibly lay claim to a greater variety of important agricultural crops than any other electorate in Queensland. Admittedly, that is a bold statement, but as I outline the position I think hon. members will agree with me.

The electorate lies just west of Dalby on the Darling Downs and embraces the whole of the Wambo Shire—with the exception of one small area that belongs to the electorate of Aubigny—the whole of the Chinchilla shire and two divisions of the Kingaroy shire.

Hon. members will thus realise just what contribution to the economy of this State comes from within its boundaries.

At this juncture I should like to pay tribute to the men who have previously represented my area. Following the redistribution, it comprises portions of the former Condamine, Aubigny, and Barambah electorates. The people were well served by Mr. Jim Sparkes, Mr. L. F. Diplock and Mr. Bjelke-Petersen. I pay a tribute to those three men and hope, as the new representative of the electorate, that I can measure up to the standard set by them.

I have already said that the electorate embraces the Wambo and Chinchilla shires. The Wambo shire has been credited with producing a third of the wheat grown in Queensland. A small portion of the shire south of Dalby is now in the Aubigny electorate. I think I am safe in claiming that the Chinchilla shire and the Wambo shire, excluding the portion not in my electorate, produce approximately half the wheat grown in Queensland, so that in wheat alone hon. members will agree that the Condamine electorate makes a valuable contribution to the income of the State.

Americans who visited the area during the war said that the black soil farmlands of the Jimbour Plains were the best in the world. At the moment they are a perfect picture. I suggest seriously to the Government that overseas celebrities who visit the State and want to gauge its potential should, in addition to being taken to the South Coast, Toowoomba and Warwick, be flown over the Darling Downs. They would undoubtedly get a lasting and very favourable impression of Queensland, and would possibly want to return. The Darling Downs during conditions such as exist at present are a magnificent picture, and anyone with imagination could realise the extent of its contribution to the economy of Queensland.

I have already said that during the war Americans said it was the best country in the world, but going further west we have other very productive agricultural land. Near Warra and towards Chinchilla only a few years ago the country was wasteland covered by prickly pear, but men who have been farming there since that time claim the country is better than Jimbour Plains. I do not know if that is so, but I do know that one man who has been farming there for 41 years claims to have grown an average yield of 11 bags an acre, taking in the bad years as well as the good. That result gives an indication of soil fertility of the area.

With redistribution of boundaries portion of the former Barambah electorate is now included in Condamine, and I am very happy that that is so. It gives my electorate an even greater variety of crops. Over the range, in the Kumbia area, is some of the best maize and peanut-growing land in the State. The area is intensively developed, having many small farms run by excellent citizens who are

prepared to work hard for their livelihood. At present the peanut industry is suffering from over-production, and is in some trouble, but that state of affairs will not break the hearts of the people. Their land is fertile, and with diversification of production they will be able to make a living. For these reasons I am very happy to have that portion of the former Barambah electorate in Condamine. So much for agriculture on the Condamine.

The industry that Queensland possibly owes most to for its development is one of the other industries that plays a big part in giving the people of the Condamine their livelihood. In years gone by, with the development of the brigalow belt, the improvement of pastures, and the advent of Rhodes grass round Jandowae, down to Kaimkillenbun, and across to Chinchilla, there were many dairy farms where men, women and children milked, in the pioneering days, upwards of 150 cows. I know of no industry that has played a greater part in the development of Queensland than the dairying industry. To my mind, it has the best economy of any of our primary industries. I qualify that statement with these remarks: each month the dairy farmer gets his cheque; he knows how much money he is going to make from month to month; he has people giving him service—the storekeepers, garages, and whoever else it may be—and they know, from month to month, they will get at least a little from him. In other primary industries, such as wool-growing and wheat-growing, with the income coming in only once a year—it is usually a pretty big one, or it has been; it is not as good at the moment as it used to be—the tendency is, if you get it in lump sums, to spend in the same manner. The dairying industry, because of its economy, has been able to play a large part in the development of the State.

In the Condamine the grazing industry is playing an important part and contributing immensely to the district's economy. The grazing industry has shown some vast changes in the post-war period. It was previously regarded as being able to be carried on only on immense areas, but, as the country has developed, it has been found that people can make a livelihood, perhaps without dairying, and they go into grazing and mixed farming. It is possibly a much more attractive form of livelihood. It is easier and possibly just as remunerative. We have seen the grazier turning to farming for the production of younger beef, and we have also seen the farmer who was essentially a grain-grower in previous years diversifying his activities and going in for crop-fatening. It is by these methods that we are able to get our beef cattle turned off in prime condition at a much younger age than we could 10 or 15 years ago.

Those are the three major primary industries of the Condamine electorate. I claim to have a reasonably good knowledge of them, particularly the dairying industry, because I

came to Jandowae when I was five years old. There were a few acres of cleared brigalow scrub around the house—just enough to grow a little bit of a crop—and the rest was brigalow. We had to eke out a livelihood there. I was the youngest and naturally, of course, I had the most work to do; that is what it amounted to. I realise now that it probably stood me in good stead because I believe I am very conscious of the problems of the dairyman.

I have had considerable experience of farming, extending over 30 years, and of grazing. As a member of this Assembly, I think my responsibility is to the people associated with those industries. They know the problems and pitfalls and it is to them that I will go for advice. At present the grain-growers are in conference at Too-woomba and I intend to go there tomorrow and sit in and listen to them. I do not want to take part in their discussions but I will listen to them and be advised by their suggestions for dealing with their problems. So, too, the graziers and the dairy farmers are the people best equipped to advise me, as a member of the Government, on how to present their views on their problems to the Government and how to have matters handled in the way they want them handled. If I approach my responsibilities in this manner I should be able to represent satisfactorily the people engaged in those three great industries.

At this juncture I want to pay a very high tribute to the late Sir Christopher Sheehy. I do not know of any man who has played his part better for any primary industry than Sir Christopher Sheehy. The dairying industry has sustained a great loss; he gave a lifetime of service to it. Possibly the way he accepted his responsibilities hastened his end. Certainly every dairyman throughout the Commonwealth is indebted to him and each of them should pause a moment to-day out of respect for him. His passing was a great national loss and I pay him my humble respects.

In electorates such as mine on the Darling Downs—and this applies to the whole of Southern Queensland—Government departments are doing magnificent work in assisting primary industry. I shall deal first with the Department of Agriculture and Forestry. The Minister, the Hon. O. O. Madsen, was selected for the portfolio because of his experience of primary industries, both on the producing and marketing sides, and he is to be commended for the way in which he is facing up to the responsibilities of his office. The department, under his administration, is giving good service to the people of the State. Great strides are being made by the C.S.I.R.O. with their research into agricultural areas, into the use of trace elements for building up soils, and, in the wool industry, for the production of better and finer wool.

That reminds me of a story told of a Condamine grazier, who came from New South Wales, and who was very keen to build up his flock and produce better wool. He sought the help of the C.S.I.R.O., and improved his pastures in many ways. Then he decided that he wanted to improve the wool from his flock, so he bought a highly-bred ram at the Brisbane Exhibition and took it back to his property. To his disgust, after paying 2,000 guineas for the ram, when he put it with a couple of hundred young stud ewes—I do not know whether this was the fault of the C.S.I.R.O.—all it would do was lie in the shade; it would not go out into the pastures at all. The grazier refused to admit a defeat, although admittedly he was somewhat disgusted. He rang the studmaster and complained bitterly about the behaviour of the ram. The studmaster said, "Don't worry about it. I will send a drench for you to give him." He sent it and the grazier poured half a bottle down the ram's neck. The ram did not wait for the grazier to open the gate; he got over the fence into the paddock and did all he was supposed to do—not only in that paddock but in other paddocks, too! A couple of weeks later the studmaster rang the grazier and said, "Did the drench work?" The grazier said, "The research done by the C.S.I.R.O. is wonderful. I just could not believe it. But," he said, "doesn't it taste awful?" I suppose there is some arrangement between the B.M.A. and the C.S.I.R.O. on that matter.

Turning now to land development, there are hundreds of thousands of acres in the brigalow belt crying out for development, and I believe that the Minister responsible for administering the Land Acts has a great responsibility in seeing that this development and closer settlement are brought about in the correct way. In my opinion brigalow country in Queensland has a great potential, and I believe that the men who take up the land should not be told exactly what they must do. We saw what happened just after the war, when the Wandoan area was cut up for soldier settlement. At that time I took a very active part in R.S.L. affairs, and I was asked to give my views on the cutting-up of the Wandoan area. I did not know the country, but I made it my business to go to men who did, and we arranged for men who had spent many years in that area to come to Brisbane and confer with officers of the Department of Public Lands. The department was advised that if it wanted to cut up the Wandoan area for dairying, each selection should be of not less than 2,500 acres.

**Mr. Ewan:** The Government would not take any notice of them.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** The Government argued that 1,200 acres were sufficient for a dairy farm in the Jandowae and Chinchilla areas, and should be in the Wandoan area, too. The advice of those men was rejected.

What has happened since? People have gone into that area—men and women for whom I have the greatest respect—and have had to make slaves of themselves to make not a livelihood, but a mere existence. After 12 or 15 years, many of those farmers are now on their feet. However, they now have grown-up families, and, although they have a good livelihood for themselves, they have absolutely no chance of settling their sons on the land. Those lads are leaving and taking jobs driving bulldozers or trucks, or going to the city. In my opinion—and I am pleased to see that the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation is present to hear this—the best person to settle on the land is the man who has been there since he was a child and has grown up in the country.

When we cut up land for closer settlement, I maintain that we should not view the subject from the point of view of one generation. It is much better to have a prosperous community than a struggling one. People criticise graziers who come down to the Exhibition and stay at Lennoons or the Bellevue, or wherever it may be, but they are entitled to stay there. After all, they probably come down to the city only once in 12 months, or perhaps they go to the Gold Coast or the North Coast. They are entitled to that period of relaxation because when they are on the job they are working not 40 hours a week, but from daylight till dark. Today, with falling prices and rising costs in the wool industry, they have to work hard.

As I say, in cutting up the brigalow land we must look to more than one generation. When a young man is given a piece of land, the natural thing for him to do is to develop the country and have a family. At the Country Party conference, when the Treasurer addressed farmers and graziers, he made a statement with which I agree in principle but do not subscribe to entirely. He advised them to pay their sons a salary. Any man on the land who has had to eke out an existence and develop his property realises that it is a partnership. If his son is to be trained in land matters he must be brought up to realise the hardships as well as the good things that go with the land. Paying him a salary is not the answer, but rather do I suggest that he should be brought in on a share basis. Give him 50 acres on which to grow his crops or 20 cows from which to breed his bullocks. In that way he shares in the good times, and, if he strikes a bad market, he shares in the bad times. In that way he can be brought up to be a good citizen from the point of view of developing the land.

**Mr. Aikens:** What is more, he will remain in the country.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** That is very true. He will remain in the country, which is one of the most important points. We do not

want boys in the country being told, "We just can't go on any further; you will have to go out and get a job." I believe legislation can be brought in to cut up land within the family under leasehold tenure. The tenant of leasehold country is just as entitled to be looked after in his old age as the city white-collar worker who retires on a pension. The man in the brigalow country who gives the best years of his life to developing the land does not go out on a pension. But I hold that in the best years of his life he should have the right to provide for his old age.

In the brigalow country 5,000 acres might be a living area today, but as it is developed in ten years' time half or even a quarter of that acreage might be enough for a living area as gradually it is more intensely farmed. In my view that is the way to go about developing the brigalow belt. There is no reason in the world why the brigalow country cannot be used for anything from fattening to all forms of agriculture.

Somebody asked me, "Will you go for the 40 minutes available?" I could go for an hour and 40 minutes, but my time is running out. However, I do want to say that as a new member in the Assembly I realise that hon. members opposite have a very important part to play in the government of the State. I hope that they can mould themselves into a strong Opposition. I hope, too, that I can always enjoy the respect of the Opposition without having to abuse them. If I have to resort to abuse to get the respect of anybody, I just will not get their respect. This applies also to the minor party and to the Independents.

Before my time expires I express the hope that the members of the Opposition will mould themselves into a strong, constructive body and I wish them a long life in opposition.

I should like to go further in speaking of land matters and, on the eve of his retirement, pay a tribute to Sir William Payne. On the Jimbour Plain there is a monument to the man who first introduced farming to that area. Many of the old hands on the Jimbour Plain would be pleased to have a monument erected to Sir William Payne because he was the man who, in the early twenties, saved the farmers in Jimbour when they were paying 3s. 6d. an acre rental on areas of 300 acres at a time when butter was worth 6d. a pound and wool 7d.

**Mr. Ewan:** He saved the Mount Abundance boys, too!

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** Sir William Payne was the man who went out there and slashed the rents and doubled the areas, and I feel that the old hands on Jimbour Plain, as I said, would like to see a monument erected to him alongside the monument to the man who put the first tractor on the plain.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HOUGHTON (Redcliffe) (12.37 p.m.): I should like to associate myself, and the electorate of Redcliffe, with the motion of allegiance to the Throne and to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I am also honoured to join in the remarks of previous speakers in paying tribute to the fine work done, and the understanding shown, by His Excellency the Governor and Lady May since their arrival in Queensland. I pray that they will both be spared many years to live among us and to inculcate into the people the great pioneering spirit that was so evident among our forbears and that they encourage by their welcome visits to far-flung parts of the State.

I should also like, Mr. Speaker, to offer you my heartiest congratulations on your elevation to the Speakership of this House and to assure you of my utmost loyalty to the high position you occupy.

As a new member of this august Chamber making his first address, I wish to comment on the dignity and decorum of this House, something that has left an indelible stain on my mind since I attained the right to sit here as a member. One point that has impressed itself upon my mind is the fact that some hon. members use this Chamber as a place where, under privilege, they can sink into the back of another hon. member a dagger that they could not use during the election campaign. Having been elected to Parliament, they think they have a golden opportunity to say and do things that they could not say or do outside the precincts of it without incurring serious consequences. I firmly believe that all taxpayers should attend the sittings of Parliament for the purpose of discovering whether their representatives uphold the dignity and decorum of proceedings and discharge their responsibilities to the full.

I have no intention of reflecting on the Chair. I realise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you have a very torrid time in ensuring that debates are conducted with dignity and decorum. An hon. member recently referred to an investigation into juvenile delinquency. Before that committee makes its report I sincerely hope it will extend its inquiries to this great Chamber. Children are given the opportunity of attending here during debates, and it would be very interesting to read essays by them and their impressions of their visits. I think the Government would be startled at the result and would issue the instruction, "No children are allowed within the four walls of this institution." Dignity, decorum and responsibility together should be the keynote of debates, and by upholding them we would set an example to those who visit Parliament.

Many of us subscribe to the principles of democracy, but others who are elected to Parliament allow statesmanship to fly out of the window, and adopt the role of professional politicians rather than that of the great statesmen of the past. I assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I shall endeavour at all times to uphold our great traditions

and the rights we enjoy. Although democracy must have organisation and controls, its vital breath is individual liberty. Despite the many forcible statements we hear about discrimination, all hon. members are equal. I have been given an office in "Uncle Tom's Cabin." I do not know whether I was despatched to that place by Mr. Simon Legree or Mr. Speaker, but the facilities and conveniences beggar description. When two or three interviews are taking place in one room, it is absolutely impossible to give constituents the service to which they are entitled. Accommodation of that standard is a shocking indictment of the Government, and I sincerely hope it will not be long before they remedy the position by providing proper facilities.

It has been said that losses of privileges do occur. From my experience generally, and also as an ex-service man, I feel that these privileges are often abused to such an extent that it will not be very long before we find that the Government will take them away. That will be simply because they have been abused by various members of this House and it is something that calls for the closest scrutiny by everybody.

I have the honour to represent the electorate of Redcliffe. I am very proud that the election was fought with the utmost respect by all parties. I hope I will continue to be their elected representative for many, many years. If I do, I assure hon. members that I shall enjoy it.

I wish to point out certain events that occurred during the election campaign, events that may have passed unnoticed by the Government. I believe that the Government's campaigning assisted me greatly. I deem it an honour that they had to bring the Deputy Prime Minister of Australia to the electorate of Redcliffe to campaign against me. However, I am here as the elected representative of the great electorate of Redcliffe and as a representative for this great State of Queensland. I hope and pray that I shall be able to contribute something material to the development of this great State of ours that will be beneficial to us all as the years go by.

Party politics, admittedly, have played a very important part in the development of this State. However, there are often times when the people of this State are sadly neglected, simply because, in many respects, the party machine overrides the individual's rights. I can assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that at all times I will express my disapproval, or approval, of any legislation that comes forward, and I will simply forget the party machine.

I have the honour to be associated with local authorities, which play a very important part in the development of the State. I am sure all hon. members will agree with me that the development of this State is vested in a partnership between the State Government and the local authorities. The people who make up the local authorities play a

very important part in its development. The local authorities are the form of government closest to the people, and know the requirements of the people far better than does any other form of government.

I agree entirely with the comment about moving the Cabinet from place to place in the State. Such a system would give all cities and all areas the opportunity of seeing the Government in action, and it would also present an opportunity for bringing before the Government some of the difficulties that are being, and must be, experienced in a young State developing as rapidly as is Queensland. When a district has the honour and privilege of a visit from a Cabinet Minister, it is usual for the local authority to fete him and give him every assistance and every consideration, and that is reciprocated by him; but so far the Government have not seen fit to entertain the local-authority representatives who come to Brisbane in August every year to conduct business of great importance to the State. I draw the Minister's attention to the omission and express the hope that, before long, the Government will see fit to give local-authority representatives in conference an opportunity to mingle with Cabinet Ministers and not rely on the generosity of the Shell Company, Tutt Bryant, or some other such organisation to entertain them. I am sure it has been an oversight on the part of the Government and I know that local-authority representatives will appreciate an opportunity to come face to face with Cabinet Ministers and other Government representatives, and with public servants.

I have often interviewed public servants and I know they contribute a great deal towards the development of the State. They are always helpful, although they are sometimes inconsiderate simply because now and again an utterly foolish decision is made. We cannot expect the Minister in charge of the department concerned to accept responsibility; it is only after overtures, or representations, are made to him that such mistakes can be corrected.

As a local authority representative, I suggest, too, that the Government give serious consideration to the selection of at least two suitable candidates in certain categories for a trip abroad each year. Instead of sending Cabinet Ministers or other politicians, let them send public servants—engineers, shire clerks, and town clerks. At least two engineers and two shire clerks should be sent abroad each year.

**Mr. Pizzey:** Half-a-dozen go every year now.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** I have not been lucky enough to be selected yet; I sincerely hope the Government will consider it one of these days. The officers should be given the chance to see what is going on in other countries. It is interesting to hear the Minister interject that half-a-dozen go. I suggest that the candidates should be chosen from all over

the State and not from Queen Street or somewhere close to Brisbane. There are many excellent officers in country areas and they could learn much from their counterparts abroad, with great benefit to Queensland. After all, governments come and go, and so do politicians; undoubtedly one of these days, either through age or through the wishes of the electors, they will all finish up with a bowler hat.

Transport is very important to Redcliffe, served, as it is, by the Hornibrook Highway—a structure built by Sir Manuel Hornibrook many years ago. He was a man of great vision and the bridge has proved a valuable asset to the area and helped its rapid development. Since the end of the last war the population of Redcliffe has been increasing at the rate of 10 per cent. a year. That is greater than the increase in any other electorate in Queensland, the average increase being approximately 2 per cent. That will give hon. members some idea of the difficulties we are now experiencing, particularly with local-authority work and transport.

The toll on the Hornibrook Highway vitally affects persons living in the Redcliffe electorate. The only other toll that I know of is that on the Indooroopilly Bridge. I realise that the Government could not relieve the electors of Redcliffe of this burden at present, but I suggest that they might give serious consideration to including Redcliffe in the metropolitan rail electrification scheme.

**Mr. Windsor:** How long has the franchise to go?

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** I think it has 18 years to go. I believe that transport problems in the Redcliffe electorate should receive the urgent attention of the Government because census figures reveal that within seven years the Hornibrook Highway will be carrying the greatest volume of traffic that it is capable of handling. Since the increase in valuations on the South Coast, more people are going to the North Coast. Redcliffe has been revalued, and I hope that in four years' time, when the next revaluation is due, the present methods of valuation will have been abandoned. In my opinion, the Government should extend the rail electrification scheme to the Redcliffe area; but if they believe that, as with the railways generally, electrification is now outmoded, they should consider at least the provision of hovercraft, or the monorail, or some other new transport system. As over 4,000 people who live in the city of Redcliffe travel to the City of Brisbane daily, I think hon. members will realise that the railway service to Sandgate is operated mainly to meet the needs of the people of Redcliffe.

On the information available to the Redcliffe City Council, it is obvious that if vehicle registration increases at the current rate, in approximately seven years' time the Hornibrook Highway will not be able to serve the transport requirements of the Redcliffe Peninsula. I suggest that the Government

immediately discuss with Hornibrook Highway Ltd. their franchise and give further consideration to allowing them to build another bridge upstream to take traffic on the Bruce Highway to North Coast resorts and further north. As the company enjoys a franchise within a three-mile limit of the present bridge, it is a matter for co-operation between it and the Government. I hope the Government will give serious consideration to this matter, which so vitally affects transport to the Near North Coast.

A survey is being undertaken on behalf of the Redcliffe City Council for the construction of a road to join up with the road that the Government intend to build in the future to cross the Pine River in the vicinity of Bald Hills. I urge that the Government give that project the highest priority because of its importance to the people living in the area.

A matter that requires the close attention of the Minister for Transport is the extension of a through-transport system to Redcliffe. At the present time through transport terminates at Sandgate. The electors of Redcliffe are entitled to the same consideration as the residents of Wynnum and Manly. They should have equal rights with Wynnum electors, even though it would mean operating a transport system in competition with the railways. It appears that the Government have given very little consideration to extending the railway system to Redcliffe. If they are not prepared to give Redcliffe residents a direct rail service, at least they should give them a bus service direct to the city, thus obviating their having to use a co-ordinated service via Sandgate.

We are not in competition with the railways in interstate trade. The railways are playing a useful part in the development of the State, but the horse-and-buggy days are over and circumstances have changed greatly. The railways still have a very important part to play but road transport must eventually, in many ways, take the place of the railways. The Government will have to give serious consideration to allowing fair competition between road and rail transport in the development of the State. Redcliffe is greatly dependent upon road transport because of the lack of a direct rail link. Local authorities are permitted to import pipes from Carmilla, New South Wales, for their water schemes, for which they receive Government subsidies. But the Redcliffe City Council has been told by the Government that unless it brings its pipes from Carmilla to Clapham Junction, and then from Clapham Junction to the Redcliffe depot by rail it will be denied its subsidy. That is very unfair, because every time the pipes are handled there is a loss of from 5 to 10 per cent. in breakages. That warrants close scrutiny by the Government. The present state of affairs is implementing the Communist doctrine of destroying as much as possible. The Government, by that kind of

action, are contributing towards disunity and, I should say, subscribing to Communist policy.

**Mr. Aikens** interjected.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** I say without equivocation that anybody who treats with Communists has no place in my politics, whether he is in the trade-union movement or anywhere else.

While I have the opportunity at a time when the Minister for Health and Home Affairs is in the House, I shall deal with something that is associated with hospital services on the Redcliffe Peninsula. Eighteen acres of land were set aside for hospital purposes three years ago and the Minister, when on a visit to that part of the State, stated openly that after the public hospital at Southport had been completed, we would be the next on the list for attention. But what do we find today? The Minister has given our block of land to an outside order—the Sisters of the Holy Spirit. I have taken the matter up with the Government and, as in other matters, they have tried to draw a red herring across the trail with an accusation of bigotry.

I have no truck with bigotry. As a matter of fact, I admire the development that has taken place on the Peninsula through this order. The Reverend Monsignor Frawley, who established it there has done great credit to the area and has assisted greatly in the establishment of schools. He is a close friend of mine, and I am only too happy to help. I will assist any order, but in this matter the Government have not been sincere. They have taken our land without any reference to us and devoted it to other purposes.

Hon. members will know that, when public lands are disposed of, it must be done by public auction or public tender. What provision has been made for the electors of Redcliffe, who, through these machinations of the Minister, have been deprived of the protection of a hospital in the future? The Minister has looked at it with a jaundiced eye, and I ask him for the information of hon. members, to lay upon the table the whole file relative to the surrender of the hospital site at Redcliffe. If the Government feel that they are unable, through bankruptcy or any other reason, to build a hospital at Redcliffe, I would say that they defaulted in all respects in not submitting the land, by auction or tender, to other organisations that might be desirous of building a hospital. Does the Minister know whether the Salvation Army, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, or anybody else, were desirous of building a hospital? The first information we got of the action taken was an Order in Council under which he gave the land away, and he is apparently not prepared to have another site gazetted for future hospital services on the Redcliffe Peninsula—a gross miscarriage of justice that I lay at the door of the Minister.

**Dr. Noble:** Are they going to build a public hospital?

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** I am asking the questions. The electors of Redcliffe have been sadly let down on their public hospital. We are entitled to the same consideration as Southport or any other centre. I would not deny Injune a hospital, but I do deny to the Minister and the Government the right to give away Redcliffe's land without giving others the right to tender for it.

**Mr. Aikens:** Was your council consulted before the land was alienated?

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** We are always being insulted. The electors of Redcliffe have been let down very badly in this matter.

Furthermore, the formula adopted by the Minister for hospital services may be satisfactory in theory, but the 10 per cent. annual increase in population of my area should be taken into account. The Minister has said that a 100-bed public hospital will be built, although he does not say when it will be built. I suppose it will be a Kathleen Mavourneen affair such as we have experienced when dealing with other departments. They keep a skeleton in the cupboard and produce it a few weeks before an election. Let the Government build a public hospital at Redcliffe without further delay.

I throw further fuel on the fire by stating that the council has asked repeatedly that it be allowed to use its own premises for the implementation of its work. I have said already that I am now accommodated in "Uncle Tom's Cabin," but prior to that I was behind the front door in the council chambers simply because the Minister for Health and Home Affairs has not seen fit to provide facilities for the medical and dental clinic, which operates in the council chambers. An hon. member this morning gave notice of a question about magpies. If the Minister goes to Redcliffe he will see the plight of electors in that city who go to those clinics for treatment. They have to sit underneath a tree like peewees and magpies while waiting for treatment.

**Dr. Noble** interjected.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** You are the magpie.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** I have the utmost respect for the electors, which is more than the Minister can claim. The clinic facilities are a disgrace to a city such as Redcliffe. Dr. Richards and his staff do an excellent job, but the primitive conditions under which they work are a disgrace. The dental officer would be equal to any in the Commonwealth; he deserves the utmost consideration. It is not humanly possible to attend to 90 patients within the prescribed visit of two hours. The doctor and the dental officer are worthy

of the highest commendation. Having regard to the number of patients whom they attend, they do their 40 hours' work in two hours.

**Mr. Aikens:** If these sort of things are going on, no wonder you were elected by a big majority.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** And it will be bigger next time, and I will have the hospital by then.

Furthermore, the community of Redcliffe subscribed money for certain articles in a small community hospital that operated until a few months ago. That equipment, bought by public subscription, was taken away and deposited in the new building at Southport. I do not know whether the Minister is aware that that was done.

**Mr. Aikens:** Shocking!

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** That is the treatment meted out to electors of Redcliffe who require hospitalisation. It is a shocking indictment of the Minister and the Government.

I shall have time to deal with only one other matter. Redcliffe has 10 policemen. As a law-abiding city it has no equal in the Commonwealth. The 10 policemen stationed there do an excellent job. When the Deputy Premier visited the area during the election campaign, one of the policemen was on beat duty. The Deputy Premier saw my vehicle with an electioneering sign on it and he said to the policeman, "Get him. Make him pay the 10s." I ask the Deputy Premier through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how many others he instructed the police sergeant to collect fees from. If the S.E.A., or others, enjoy the right to advertising, surely the electors, or people seeking election, are entitled to have canvas or calico signs on their cars.

**Mr. Morris:** I did not give them any instructions to that effect. It is news to me.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** I accept the Minister's explanation.

There is another matter: I am prepared to look after the development of Redcliffe, and any further development of this State. I am big enough to appreciate the difficulties that confront the Government. All I ask is that faithful and due consideration be given to the electors of Redcliffe, and I will be quite prepared to co-operate with the Government to the utmost of my ability on anything that will benefit this great State and its people.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I should like to point out again to new members a rule of practice that is permitted in this House that, by the special indulgence of the House, a member unable conveniently to stand by reason of sickness or infirmity is permitted to speak sitting with head uncovered.

**Mr. DEAN** (Sandgate) (2.32 p.m.): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would rather stand. However, I thank you for the courtesy extended to me on this occasion. I feel extremely gratified this afternoon to stand in this historic Chamber as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland.

On behalf of the people of the electorate of Sandgate, and on my own behalf, I have pleasure in expressing loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I am also completely in accord with what has been said by previous speakers about His Excellency Sir Henry Abel Smith and Lady May. I agree heartily with their eulogistic references to those two very distinguished people. Sir Henry and Lady May are very fitting representatives of Her Majesty and are continuing the excellent work that was done by our noble Queenslander, Sir John Lavarack, who did a marvellous job for the State. I am very happy to support my colleagues on that subject.

I am sorry that Mr. Speaker is not present, but in his absence I add my congratulations to him on the office that he has been elevated to. I feel sure that he will not be insensible to the great tasks and responsibility imposed on him in the office that he holds.

I trust it will be realised that, although I come here as a new member—and I am deeply conscious of that—I have had a fair amount of experience in public life. Over the last six days I have been trying with at least some success, to gain an understanding of the feeling and the atmosphere of this Chamber. I now find myself enjoying some degree of comfort, and some degree of mental relaxation, and I hope to make a suitable speech. I am enjoying a degree of mental comfort, but it is offset by some physical discomfort. I have never experienced a more uncomfortable place to sit in than this Chamber. I say that without any fear of contradiction. We have only to cast our eyes around the Chamber and see the varying postures of others to realise their discomfort. They do everything but lie down—and I have heard that at times they have to resort to that position to get some comfort. The seating in the council chamber that I have come from is extremely comfortable, so hon. members will readily realise that the impact of the discomforts of this Chamber on me is very great indeed.

I have listened carefully to the maiden speeches of the various hon. members and I have learned much about the needs of the State. One subject that I thought my municipal colleague from Redcliffe would dwell on was the one we are both interested in—the local authorities' sphere—but, I suppose happily for me, he did not spend much time on it except from a domestic point of view. So I feel quite justified in speaking this afternoon on the subject of local government, with its implications in the community and the great bearing it has on everyday life.

I am sure it will be agreed that many hon. members are lamentably ignorant of the

work of local authorities and that anyone who comes to this Assembly having had the privilege and honour to serve on a local authority comes with a definite advantage. Over the years, that has been exemplified in reverse; some of the decisions made in this Chamber by politicians who have not had the advantage of an intimate knowledge of local authority work have been deplorable, to say the least, and the impact of those decisions on the community has been very bad. I sincerely hope that, with my municipal colleagues on both sides of the Chamber, we will be able to contribute something of value to the debates on local government and other matters of local interest.

I think, too, that we should pay respect and homage to those who have served on local authorities in the past. The great strides made in the development of Queensland have been due entirely to the efforts of those serving on the various councils throughout the State. Experience of that kind is needed in the State Parliament, and it is needed even more in the Federal sphere. I have heard in broadcasts from Canberra, and I have read, remarks made by Federal members about local authorities, including distinct reflections on them. Such references are very detrimental and damaging to the public mind and against the public good. Only recently in a local-authority magazine a Federal member was reported as passing some very derogatory remarks about local authorities. He belittled them to such an extent that he was challenged. I take him to task for that. Attacks of that kind are in very bad form and are mostly brought about through a complete ignorance of the subject. The local authorities of Queensland have played a vital role in the State's development. If they were given more consideration by the State, and the Commonwealth, they could play an even greater part.

A very narrow attitude towards the local authorities that I have had anything to do with has been adopted by State Governments of the past and present; I do not exclude any of them. The subject of subsidies comes immediately to mind. Some subsidies are so meagre that the local authorities cannot do the work for which they were elected. As an example I cite the Brisbane City Council, on which I have served for very many years. The small amount of finance we have had to carry out important projects within the city of Brisbane—whose population is close on 600,000—has at times caused dismay and disgust to those trying to administer the city's affairs. I know, of course—as you do, Mr. Deputy Speaker—that the greatest weakness in our local government structure is the outmoded method of finance. In Queensland, local authorities depend almost entirely for their revenue on rates levied upon the unimproved value of land. That system of levying rates dates back to the early days of Queensland, to the days of Sir Samuel Griffith. It was

thought to be the most suitable method in those days but I suggest that it is clearly outmoded in 1960, even though few other sources of revenue are open to local authorities.

From time to time Governments interfere with the local-authority structure. If the brake is not put on both the State and Federal Governments, local government will virtually disappear. It will be a very sad day when that happens. Local authorities in Queensland have played their part in the development of the State, but city councils and shire councils can carry out the work necessary for the development of their own particular areas only if they have sufficient funds. Many hundreds of people work in shire councils, and many of them work voluntarily. They do that purely from a sense of citizenship and a sense of being part of the community in which they live, and they do a magnificent job. The difficulties they face in their task are really enormous, and in many cases a little extra money would enable them to carry their projects through to a successful conclusion. As I said, if we are to preserve our system of local government we must overhaul and reconstruct our present methods of raising money.

It is very unfortunate, too, that the State Government have for some time imposed taxes upon the local authorities of Queensland. Perhaps that is a provocative statement to make, but if I explain what I mean and clarify my statement, hon members will realise that what I say is correct. Some of those taxes are the transport tax, charges by the State Electricity Commission, and registration fees. The diesel oil tax levied by the Commonwealth Government was a shocking imposition. Having served as an alderman of the Brisbane City Council, I am aware of the many millions of pounds that this Government, and other State Governments, have received from the Commonwealth Aid, Local Authority Roads, Fund. From the inauguration of this scheme till June 30, 1960, Queensland received £48,031,602. What have the Government paid to the local authorities of Queensland? Only 20 per cent. of that amount was paid out, and I think that the Brisbane City Council, of which I have some personal knowledge, has received the rawest deal of all.

It must be conceded that the Brisbane City Council has the greatest responsibility of all local authorities. It carries the responsibility of a city—the capital city of the State. Out of more than £48,000,000, since the inception of the scheme the Brisbane City Council has received the magnificent sum of £310,000 to be used for the development of rural roads within the city area! It cannot use that money for any other purpose. The largest amount ever received for the purpose was £65,050, this year. When it is remembered that the population of the city is approaching 600,000, representing nearly 40 per cent. of the total population of the State, and that 40 per cent.

of the motor vehicles registered in Queensland are either domiciled in Brisbane or use roads in Brisbane that are constructed by the Brisbane City Council, the injustice will be readily recognised.

The greatest sin of all in the distribution of the money from the Commonwealth Aid, Local Authority Roads, Fund, is committed by giving full authority for this distribution to the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity. He has sole control of the allocation of this money to local authorities throughout Queensland. Obviously he places the greatest emphasis on rural roads and country roads, particularly outside the Brisbane area. Very little regard is paid to the arterial road system within the city itself.

In case any hon. member entertains the idea that I am suggesting in any way that the Brisbane City Council should receive a pro-rata amount of this money from the fund, I point out that I realise that the interests of the country are paramount. But it must be conceded that roads in the capital city of the State should receive more consideration than those of any shire system. If more consideration is not given to local authorities, the Brisbane City Council and other councils should have direct access to the Federal authorities in the allocation of the money. It is not just that since the inauguration of the scheme we should have received only £310,000 out of £48,000,000. It is a matter to ponder upon. I have no doubt that the Treasurer will refer to the various subsidies that the council receives, but they are infinitesimal compared with what the New South Wales Government make available to the City of Sydney Council. The Government of New South Wales bore almost the whole of the cost of the Cahill Expressway, and I understand that they have committed themselves to subsidies amounting to £4,500,000 out of a total cost of £5,000,000 for the Sydney Expressway. In that city the Government recognise that traffic will become choked unless expressways are provided. I remind hon. members that the cost of that project was not borne by the rate-payers of the city of Sydney; it was paid for out of Federal Aid money and other revenues collected from the whole of the State of New South Wales. Unless this Government face up to the problem of Brisbane city traffic and apply a considerable amount of money from the Federal Aid Fund towards the construction of main roads, traffic congestion will become chaotic and the cost of remedying it will be prohibitive.

The Brisbane City Council is entitled to a far greater share of the money than it has had in the past, particularly when one realises that it is anticipated that the population of Brisbane will reach 1,000,000 by 1981. No time should be wasted in applying for an increased grant of Federal Aid money. Not only do the Federal Government not make adequate moneys available from the

Commonwealth Aid, Local Authority Roads Fund, but the State Government actually tax local authorities. One tax that surely cannot be defended by any fair-minded person is the State transport tax that is levied on bus passengers. Last year the Brisbane City Council paid to the State Transport Commission an amount of £37,000 to operate its own buses on its own roads, which are built and maintained by the council. It must also be remembered that that amount was paid at a time when the Brisbane City Council Transport Department was a heavy drain on the council's general finances. It is becoming a greater burden every day, so surely no justification can be found for such a tax upon a local authority. In addition to that, registration fees on the council's own busses amount to £18,000. Registration fees to that amount were paid by the council last year to run its own busses on its own city roads.

I feel that I have touched sufficiently upon the subject of local authorities. I know that when one gets onto a subject with which one is fairly conversant it is hard to leave it; I know also that it becomes rather boring and can become uncomfortable for listeners, so I think I can leave local authority matters at that. I have said enough to generate some thought on the subject, thought that might perhaps bring some action in the future when we have an opportunity of debating local-authority matters.

In the time at my disposal I wish to touch on certain other matters of importance to my electorate. I think hon. members are aware that the electorate I have the honour to represent is a bayside resort. I can go so far as to say that it is looked upon as one of the leading bayside resorts on the coast and, with a little more help from the Government, we could make it one of the natural playgrounds of Queensland.

Despite that fact, the people of Sandgate have been disappointed at the lack of consideration by State Governments over the years. Sandgate has not been blessed with generous assistance from the various Governments. As the hon. member for Redcliffe was speaking with some force about the way his council has been treated, I could not help but feel sympathy for him. I think many others feel likewise when considering the local-authority matters. One way in which the Government could assist my area would be in the implementation of a sewerage scheme. Redcliffe is further advanced than the Sandgate area in that it has commenced a sewerage scheme. There is no suggestion that one will be started in the Sandgate area, but the council would be very happy to co-operate with the Government in that work if the Government could help it by granting a special loan or subsidising council expenditure. The installation of sewerage would improve Sandgate as a tourist resort. The district is potentially a tourist resort. If it had certain refinements such as sewerage, it could hold its own with any resort on the coast.

The hon. member for Redcliffe referred to medical and dental services in his area. I am concerned in the same way about those services in the Sandgate area. In many ways they are archaic. Medical officers have to work under very overcrowded conditions. The accommodation at the Sandgate Medical Clinic has become inadequate and, with an increase in population and a consequent greater demand for attention, a larger building will be necessary.

For many years we have been promised a clerk of petty sessions office at Sandgate. I was informed recently that a clerk of petty sessions office for Sandgate was approved by the Government in their last term of office. I sincerely hope that they will implement the plan during their present term of office. I do not want to get any credit for it, but I shall be happy to see it in the area.

The building of more homes and the increase in population in my electorate have meant increased school enrolments. A new high school was constructed last year, and I think in time its record will be equal to that of any high school in the State. But the older schools need some attention. The Sandgate Primary School seems to have been left by the wayside. The Government may have decided that it has dwindled in importance with the movement of population to the outer areas, but the teachers there still have to carry a very heavy load. The grounds are in urgent need of improvement. The rear of the property is unsuitable as a playground and I ask the Government to restore it to proper condition. The small amount that would be required to build a concrete wall and a safety fence would be well worth while, having regard to the benefit that the children would derive.

On behalf of the people of the Deagon area, I express resentment and disappointment at the excision of that area from the Sandgate electorate. It is very close to the Sandgate district, but with the redistribution of electoral boundaries it was included in the Nudgee electorate. That has destroyed the community interest that existed between the Deagon people and their Sandgate friends. I ask the Government to consider amending the Act to include Deagon in the Sandgate area. It is not a large district but it is fairly heavily populated, and the people definitely want to be in the Sandgate area. I am not urging this step from a selfish viewpoint, because I get support from all areas in the electorate; I am not making my suggestion in order to get more votes at the next election. The inclusion of Deagon in my electorate would simply mean that I would be returned with a larger majority.

Finally, before leaving the subject of local development, I wish to pay a compliment to the Town Clerk and the staff of the Brisbane City Council for the way in which they helped me during the last eight years. I consider that the staff at the Brisbane City Council is equal to, if not better than, that

in some State departments, and I have had the privilege of working with both Federal and State departments during the years. The members of the Brisbane City Council staff are very efficient, and compare favourably with any public servants with whom I have had anything to do.

There is another item I should like to refer to before my time expires. I refer to something that occurred in this House six days ago in a speech by the hon. member for Bundaberg about the lift outside this Chamber. I wish to make it quite clear that I do not in any way associate myself with, or support in any way, the remarks of the hon. member for Bundaberg concerning the placing of the lift. I, for one, thoroughly appreciate the Government's action in installing a lift. I cannot understand why it was not installed years ago.

I am sorry that the hon. member for Bundaberg is not present. I may not get another opportunity for a long time to ventilate my feelings on this matter, so I feel honour bound to express the strong feelings that I had last week when he made a derogatory reference to the placing of the lift and the waste of money putting it there. All I can say is that I do not know why it was not put there years ago. The hon. member previously held senior ministerial rank in this House and could have exercised influence to have it put there. I cannot understand his placing himself in the open by saying what he did.

While I am on the subject, the hon. member for Bundaberg aroused my feelings to a certain extent when he mentioned certain repairs and improvements to this House. When, some weeks ago we attended a garden party a few feet from the wall of this Chamber, I feel sure that the feelings of many hon. members and their guests must have been filled with dismay as they looked at the dilapidated building bordering the lawn. I have been closely associated with local authorities, and from time to time, we have had to invoke council ordinances on certain buildings. If Parliament House and its adjacent buildings were owned by a private individual, the ordinances of the Brisbane City Council would be invoked tomorrow to make him do something about them. When hon. members go out on the lawn and look around at the buildings outside, they must find it hard to understand why the hon. member for Bundaberg should raise the matter. Here again he had nothing to commend him for making such a reference. From my observations, I should say that the white ants are well and truly entrenched in many parts of the buildings. That is not good, and it has not been good government to allow it to take place. Once a public authority takes on a public trust, such as buildings, the people outside place them in our trust. They entrust us to look after them to a certain extent and keep them in decent repair, because we are using them

only temporarily. In this case, the hon. member seems to have some feeling of delight in talking about what he regards as a waste of money on something of a valuable and historic nature; something that is virtually irreplaceable. We could not replace this building with the same atmosphere, or the same historic value. It could be replaced, but we could not rebuild into it what now exists. That is why I say it does the hon. member no good to raise these matters. I am surprised that some hon. member did not take him to task earlier. I felt it my bounden duty to refer to it. I disagree with him entirely. What has been done lately should have been done years ago.

The brief note I have before me reminds me of something one hon. member said about personal freedom and the destruction of our constitutional rights. I think the time is now ripe for this Government to take steps to restore to the people their rights to a public domain. I do not think they have ever had the privilege as we have here, of being able to enter a domain and express themselves. We are privileged people. We can come here and say almost anything we like. We have a very wide range of expression indeed, and we use it; we are fully protected. But Mr. and Mrs. Citizen outside have not that right. That is not fair, and it is not democratic.

Recently we lost a further part of the Brisbane Domain. It has never been used for the purpose for which it was set aside by our forefathers, and it never will be. Sydney has a plot of ground, and so has London, where people can go to give full vent to their feelings on religion or any other subject and then go away and feel satisfied. But in Brisbane we have no such place.

I do not ask the Government to return the Domain to the city; it is too late for that—some of it has already been excised for another purpose—but I ask them to give the people another area of land, and even to go to the extent of asking the Brisbane City Council to make one of the parks available for use as a public forum. We often brag about cherishing and preserving our freedoms, but in Queensland, and in its capital city, we do very little about it. So I strongly urge that one of the parks of Brisbane be set aside as a public place for people to exercise their democratic rights as citizens should be able to in a democratic country.

**Mr. CAMPBELL** (Aspley) (3.7 p.m.): I join with other hon. members in expressing my loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. At the swearing-in ceremony last week we were reminded that we are now in the ninth year of her reign and I feel sure hon. members will agree that, in this part of her dominion, they have been nine happy, prosperous and peaceful years.

In the absence of Mr. Speaker, I congratulate him on his appointment to high office in the Chamber. His appointment is

of particular interest to me because, following his election in 1950, he was my representative in this House, as was the Premier before him.

We on this side of the House can congratulate ourselves on our choice of Ministers. They were specialists in their private capacities and they have brought to the administration of government the experience they gained over the years in their former avocations. I am reminded of the seemingly generous comments on our contemplated Ministers when, during the 1957 election campaign, our opponents said, "These Liberals and Country Party chaps are nice, decent fellows, but you could not entrust them with the government of the country because they have had no experience." It was perfectly true that they had had no experience in government, though they had had quite a long experience of observing other people who were perhaps doing some things they should not have done while they were in charge of the Government. Nevertheless, I am quite sure that in the next three years Cabinet will continue its sound administration and that projects that were started in the Government's previous term of office will be completed.

I should like to thank the electors of Aspley for the confidence they have shown in me, and I hope and pray that I shall not be found wanting. I also pay tribute to my opponents in the recent election. The Aspley campaign was one of the cleanest in Queensland. I was in the rather peculiar position of having a woman as one of my opponents. Being of a somewhat chivalrous nature this imposed certain limitations upon me, but I pay tribute to a very gallant little lady for the very strong fight that she put up.

The Aspley electorate came into being as a result of the recent redistribution. It was made a new electorate because of the tremendous development in that part of Brisbane, a development that has taken place over the whole perimeter of the city. It has taken place only in the last eight to ten years, and even now it is hard to visualise that in that short time fine houses and well-kept gardens have been established on land that previously was used for market gardens, dairy farms, poultry farms, and other rural pursuits. No doubt the type of soil that supported those industries previously will ensure that Aspley will become the garden suburb of Brisbane.

The main need in my electorate is for the provision of essential services. I entirely agree with the hon. member for Sandgate that attention must be given to this aspect of administration in the near future, because it seems to me that expansion is outstripping our ability to provide facilities to meet that expansion.

Drainage at Zillmere is one of the biggest problems in my electorate. The Treasurer and Minister for Housing inherited that

problem. I am not going to comment at this stage on the administrative acts of the previous Minister for Housing, but the drainage problem is very serious and I hope it will not be very long before it is overcome, as it has been overcome in other Housing Commission areas. Only a few months ago there was a drowning fatality in one of the bailer sumps that have been used in Housing Commission homes. In addition, a very obnoxious smell develops in wet weather. These conditions have existed for over nine years, and I think the tenants there have been very tolerant in putting up with them. The Treasurer and Minister for Housing looked into the problem some months ago, and he said that if he decided to spend the money required to remedy the defect, it would limit his ability to provide additional houses. He wisely decided in favour of providing more homes for more people, although he said that he was negotiating with the Brisbane City Council to work out a scheme whereby the defect could be remedied. I hope it will not be long before that very distressing problem is solved.

I should like to pay a tribute to the Department of Education for the manner in which it has kept abreast of the demand for schooling facilities. In a growing area the demands made on the school service have been very great indeed. Although some inconveniences have been suffered by both teachers and pupils they, nevertheless, have been relatively light. The Government showed great foresight in their first term of office by deciding to concentrate much of their developmental effort on the provision of adequate schooling facilities for children. I pay a tribute to the teaching staff. From my observations of the schools in the Aspley electorate I am quite satisfied that the teachers are dedicated to their task. This is very desirable because, after all, they are moulding the thoughts and lives of the State's future citizens.

The electorate of Aspley is made up partly of portion of the former Kedron electorate and partly of portion of the former Cherm-side electorate. The Kedron end is a well-settled area that has developed over many years; the Aspley end is in the process of tremendous development. From the time of the closing of the electoral rolls to the issuing of the supplementary rolls, approximately 1,000 more people became enrolled for that part of the electorate. It makes one wonder what the enrolment will be in the next two or three years.

As I have had some association with the poultry industry, no doubt it is expected that I make some comments on it. They would have been very brief but for the fact that over the years some rather mischievous statements have been made in the Chamber about the poultry industry, just as there have been some very unwise administrative acts by former Governments. I hope my remarks will not be likened to those of the speaker,

who, when introducing himself, said that he did not know much about the subject, and then spent the next hour demonstrating the truth of his statement.

It is not generally realised that the poultry industry ranks with the major primary-producing industries of the State and the Commonwealth. Its chief product, the egg, is one of nature's most nutritious substances as it contains every vitamin known, except C—and some yet unknown—and almost every mineral. It is necessarily a high-cost industry because the fowl does not possess the grazing habits of other livestock. Consequently all the required rations have to be purchased, and thus the poultry industry makes a tremendous contribution to other primary industries and has a beneficial impact on the price of many commodities. It is the chief consumer of bran and pollard. One of the grudges the industry has had against past Governments was the fact that they too readily loaded the price it had to pay for bran and pollard in order to keep down the cost of bread. I suppose that was an illustration of the greatest good for the greatest number. If it were not for the use that the poultry industry makes of bran and pollard, flour millers would be at their wits' end to dispose of their product.

Next to the flour-milling industry, the poultry industry is the greatest consumer of wheat. An interesting point is that the poultry industry is able to convert inferior grades of wheat to a high-quality food product. There are times when, against our wishes, we have had to accept very low grades of wheat but, nevertheless, we have been able to use it.

In addition, the poultry industry consumes large quantities of the coarse grains—maize, sorghum, barley, and other crops. Indeed, it fostered the growth of grain sorghum in this State and poultry farmers had great difficulty in inducing farmers to go in for that crop, which, in the last 20 years, has become one of our main grain products.

The poultry industry is an important consumer of meatworks by-products, and again we say that we are able to convert what is regarded as offal into a highly nutritious food. The price we pay for the meat by-product has some bearing on keeping down the price to the consumers of meat. Stock-feeders in this State are very concerned at the shortage of protein meals because of the increasing use of concentrates, not only by the poultry industry but by all livestock feeders. It seems that unless something is done the demand will outstrip the supply. This will be particularly evident in the next 12 months because of the short runs that the meatworks have had, and we have not in this country an alternative supply of protein meals. One of the solutions to the problem would be to foster the soya bean industry in this State, because the soya bean is of tremendous value as a stock food. It contains approximately 40 per cent. of protein. In the United States

and elsewhere soya bean is the basis of protein in all stock food rations and great quantities of it are produced. Fortunately for the United States, it has such a population that it can consume the oils that are extracted from the soya bean. They are used either for manufacturing or for food purposes. I know that to suggest doing that here would run counter to the butter producers' interests, but it is seriously suggested by reliable authorities that some butter producers could get a better return from the production of vegetable oils than from the production of butter fat.

I do not wish to buy further into this argument, but I do emphasise that the shortage of protein could have a very serious effect on our livestock industries in time to come. A little known but valuable role of the humble egg is its use in medical research. It is the main vehicle for the production of vaccines and the culture of a great variety of viruses and, being relatively sterile, it is ideal for that purpose.

A dramatic development in the poultry industry in the last two years has been the production of the meat chicken, and no doubt in the last month or so hon. members have read articles in the local Press about it. It is based upon a practical application of scientific research in the United States of America. The technique has been introduced recently into this country, with the result that poultry meat will soon cease to be regarded as a luxury. As the programme develops, it will be placed before the consumers at a price considerably lower than that for the better cuts of meat.

The poultry industry has never received, nor has it sought, any assistance by way of subsidy although there have been periods when some sections of the industry have considered that a subsidy might be desirable. As it believes in self-help, the poultry industry voluntarily levies itself to make extra funds available to the Department of Agriculture and Stock. Through that medium we are able to help the department to make available very necessary extension services for the industry. The contribution of the poultry industry to the Department of Agriculture and Stock is quite considerable. The poultry industry sponsored one of the State's most successful co-operative organisations. At the present time there are 18,000 shareholders on the roll and the annual turnover of the Society exceeds £3,000,000.

The poultry industry was early in the field of orderly marketing, and so soundly was the organisation developed here that all other States, when considering the establishment of similar organisations, modelled them on the Queensland Egg Marketing Board.

For 35 years the marketing board has operated successfully in the interests of the producer and the consumer. But at the present time it is confronted with a very real

marketing problem. It is vigorously endeavouring to cope with the problem, but it is hampered tremendously by the proximity of Brisbane to the border of the State and the fact that some people are thus able to take advantage of Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution and evade the provisions of the marketing board regulations.

There is no way in the world that Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution will be altered. I understand that other marketing organisations are confronted with the same problem, and I suggest that they will have to dovetail their regulations so that they coincide with Section 92 and do not run counter to it, as they do at present.

It would appear that there is a marked division of opinion on the subject of the marketing regulations because of the effect of Section 92, and the ability with which a lawyer is able to argue in court has a great bearing on the court's judgments. That being so, we should not think too harshly of those who seek to disregard the provisions of the State's marketing regulations.

I have been speaking of the development of the meat chicken, and I should like to emphasise the important part played by agricultural scientists in that development. That is one of the great problems confronting this State today. Immense development has taken place in secondary industries in the last 10 years—through the medium of automation and electronics—and will continue to take place and a parallel advance will have to be made by primary industry. If it is not, those engaged in primary industry will be the wood-and-water joeys of the community. There has been a good deal of discussion during this debate on rising costs, and I suppose they are inevitable. Those engaged in rural production work just as hard as, if not harder than, their counterparts in secondary industry. Nor do I think they are any less intelligent. If they are to maintain a standard of living in the face of the advance being made in secondary industry, their progress will have to go hand in hand with that of secondary industry. That will come only from the employment of agricultural scientists. A large industrial organisation has the facilities and the capital to employ highly-qualified technicians; very few primary producers have the same facilities.

Most primary industries make contributions to the Treasury for use by the Department of Agriculture and Stock, and I think they would be prepared to increase their contributions if they could be assured that as a result they would have made available to them a greater number of agricultural scientists. The days have gone when farmers were highly critical of experts. They now accept their knowledge and their experience, because they know that they can advance as a result of their demonstrations. I strongly stress this need. I hope that due note will be taken of it. We have seen

tremendous developments as a result of the application of scientific research to primary industry. Those hon. members who have been fortunate enough to visit the C.S.I.R.O. experimental farm at Samford will realise the great possibilities that will flow from the demonstrations taking place there. Practical application can now be given to the experiments that have been conducted. That is only one small instance of what can be achieved by the application of science.

I support the comments that the mover and the seconder of the motion made about the development of the beef-cattle industry in North Queensland. When you learn that an area of land that previously carried one beast to 25 to 50 acres now carries one beast to the acre or better, thanks to the application of common sense and science, you cannot fail to realise that in that strip of wet coast in North Queensland we have the best cattle-fattening country in the world. Recently I was concerned to read that, because of a shortage of supply, we were not able to satisfy the shipping that had been provided for the chilled-beef trade. It is a specialised trade, calling for a quick-maturing beast. But the need can easily be met, for there is a tremendous amount of country in that wet belt readily available for production, and I believe there are enough virile men in the State and in the South who are prepared to proceed with its development. Hand in hand with increased production will go continuous employment at the meatworks, thus removing one of the bugbears of the towns of the North—seasonal employment.

The announcement was made recently that the Government were prepared to spend £2,500,000 on developing a road system in the Channel Country of Western Queensland. I do not doubt that the people of the area need a good road system, but I wonder if the possibilities of using off-road transport there have been fully considered. Had off-road transport been available in 1958, the terrific toll of cattle in the area could have been avoided. I hope that earnest consideration will be given to this very sound method of transport.

I was intrigued at some of the comments of hon. members on price control, and at their approach to the subject. It seems that those who advocate price-control measures lose sight completely of the influence of supply and demand on prices. To illustrate my point, might I say that it was not from any desire to put cheaper eggs on the breakfast table that the price was reduced recently from 5s. 8d. to 3s. 4d. a dozen; it was not from any tender-hearted consideration that the poultry-farmers had for the community. It was because of the harsh economic fact that the price of eggs at this time of the year is determined by what our exportable surplus will bring on the London market. In the same way, a drought in the Argentine can affect the price of beef, and an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Europe can affect the price of butter. A statistician or

an accountant might be able to assess the margin of profit on which an item can be sold, but surely nobody is foolish enough to think that he can control the basic price of the product.

As I said, we did not need a prices order to make us reduce the price of eggs when a surplus occurred. By the same token, we do not wish to have recourse to a statistician or an accountant to ask permission to increase the price when a shortage occurs in the period of low production. I know that some hon. members will say that that is not a very scientific method of dealing with prices, and they may be right. But I think we have had enough experience of price control over our primary commodities in the past to realise that the cure is very often worse than the disease. The poultry industry, in particular, suffered very severely at the hands of the Commissioner of Prices and the Minister in charge of prices four or five years ago because neither of those gentlemen could understand the complexities of the industry. Every industry has its complexities, and I defy any one person to understand all of them.

I hope, therefore, that when hon. members are examining these problems they will base their arguments on logic, not on expressions that we hear from the stump during the pre-election period.

**Mr. MELLOY** (Nudgee) (3.44 p.m.): First let me say how pleased I am to join with other hon. members of this Assembly in expressing loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II., and also in assuring Her Majesty of the loyalty of the electors of Nudgee, whom I represent.

I should also like to pay tribute to Their Excellencies Sir Henry and Lady May Abel Smith for the wonderful way in which they are carrying out their duties as Her Majesty's representatives in Queensland. As we all know, they have proved themselves to be excellent ambassadors and wonderful mixers. At the very outset of their term of office they made it abundantly clear that they were not going to be mere figureheads.

I take the opportunity also of extending my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to your high office. I am sure that you will do the office honour and will extend courtesy and attention to all hon. members of this Assembly. I am confident that the new members can have every confidence while under your care.

I express my appreciation to the electors of Nudgee for returning me with such a substantial majority as their representative. I assure them that I shall do my utmost to justify their choice.

At the risk of being accused of working the parish pump I intend to devote some of my time to making an appraisal of the resources of my electorate, which lies at the front door of the city of Brisbane. Its situation is important geographically because in that area lies the future industrial development of the city. The tendency of industry,

would be to move towards the sea rather than away from it. Around Pinkenba, Myrtle town and the areas near the river all the facilities essential to the establishment of industry are available—a railroad, an airport, and shipping facilities. But adequate drainage of the area is lacking. If industries are to be established the area must be properly drained. I realise that drainage is one of the responsibilities of the Brisbane City Council, but if the area is to be developed as it should be proper drainage will be beyond its resources and capabilities. Therefore, I suggest that the Government consider assuming the responsibility for developing the area in every way. I suggest that they should accept the responsibility for constructing an adequate drainage system that not only would serve the area as an industrial area but also, in co-operation with the Brisbane City Council, would help to alleviate the drainage problems in Banyo, Boondall, and other low-lying adjacent areas.

That part of the Nudgee electorate that fronts the sea would be one of the worst-drained areas in Brisbane. In parts of my electorate 3-ft. wide water channels remain filled with dirty, stinking water for weeks after rain. Again I realise that that is the responsibility of the council, but it is a tremendous task and one that I do not think the council is capable of handling. I again suggest that the Government consider accepting the responsibility of draining the area around the mouth of the Brisbane River.

There are both farming and industrial areas in the Nudgee electorate. Pinkenba, Myrtle town, Lower Nudgee and Cribb Island form a very sound farming area that supplies a large proportion of Brisbane's household vegetables needs. There are approximately 85 farm holdings in the area extending from Myrtle town to Cribb Island; some of them have been established for almost 100 years. There are many old families there, and the farms produce fruit as well as vegetables. High-quality grapes are produced in the area. Perhaps some hon. members know Childs's vineyard. It is one of the best-known vineyards around Brisbane, although no wine is produced there now. I simply mention that to show that quite a quantity of grapes is produced in the area.

I wish now to refer particularly to the area known as the Lower Nudgee district. There are 35 farming properties in this area and their water supply is very poor. It is amazing that in an area like Lower Nudgee, only 8 miles from the city, there is no reticulated water. The farmers have to cart water every day for their crops and for household needs. That is holding the area back. With an assured water supply it could be producing twice the quantity of vegetables it now produces.

The farmers have made repeated attempts to get reticulation of water. They have even offered to pay the cost of reticulation and they have assured the council that their excess

water rates would give a return to recompense it for the outlay, but unfortunately the council has not found it convenient to accede to their request. I hope that in the near future some attempt will be made to alleviate the distress to these people caused by the absence of a proper water supply.

Whilst I am on the subject of the farms in my electorate, I should like to refer to the removal of the markets from the city to Rocklea. The farmers are very incensed about the proposed removal. It is remarkable that when the move was first mooted, and subsequently decided upon, apparently no consideration was given to the fact that there are farms on both sides of the city. When the markets are moved, it will mean that farmers in the Lower Nudgee, Pinkenba and Myrtletown areas will be required to carry their goods a distance of 16 miles to market. That will mean a doubling of the time required for delivery. In addition, shopkeepers on the northern side of Brisbane will have to pay twice as much to have their vegetables delivered. It is a deplorable state of affairs and the shifting of the markets could well be reconsidered, even at this stage.

Returning now to the potential of the lower areas of the Brisbane River for industry, the Minister for Labour and Industry has made great play of the fact that he has been attracting tourists and industries to this State. The fact is, however, that neither Brisbane nor Queensland are developing industrially as fast or as greatly as they should. We are losing population, one of the reasons being that we have not enough employment in the State to hold the people. They migrate to the South in search of employment. The southern daily newspapers carry 12 pages of advertisements seeking labour. Unless the Government give greater attention to the problem and provide better facilities for industry, we shall continue to lose population to the southern States.

On the seafront of my electorate there is an area of approximately 10 square miles of swamp land. If reclaimed it would be ideal for industrial and residential purposes and I suggest that the Government seek means to reclaim it for industry and housing. If they cannot do it, they should examine the possibility of some organisation doing so, not for the purpose of exploiting people who may want it but to make it available for industry and housing.

I leave matters affecting my electorate, and turn to the meat industry in Queensland. I stress to the Government the desirability of setting up a commission of inquiry into the meat industry. The price of meat, in Brisbane in particular, has had a tremendous effect on the economy of the workers. A few years ago the mother of a family could go to a butcher's shop and select whatever cut of meat she wanted, but today she cannot afford to. When a housewife goes to the butcher's shop now, she has to buy mince, sausages or other cheap cuts. The price of beef and veal in Brisbane has risen over the last three years

by 70 per cent.—an astounding increase—while the quantity of beef sold by butchers in the same period has decreased by 9 per cent.

Also of interest is the fact that the amount of beef consumed in Australia for the six months' period ending December 31, 1959, was 51.2 lb. per head of population, compared with 65.2 lb. for the six months ending December, 1958. The drop in consumption occurred not because people had gone off meat as a food; it was simply because they could not afford to pay the price asked for it and the fact that there was a shortage of meat during that period.

I have figures covering the price of meat to retail butcher shops. In 1957 beef cost butchers 1s. 2d. a lb.; they are now paying 2s. a lb. for it. Is it any wonder that the average housewife cannot afford to give her family the meat to which they were previously accustomed? The reason for the shortage and the high price of beef is not hard to find. It is just not coming into the city; it is not available to the butchers. In 1958-1959 the average kill at the abattoirs was 6,353. In 1959-1960 it dropped to an average of 4,866 beasts.

**Mr. Ewan:** They killed a lot for export purposes.

**Mr. MELLOY:** I will come to that.

There was a drop of approximately 24 per cent. in the amount of beef that went through the abattoirs. One of the reasons was that the dollar-hungry graziers chose to send their meat to America to get a higher return for their product. That may be all right for the graziers, but they have just as great a responsibility to the State as have the workers.

**Opposition Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MELLOY:** We have a responsibility to see that we are provided with the necessary goods for our living. We are called upon to provide the necessary labour and hon. members know what happens if we withhold it. I do not have to tell the industrial members on this side of the House what happens; they know full well. We do our job to the best of our ability, and we give of our best for the people of this country. We do not withhold it, but now the graziers are withholding beef from the people of Queensland.

**Mr. Ewan:** That is utter balderdash, and you know it.

**Mr. MELLOY:** It is not balderdash, as I will prove to the hon. member. What I am saying is absolutely correct. If the hon. member will keep quiet he will learn something.

Let us consider the figures for the quantity of beef exported to the United States of America, which denuded the local market. In 1957-1958 Australia exported to the U.S.A. 6,000 tons of beef and veal. In 1958-1959 we exported 57,000 tons. The quantity exported jumped from 6,000 tons to 57,000 tons in one year! That is where our beef is

going and that is why we have no beef in Brisbane and why we have to pay so much for the little there is.

Over the same period, these dollar-hungry graziers adopted a policy of killing off many thousands of female stock for process and export. This stock was enough to produce herds for many years to come. It was not only the female stock they killed, but the progeny of this stock also, which in turn would have provided more beasts for the cattle industry. It is no wonder that the people of Brisbane are being deprived of beef and veal at reasonable prices.

If we are going to do anything about the matter we must have it thoroughly investigated. We cannot do it as individuals. We know what is happening in our homes. As a family man, I cannot provide enough beef for my family. I know many families who are in the same position. Of course, there are some hon. members opposite who have never had to face that position.

**Mr. Mann:** They are wealthy.

**Mr. MELLOY:** They are wealthy. I suggest to the Government that they consider setting up a committee of inquiry to go thoroughly into the beef industry in Queensland.

**Mr. Bromley:** And with worker representation, too.

**Mr. MELLOY:** Exactly. If there is no worker representation, there will be no just decisions from any committee of inquiry. That is not confined to an inquiry into the beef industry; it applies to any inquiry set up by any Government. Unless every section of the community is represented on it, the committee cannot be expected to give a just decision.

I turn now to another very important phase of community and national life—housing—and the failure of the Government to overcome the shortage. I want to deal first with finance for housing. The main aim of making finance available for housing is to reduce the growing lag in home-building. Behind all this is a very real desire to keep the building industry as fully occupied as possible. After all, the building industry fosters ancilliary employment. The manufacturers of furniture, furnishings, refrigerators, and indeed everything that contributes to the furnishing of a home, are affected by the building industry, and unless the building industry is stimulated, we cannot expect to stimulate employment in the State. In short, building is one of the greatest factors contributing to employment.

We have been told repeatedly that all available money must be channelled into the new-home field, and that moneys made available through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, and to co-operative terminating building societies operating under Government guarantee, are used exclusively for this purpose. Most of the finance for home purchase is being made available for

the purchase or building of new homes. So the market for existing homes has become virtually frozen except for cash buyers, thus inflating building costs and the prices of new homes.

The housing needs of individual families everywhere are constantly undergoing change. Large homes become too large for diminishing families, while small homes become too small for growing families. It seems obvious that if as many people as possible are to be adequately housed, existing homes, which form the bulk of the nation's housing stock-in-trade, must be used to the very best advantage. To achieve this end, the free movement of the existing home market should be facilitated and encouraged to bring about the equation of available accommodation to the needs of individual families by the removal of discrimination between the two categories in the allocation of finance. If this were done, the vast reservoir of unsuitably-occupied existing homes that is at present being held back from the sale market by the shortage of finance would be released to play its part in housing the people of the State.

Let me illustrate that more clearly. Cases are frequently brought to notice, on the one hand, of an elderly couple occupying a large family home; their desire is to sell the large home and purchase or build a small one for their own convenience and their own requirements. On the other hand, we have the young couple who, say, 10 or 12 years ago, purchased a home, possibly with only two bedrooms; in most cases they would have purchased it on certain financial arrangements. They find it impossible, except at excessive rates of interest, to borrow money to extend their home and accommodate their growing family. They are anxious to dispose of their small home and purchase a larger existing family home, which is readily available and is suitable for their requirements. Lack of finance is the main obstacle preventing this more economic use of existing floor space in housing the people. It must be acknowledged that it is uneconomic and wasteful for two elderly people to occupy space that is admirably suited to meet the needs of a young couple with an increasing and growing family. Furthermore, because of the inability of young people to finance the purchase of a larger home, old people are compelled to face the work and upkeep that is needed in a home greatly in excess of their requirements.

Building costs are still rising because money is being used for the building of new houses, which are the only type of houses for which finance is available in any appreciable volume. New homes, therefore, are free from any effective competition from existing homes. As a result they are at a premium, which results in inflated values for land. We have seen that only too clearly. Members of the A.L.P. are firmly of the opinion that

the only effective method of curbing the cost of new buildings is to place new construction in direct competition with lower-priced existing homes. I should point out that, in general terms, existing homes can always be purchased at a very much lower price than new homes, and, in addition, are usually to be found in more convenient locations, with services, such as light, water, gas, and sewerage, provided.

Reverting to the owners of large family homes who desire smaller homes, it could be said that in many cases these people would purchase a new home if finance were provided to enable the young people to purchase the home most suited to their needs. The money being made available for new construction would not be affected, as it is contended that by making certain moneys available for the purchase of existing homes, the number of new buildings that would be required would not be affected by this change of equity. That is obvious, because if we made money available for existing homes, we would not be affecting the purchase of new homes. It would only mean a switch by the smaller families into the smaller homes and the larger families into the larger homes, and the new homes would not be affected.

Many thousands of existing homes in first-class condition and situated in favoured areas are available for purchase, and only the lack of finance prevents owners and purchasers completing satisfactory transactions that would have the effect of releasing the inflationary pressure on new building costs, with its monopoly of present finance, thus enabling those with limited resources to acquire existing dwellings at prices considerably lower than the cost of new buildings, and placing existing low-priced dwellings in direct competition with high-priced new dwellings. It would remove the hardship imposed on those compelled by circumstances to change their place of abode. I am referring now, of course, to people living at Salisbury whose place of employment is changed to Sandgate or Redcliffe, for example. To avoid high travelling costs, those people must of necessity change their homes, and under the present setup it is impossible for them to get the necessary finance to effect that change.

As I have pointed out previously, the community is dependent upon the stock in hand of existing homes to supply its main housing requirements, and the artificial freezing of this supply through failure to provide sufficient loan funds can bring nothing but harm as a consequence. National morale must suffer as a result of frustration of the natural needs of a family to secure proper housing, and the ultimate result will be to encourage many to seek a solution of their problems through the agency of any extreme measure that promises them relief from the injustices that they believe they are suffering.

The Commonwealth-States Housing Agreement will terminate next year. I have several suggestions that I should like to make to the Government before it comes up for renewal—if it is to be renewed. Under the present system the allocation to housing societies is 30 per cent. That is one matter that the Government could well consider next June. Housing societies provide a very good opportunity for young people to acquire a home on a very low initial outlay. Once they become members of these societies it is possible for them to accumulate a deposit and get the necessary finance with a minimum of delay. I suggest that when the Government are deliberating on this matter they might consider increasing the allocation to 40 per cent., with a 40 per cent. allocation of that money for the purchase of existing homes.

Before I conclude, I wish to refer briefly to two matters that have been raised in the Chamber this session. We know that a committee was appointed to inquire into juvenile delinquency, and its findings have been tabled. I give full credit to the hon. members who sat on that committee and the work they did, but it is my opinion that the greatest cause of juvenile delinquency is conditions in the home, conditions brought about by a low standard of living, which in turn is caused by the present-day cost-of-living and the low wages paid to workers in industry, both in this State and throughout the Commonwealth. Bad housing is another factor. Because of the lack of adequate housing two and three families sometimes share one home, with as many as 12 people living in a two-bedroom house. How can we expect parents to bring up children as decent, law-abiding citizens under such conditions? Referring to the findings of that committee, I do not think that the problem can be solved merely by providing youth clubs and organisations of that nature. Much of the good done by youth clubs is lost immediately children return to their homes if they are living under sub-standard conditions. The youth clubs imbue the children with certain ideals, they discover new ways of life and have their eyes opened to higher standards of living, but when they return to their homes they find conditions entirely different from those they have learned they should be living under. Perhaps because of low wages parents cannot provide for their children as they should; perhaps because of financial necessity both parents go to work and leave their children to their own devices. I believe that most juvenile delinquency stems from unsatisfactory conditions in the home and the problem can be solved only by improving those conditions.

I will relate an incident that occurred during my election campaign. I called at a home whilst I was canvassing; I knocked on the door and it swung open. I knocked again; but there did not seem to be anybody around. I heard a noise inside the house

and a minute or so afterwards a girl of about 12 years of age came out with only a towel wrapped round her. I said, "Where is your mother?" She said, "She is at work." I said, "Is your father home?" She said, "No." What a situation that was! That girl was very fortunate that some pervert did not call at the house. That parents could subject their children to such risks is beyond my comprehension. That is the sort of thing that is brought about by conditions that make it necessary for both parents to go to work.

I would like now to refer briefly to Communism, which is so often raised as a bogey in this country. What causes me amazement is the attitude of the political parties in this country to this subject. It appears to me that if the Liberal Party, and all other political parties opposing the Labour Party, were to devote to attacking the Communist Party, one-tenth of the energy that they devote to attacking the Labour Party, something would be achieved.

**Mr. Windsor:** Or if you did.

**Mr. MELLOY:** We attack the Communist Party at every opportunity. The Australian Labour Party is one day going to prove the salvation of this country.

**Opposition Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MELLOY:** The Australian Labour Party will be a bulwark. The time will come when the people are so disgusted with the present system that they will revolt and, if there is not an Australian Labour Party in existence, they will turn to the Communist Party. So the day will come when the people of Australia will thank heaven for the existence of the Australian Labour Party.

**Mr. MANN (Brisbane) (4.23 p.m.):** I should like to join with other hon. members in declaring loyalty to His Excellency the Governor. When I was occupying the position that you now occupy, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of frequently meeting the then Governor, Sir John Lavarack, and I always found him a very courteous gentleman and one who had the welfare of this State at heart. I can say without fear of contradiction that he was one of Australia's best sons.

I have not had the opportunity of meeting our present Governor, Sir Henry Abel Smith, because when ever I have been invited to attend a function at which he has been present I have always had some other function to attend. However, I do pay him the tribute that, from all the information I have received, he is living up to the traditions that we in Queensland expect of a native-born son. Consequently, I say that he is doing a job of which all Queenslanders may be proud. I join also with other hon. members in expressing my loyalty to the Throne.

I should like also to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the position of Speaker of this Assembly. It is a very important position, and a very onerous one.

Besides conducting the affairs of this House and keeping it in order, you also have the responsibility of running Parliament, looking after and managing the staff, and attending to the refreshment room. In addition, you have to attend to the wishes and wants of hon. members, which are many and varied as you will find as you proceed. Generally, Mr. Speaker, you have the responsibility of running the House. I join with the Leader of the Opposition in saying that A.L.P. members will do all they can to help you in carrying out the onerous duties of your honourable position.

I also offer congratulations to the Chairman of Committees. I think all hon. members will agree that he has carried out the duties of his position with dignity. I congratulate him further on the answer that he gave to the hon. member for Bundaberg, when he was nominated by that hon. member for the position of Speaker. The hon. member for Clayfield said he had been advised by a member of the Labour movement that, if he accepted nomination by anyone other than a member of his own party, he would be a political rat. I agree wholeheartedly. That is what he would have been branded if he had stood for election as Speaker in opposition to his party's nominee. I put on record my belief that many thousands of workers in the South Brisbane area thought that of the ex-Leader of the Queensland Labour Party when they voted against him at the recent election, and that many thousands of sugar-workers, farmers, and other workers in the Bundaberg area thought the same of the hon. member for Bundaberg, that is, that he was a political rat. That is why they cast their votes against him and reduced his majority of 3,000 at the previous election to a mere handful of votes.

I compliment the hon. member for Clayfield on his stand. I have heard it said that he would have been ostracised and denied the position of Chairman of Committees—and I say quite frankly and unequivocally that that is what he would have deserved—if he had tried to buck the party machine. After all, the Governments of Australia are party Governments, whether Liberal, Country Party, or the Australian Labour Party, of which I am proud to be a member. I agree with the advice given to the hon. member for Clayfield that if he had accepted nomination by anyone other than a member of his party he would have been a political rat.

I brand as completely untrue the smearing utterances by Q.L.P. members, Groupers, and Liberal members that A.L.P. members are associated with Communists, and that the Australian Labour Party is dominated or influenced by Communists. The part played by Dr. Evatt in exposing the attempt by Mr. Santamaria, and those who support his policy, to gain control of the Australian Labour Party resulted in years of political smears and pillory for Dr. Evatt, but he overcame those things and has now been elevated to a seat on the High Court of Australia, where I think his eloquence and

brilliance will be appreciated not only by those who sought to smear him but by every citizen of the Commonwealth.

**Mr. Knox:** He will be more appreciated there by the Labour Party than he was as a member of that party.

**Mr. MANN:** He was greatly appreciated by the Australian Labour Party, and by all members of that party. We realised his worth to the party and the great job he did in exposing the attempt by Santamaria and those who supported him to gain control of the party. If the policy put forward by Mr. Gair and the hon. member for Bundaberg, and others who supported it, had been accepted by the workers, the people of Queensland would have had imposed on them the hidden hand of Mr. Santamaria. The only alternatives available to the people of Queensland were the election of the Liberal Party or the election of the Australian Labour Party, the only party with an Australian outlook and Australian sentiments.

We do not want to be governed or controlled by any foreign ideology. That is the attitude of the Australian Labour Party.

I should like to commiserate with the ex-Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation on the attitude adopted towards him by the members of his party. I read an article in this morning's paper about Sir William Payne, an eminent Government servant and one whom I hold in the very highest regard. I consider him to be without equal; if he has an equal, there is none better qualified than he to advise Governments on land matters. I have always held him in very high esteem, and this morning I read in the Press a eulogy by him of the former Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation. He said there had never been a harder-working Minister, or a more energetic man, or a man better fitted to occupy the position of Minister for Public Lands than the hon. member for Fassifern. Yet this Government, for political reasons, or political expediency—because he would not yield to pressure from the Liberals—had his head cut off as a Minister of the Crown.

I want to warn the Premier—I am glad he is here—of a plot to throw him from his position as Leader of his party. I have been informed along the grape-vine that there is a plot to dispose of him. He is a kindly soul; a man without malice aforethought. He goes along in his placid way, quite unaware of the plot. However, there is an attempt to get rid of him as the Leader of the Country Party. I believe that two members of the Country Party have already been approached, and those concerned in the plot are only waiting to get the sanction of two others, when they will lop the Premier's head off and install someone else as the Leader of the Government.

**Mr. Tooth:** Listen to Hans Andersen.

**Mr. MANN:** The hon. member may think it is a joke, and is something from Hans Andersen, but it is within my knowledge through the political grape-vine. The hon.

member does not want to be too complacent and does not want to regard the dismissal of Mr. Muller as an act of fate, or something that had to happen. He wants to look after his own political hide. I see the hon. member for Nundah smiling and grinning to himself, but I have been advised that he is more than a friend of the Minister for Labour and Industry; that he is one of the best log-rollers in the Liberal Party, and in all probability he has something to do with the log-rolling that is going on now.

**Mr. Knox:** Tell us more about this plot.

**Mr. MANN:** I have already warned the Premier. I am very glad to have been able to do it, because I regard him as a very honourable gentleman, a very worthy citizen, and a very honourable politician. I am warning him that getting rid of the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation was only the first step in his demise, and that he will have to be very careful of the intrigue that is being carried on by the members of the Liberal Party in an endeavour to gain control of the Government benches.

**Mr. Knox:** You know a lot about plots; you ought to be able to tell us how they tried to get the endorsement for Brisbane away from you.

**Mr. MANN:** The hon. gentleman wants to cross-question. I have been informed on the grape-vine that he is a great stooge of the Minister for Labour and Industry, the Deputy Leader of the Government, who has great ambitions to be the Leader of the House—

**Mr. Morris:** Don't you believe it!

**Mr. MANN:** And he is looking to the hon. member for Nundah to do the work for him—and he wants me to expose it further! I have told the House that the grape-vine has the information.

**Mr. Hiley:** You are a very credulous fellow; you are usually the opposite. If the issue of leadership was decided in the same way as that in which you were expelled from the Labour Party in Toowoomba, anything could happen.

**Mr. MANN:** I want to put the hon. gentleman right. I was never expelled from the Labour Party. I have been a member of the Labour Party for more years than he would care to count, and I have never been expelled. The Treasurer has his facts mixed. He comes along here as a very good debater and a very subtle gentleman, and words flow from him like honey from a beehive so that he almost convinces one that what he says is absolutely true, but I have been informed on the grape-vine that he, too, is one of the plotters.

I am astounded that not one of the older hon. members of the Government has risen to his feet to compliment the Government on their effort during the past three years. It is customary for at least one of them to offer congratulations to the mover and the

seconded of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I wholeheartedly congratulate both those hon. members. The hon. member for Hinchinbrook gave a very good address to the House, in which he demonstrated that he understood the potential and value of North Queensland as an integral part of the State, and that he understood the North thoroughly. He made some very valuable suggestions to the Government and I compliment him on them. But not one word did he say about the Governor's Opening Speech. He saw nothing in it that he could commend the Government for—nothing that he could eulogise—so he could not say, "My Government did this.", or, "My Government did that." He contented himself with giving a dissertation on the potentialities of North Queensland and its value to the State.

**Mr. Pizzey:** I do not remember your praising the ex-Treasurer in your speech when you were on this side of the House.

**Mr. MANN:** Of course I did!

I was disappointed with the seconder of the motion but I could not help feeling sorry for him, because I studied the Governor's speech and I could find nothing in it that the hon. member for Bowen could eulogise. No doubt he said to himself, "What is the good of my talking about the Governor's speech? There is nothing in it for me to comment on. I will give the House a recitation on the discovery of Bowen and its establishment." It was a very good historical recital but it was nothing for the Premier or his Ministers to be proud of. Someone should have been able to say, "This is what my Government did," or, "The Government did this.", or "The Government did that."; but there was nothing in the Governor's Opening Speech that would give the new members the cue to rise in their places and eulogise the Government.

I repeat that this Government have yielded to pressure from monopoly interests, from big landholders, from greedy commission agents, from wholesale butchers, and all the people who try to make a profit out of the workers. They have yielded to pressure on many occasions. My party is strongly opposed—and I think the people of Queensland are strongly opposed—to the actions of the Government. I say quite frankly that, in the last three years, the Government have demonstrated that they are not in favour of keeping prices down. Immediately they were elected to office they abolished price control and rent control, and today prices have soared beyond the reach of the working man. Is it any wonder that there is industrial unrest in the community? We see it on all sides. We see the railway unions holding their ballots to decide whether they will go on strike, and the vote has been carried for a strike. The Minister for Transport refuses to face up to his responsibilities and meet the representatives of the unions.

**Mr. Morris:** No, he doesn't.

**Mr. MANN:** What is wrong with meeting the unions and seeing what the burden of their complaint is and whether he can rectify it? I believe that the Minister's refusal is a very grave mistake. He should meet the unions. They can then tell him their position, and if he does not want to assist them he can say, "My Government have decided that you will do this or that." At least let him hear their complaints.

I have a few questions to direct to the Minister for Labour and Industry, who is now defending the Minister for Transport.

**Mr. Morris:** That is all right by me.

**Mr. MANN:** I listened to the Treasurer's reply to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Kedron, on the industrial dispute at the dock. He said that some of the dockers had applied for Social Service benefits and others were on long-service leave. The hon. gentleman has never had to work like a docker. He has always been a man of wealth and influence.

An award was made by an Industrial Commissioner, and the employers immediately appealed to the Full Court and contested 25 clauses in it. A new award was made by the Full Court, and the dockers were worse off than they were before they had an award. I ask the Minister this question: If he were a docker, would he stick to a job as a permanent employee if the employers were not prepared to guarantee him six months' continuous employment?

**Mr. Hiley:** If they are not, they have to pay casual rates.

**Mr. MANN:** That is what the argument is about, and that is why the dockers refuse to accept permanent employment. The employers will not agree to give them a guarantee of six months' continuous employment. They are entitled to accept casual employment, the rate for which is £3 a week more than the ordinary rate.

**Mr. Hiley:** We cannot employ a man on a permanent basis unless we give him the six-months' guarantee. That is the law.

**Mr. MANN:** In New South Wales and Victoria the employers have conferred with the dockers and have reached agreement. What the dockers find most intolerable is that the Government refuse to accept them as casual employees and refuse to allow the docks to be used by people who wish to use casual labour in repairing their ships. They have also informed the Department of Social Services of the Menzies Government, their counterparts in the Federal sphere, that these men are on strike, and the men have been refused Social Service benefits. I say it is a shocking indictment of the Government that they are not prepared to make the docks available to any person who is prepared to employ the men at casual rates and keep at least some of them employed. The

Government refuse to use the docks until the dockers say, "We will accept the lesser rate of pay."

After the previous election some people thought that the Government would follow in the footsteps of the Moore Government and reduce wages and break down working conditions.

**Mr. Hiley:** We increased them.

**Mr. MANN:** I am talking about the present industrial turmoil. It is very bad for the economy of the State.

**Mr. Hiley:** Will you listen for a moment? Two unions are involved. Before the shipwrights withdrew their labour they asked to see me. They saw me and we made an arrangement that has been honoured by both sides. However, the painters and dockers, apparently because they have lazy and indolent officials, did nothing. They did not see me. They pulled the men out and then they wanted to come and see me. I will see them the minute the men are working, and they know that. They have been told that.

**Mr. MANN:** It is all very well to say that they are lazy and indolent. I do not intend to make any apologies for the Labour Party or the Labour Government when I say that there were rotten conditions on the docks from the point of view of amenities.

**Mr. Hiley:** We have had to clean up a lot of them.

**Mr. MANN:** I am not going to argue about that; I give the Government full credit for it, but it was because the dockers came to see me and the hon. member for Kedron—

**Mr. Hiley:** After their own laziness—

**Mr. MANN:** Nothing about laziness at all. The Treasurer did nothing about it. It was because of the attitude of the hon. member for Kedron and my attitude—

**Dr. Noble:** They tell me you are encouraging them to stay on strike.

**Mr. MANN:** I make no bones about it; if I were a docker there would be no way in the world I would work for £15 a week when I should get £18. The hon. member for Yeronga is a man of affluence; he is a doctor who can command big fees; he is a member of Parliament. If he were on the dole and someone said to him, "I will give you £15 a week although you are worth £18," he would say he could do with the job what the hon. member for Townsville South said that they could do with the plum pudding in the poor-house.

The attitude of the Government towards the dockers is on all fours with their attitude towards the miners at Mt. Isa. There is a

deliberate attempt by this Government to reduce the wages and conditions of workers in Queensland—

**Mr. Knox:** Where is it?

**Mr. MANN:** The hon. member is a sidekick of the Minister for Labour and Industry, who issued an Order in Council that took away from mines check inspectors in the Northern, Southern and Mt. Isa Divisions the right to be industrial inspectors as well as mines check inspectors.

**Mr. Morris:** You know they never acted as industrial inspectors.

**Mr. MANN:** There is no need for the hon. gentleman to tell lies.

**Mr. Morris:** Under your own Government they never did.

**Mr. MANN:** It is no use the Minister for Labour and Industry trying to camouflage the issue or tell stories about it. In the mine at Mt. Isa there may be a hot stope. The hon. gentleman has never been underground so he would not know what a hot stope is. When the miners got into the hot stope and the temperature reached a certain degree that is very hot, the mines inspector, not as a miner but as an industrial inspector, could say "That stope is too hot. We will work only a six-hour day." The industrial inspector had the power to make that decision. The miners were paid six hours at contract rates and two hours at the ordinary miners' rates to make up the eight hours. But under the Order in Council issued by the Minister for Labour and Industry the inspector cannot say, "That is a hot stope." It is left to the management. If the men decide it is a hot stope and that it is too hot to work for more than six hours, they lose two hours' ordinary pay. It is no use the Minister sitting with his arms folded and smiling complacently. That is a fact and it is the reason why the A.W.U. wrote to the Minister asking him to rectify the position. But nothing has been done. I have been waiting for the Minister to table the regulation. It has not been tabled yet. When it is, I intend to move that it be disallowed.

It is noticeable that hon. members on the Government side of the House have been too afraid to stand up and talk about the Government. They are frightened of antagonising the Government. They know it is a wage-reducing Government but they are sitting there with their arms folded. The hon. member for Kelvin Grove is a scholastic man with the ability to debate. Why does he not get up and say something about the Government? Not one of them has spoken. As a matter of fact, had it not been for hon. members on this side of the House the debate would have collapsed.

I tell the Minister for Labour and Industry that his action in this respect has had very serious repercussions on the workers. They are very unhappy about it.

**Mr. Morris:** That is not right. You know that many of them have said that I am the best Labour and Industry Minister there has been.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You are not game to tell us who they are.

**Mr. Morris:** Many union leaders have said that.

**Mr. MANN:** The working-class generally know that the Minister is waiting to cut the Premier's head off, so that he can become the Premier.

I have here a copy of "The Worker", in which is printed a copy of the letter that the Minister wrote to Mr. O'Brien taking from him the right to be an industrial inspector. The Minister for Labour and Industry says that he has not done anything as it was never exercised. If that is so, why did he take it away? What is his reason?

**Mr. Hanlon:** Who asked for it to be taken away?

**Mr. MANN:** Mount Isa Mines, of course. The hon. gentleman knows that the Minister has been approached by Mount Isa Mines. We can understand the attitude of hon. members opposite. They have to get their money for election campaigns from big business, and Mt. Isa rates very high among big business concerns in this community. When the Minister says there is nothing in it—that they have never exercised it—it is not true. They have exercised their rights as industrial inspectors, and I challenge him to say why he did it. Let him get up and tell the House.

**Mr. Morris:** You tell them.

**Mr. MANN:** I am challenging the Minister to say why he did it, unless, of course, the Government are trying to worsen the conditions of the miners at Mt. Isa. I go further and say that it is being done to reduce the working conditions of the men at Mt. Isa, and that the Government have started on a policy of wage reductions and lowering working conditions.

**Mr. Hiley:** We did not drop to your standard. You know that every Crown servant has had his wages increased under this Government.

**Mr. MANN:** Under Labour Governments we could boast particularly that we had the highest basic wage in the country and the lowest cost of living. Today we say we have the lowest basic wage and the highest cost of living. Let the Treasurer deny that.

**Mr. Pizzey:** We had the lowest basic wage when your party were in office.

**Mr. Hiley:** And you were the worst employer in the State.

**Mr. Knox:** Parliament House staff were treated the worst under your Government.

**Mr. MANN:** The hon. member said that the Parliament House staff were treated the worst. I say that is a lie, and I throw it back in his teeth.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member knows that that is unparliamentary language and I ask him to withdraw it.

**Mr. MANN:** I do, Mr. Speaker. My thoughts over-ran me. The statement is untrue, and the hon. member knows that it is untrue and that the Parliament House staff were treated on all-fours with other Government employees. The hon. gentleman thinks that because his Government put a blue carpet in the Chamber and painted the House in contemporary colours and put a lift in, something has been done for the staff.

**Mr. Knox:** What about all the other amenities for the staff?

**Mr. MANN:** The Government altered the kitchen, which badly needed attention. Other than that the amenities were always available. The hon. member for Nundah confines his remarks to Parliament House, but I am talking about the workers generally—the painters and dockers, the check inspectors and all the other workers who have to pay extra money for beef and every other commodity that they require. The cost of living has increased continually since this Government assumed office. Although the basic wage has been increased every six months to meet the increases in the cost of living, many people in my electorate find it hard to make ends meet.

The Treasurer, complacently states that he is quite happy about housing. I recall his famous statement that he would never rest until the housing shortage was overtaken. No doubt he has had many restless nights since that utterance. That may account for his hollow cheeks.

**Mr. Knox:** Have you been down to Victoria Park recently?

**Mr. MANN:** The hon. member is referring to temporary accommodation in Victoria Park, but the Government have no temporary accommodation to offer people who are in necessitous circumstances. They have to wait until they can get a Housing Commission home.

**Mr. Dewar:** We got rid of your slums.

**Mr. MANN:** But the Government have not provided sufficient houses. The hon. member should know the position. He was appointed to a committee of inquiry into child delinquency and, if there is anything that contributes to child delinquency more than a housing shortage, I do not know what it is.

**Mr. Dewar:** Housing slums, and we got rid of them.

**Mr. MANN:** If the hon. member thinks that that is going to solve child delinquency. God help the delinquent, and God help him!

The Government have deliberately set out to make conditions worse. I direct my remarks through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, rather than to the Treasurer. I know the Treasurer does not want to be the Leader, although he wants to be the king-maker in the Government. The Premier recently was out in Barcaldine, addressing the graziers. They complained about the Station Hands Award and the Premier said, "You can't blame us for the 40-hour week. The court made the award." The graziers were angry about the award and the Premier, in all honesty and sincerity, said to them, "We will have a look at the matter and if necessary alter the law." I put it to the Premier that he said that, and I ask the Government how they intend to alter it? Are they going to alter the conditions? Are they going to make the punitive clauses of awards more severe, or direct the court to make them more severe?

**Mr. Windsor:** We are keeping you guessing.

**Mr. MANN:** I am not guessing. I believe that this Government are trying to do what the Moore Government did. They are deliberately trying to make the conditions of employment worse. The Treasurer has mentioned the painters and dockers. The Government have shown their policy in regard to Mt. Isa Mines employees. The Premier said that the Government would make the Industrial Court more flexible. I repeat my question: Is it the intention of the Government to make the punitive clauses of awards more severe, or is it their intention to take over the determination of hours of work and conditions? The Premier remains silent. He is not game to answer my question.

The position is summed up by the following article, which appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of 14 May, 1959—

"Queensland employers' organisations yesterday welcomed the statement by the Premier that the Government was reviewing the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts."

The employers' organisation were welcoming it! It continues—

"It is known that meat companies are dissatisfied with the present operations of State arbitration, and are contemplating transfer to Federal jurisdiction.

"One operator said last night: 'We feel that the punitive powers under the Federal arbitration system are much more effective as a deterrent than the more limited powers of State arbitration law.'"

Does the Premier intend to make the Industrial Court more flexible? Is he going to make its punitive powers more drastic? I warn the Minister for Labour and Industry that taking punitive action against members of the unions, or any section of the community, will not drive them to work. What the Minister should do is to meet them in conciliation and listen to them. Quite

frankly, if there are strikes, which there are likely to be in the railways as well, it will disrupt the economy of the State. Not only will it disrupt the State Government but it will disrupt hundreds of other workers, who will suffer.

**Mr. Knox:** Not only the railway workers will suffer.

**Mr. MANN:** I know. Then there is the threat from the Minister for Labour and Industry. I expected he would say that.

**Mr. Knox:** Don't you believe there is a section of the railwaymen—

**Mr. MANN:** As a matter of fact, I do not intend any ambiguity about it. I tell the workers in my electorate if they cannot get their conditions through the court, and if they cannot get what they seek by conciliation, there is only one way to get it, that is, by industrial action.

**Mr. Morris:** I want to clear up one matter. Do you say you challenge me to give the House the story about the industrial inspectors at Mt. Isa?

**Mr. MANN:** Yes.

**Mr. Morris:** It is on your own head. You have asked for it; I will give it to you.

**Mr. MANN:** I will be very glad to get it.

**Mr. Morris:** I hope your fellow unionists will know you asked for it. I would not have been bringing it up of my own desire. It will be to your regret. You remember that.

**Mr. MANN:** I challenge the Government to reintroduce price control on meat. I think it is about time the Minister in charge of prices looked at the exorbitant prices charged for meat, not only in butcher shops, but also for tinned meat and processed meat in the retail shops. The Government should not only reintroduce price control on meat, but they should also reintroduce the grading of meat so that the housewives and those who buy meat will know they are not being "slugged" in paying for rump and first-grade meat when they are getting second and third-grade meat. Those are the points I wanted to raise.

**Mr. Ewan:** Don't you want meat at all?

**Mr. MANN:** That is typical of a grazier. That is what one would expect from a brigalow grazier. Of course the workers want meat, but they want it at a reasonable rate. Poor people in my area are finding it hard to pay the present exorbitant prices for meat. They have had to resort to cheese and other things for the breakfast table, rather than have the meat they need and desire.

(Time expired.)

Debate, on motion of Mr. Jones, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.5 p.m.