

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 8 SEPTEMBER 1960

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 8 SEPTEMBER, 1960

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

QUESTIONS

DEVELOPMENTAL CONDITIONS, LEASEHOLD LAND, TULLY DISTRICT

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) asked the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation—

“(1) Is it a fact that two blocks of land, approximately 1,000 acres in each, have been thrown open for lease in the Tully area and that the opening of more blocks is contemplated?”

“(2) Is it a fact that the successful lessees will be required to clear and plant with suitable grasses within a period of five years only 300 acres of such land and can, if they wish, allow the remainder of the land to be idle and unproductive?”

“(3) If so, in view of the urgent need to provide additional cattle for slaughter, will he alter the terms of the lease to ensure that the land will be brought into full production as soon as possible?”

Hon. A. R. FLETCHER (Cunningham) replied—

“(1) Two blocks of land, one with an area of 981 acres 2 roods and the other—1,022 acres, have been thrown open for selection as Settlement Farm Leases, and the opening of a further nine blocks is in hand.”

“(2) The selections will be subject to conditions which will require the lessees within a period of five years from the commencement of the terms of the leases to destroy the standing scrub on an area of not less than 300 acres on one block, and 400 acres on the other, in equal proportions during each year, and plant such areas with suitable grasses.”

“(3) The cost of establishing tropical pastures on scrub lands is considerable and whilst it is desirable to have the selections in full production as early as possible, conditions of lease must be economically within reason. The Honourable Member must remember also that the whole of the areas does not require timber treatment. Further, only parts of the areas are comprised of good quality scrub land whilst other parts are of a type which does not lend itself to timber treatment, such as

in the case of the Teatree swamp area. Regard must also be had to the inescapable expenditure on improvements such as accommodation, fencing, etc., facing the new settlers. It must be remembered that men entering the ballot for blocks like these must be assumed to have the intention of developing the block for the purpose of making a living thereon. While conditions within the reasonable limits of a new settler are insisted upon it is not in any way a limitation of his desire to develop the major portion of the block immediately. Development conditions constitute the minimum requirement which the Department considers reasonable. Consequently no alteration in terms and conditions is considered necessary."

DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES, IRRIGATION AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

Mr. BAXTER (Hawthorne) asked the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation—

"Will he inform the House if it has been decided to dismiss up to thirty-five clerical and professional officer employees from the Irrigation and Water Supply section of his Department? If not, has the dismissal of some officers in these categories been considered and, if so, how many?"

Hon. A. R. FLETCHER (Cunningham) replied—

"It has not been decided to dismiss any clerical or professional officers of the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission. The funds available to meet salaries of staff in the Irrigation Commission will not be known until the Budget has been debated by Parliament. If, following consideration by Parliament, funds are inadequate, and this appears likely at present, from 40 to 50 officers could be surplus, and details of these officers are being referred to the Public Service Commissioner with a request that he examine the possibility of transferring these officers to other Departments if this is necessary."

BITUMEN SURFACING OF QUADRANGLE, SEVEN HILLS STATE SCHOOL

Mr. BAXTER (Hawthorne) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"In view of representations made by me requesting the bituminising of the quadrangle at the new Seven Hills State Primary School, the official opening of which takes place on October 1, 1960, will he inform the House what arrangements, if any have been made to have this work finalised before the official opening day?"

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis) replied—

"It has not yet been possible for the Main Roads Department to meet the request made by the Department of Public

Works for an estimate of cost for the construction of a bitumen surfaced parade area at the Seven Hills State School and it is therefore very unlikely that this work will be completed by the 1st proximo."

STUDENT ENROLMENTS, PANEL BEATING AND MOTOR MECHANICS

Mr. BAXTER (Hawthorne) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"(1) How many students are enrolled for the panel beating course at the Technical Correspondence School, Brisbane?"

"(2) How many students are enrolled at the same school for the motor mechanic course?"

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis) replied—

"(1) 69."

"(2) 583."

COMMONWEALTH FINANCIAL AID, TOWNSVILLE-MT. ISA RAILWAY PROJECT

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"(1) With regard to the underwriting by the Commonwealth Government of the necessary loan money required by the State for the Mount Isa rail project, will he advise when it is anticipated that the exact terms of such loan will be expressed in the form of a contract and presented to the House?"

"(2) Is he prepared to issue a statement now on the current situation and to keep Parliament and public fully informed from time to time on the progress of these negotiations with the Commonwealth regarding terms of the loan?"

"(3) Will he include in such statement a brief comparative outline of (a) the direct contribution and (b) the favourable terms granted by the Commonwealth to other States in major projects such as the Snowy River scheme, the Melbourne-Albury rail standardisation, the Leigh Creek rail project, etc., so that public opinion in Queensland can be directed to impressing on the Commonwealth the claims of this State for consideration on the Mount Isa project at least comparable to that given by the Commonwealth to other States in helping their major projects, particularly in view of the national value of the Mount Isa project?"

"(4) Has the Commonwealth Government made a direct cash contribution to any major developmental project of the Queensland Government in the post-war years?"

"(5) Are there any other States which have not had such a direct grant in that time?"

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

“(1) The concurrence of the Commonwealth Government to a suggested draft Agreement between the Commonwealth and State Governments is still awaited. As soon as the Agreement is finalised, it will be placed before the House with the necessary enabling legislation.”

“(2) The broad terms of the proposed loan were contained in an exchange of letters between the Prime Minister and the Premier. There has been one agreed variation since broad agreement was reached and that was in relation to the interest rate. The Prime Minister's original proposal, which was accepted by the State, was that interest should be paid at the rate currently applied by the World Bank for loans of similar amount and period, with rebate in respect of raisings at a reduced cost. The Prime Minister later sought to have this uncertain rate replaced by a presently ascertained rate and accordingly he suggested that the Commonwealth would, subject to Loan Council approval, allocate the proceeds of two recent overseas loans for the purpose of the Mount Isa Agreement. The weighted average interest rate in these two loans was 5.54 per cent. and the Commonwealth was prepared to round this off at 5.5 per cent. As the current World Bank rate was of the order of 6½ per cent. the Government gladly agreed to the Prime Minister's proposal. I might add that the State has the right to progressively draw the money as required and the Commonwealth is bearing the full interest charge until such time as Queensland draws the money. The Loan Council at its subsequent meeting granted its approval to the two overseas loans being allocated to the Commonwealth in order that it, in turn, could make advances to Queensland for the Mount Isa Railway.”

“(3) The request will be kept in mind when the legislation referred to is being introduced.”

“(4) Yes.”

“(5) No.”

PUBLIC TRANSPORT FACILITIES, INALA

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) asked the Minister for Transport—

“In view of the many deputations and requests relative to inadequate transport facilities at Inala and in view of the added financial strain placed on the resources of residents of this area due to increased rail fares, will he take steps to (a) investigate the possibility of building a rail link to Inala to replace the present co-ordinated service; (b) carry out an investigation into the desirability of direct bus services to the city, and (c) explore any other avenues to alleviate the transport problems of this area?”

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

“Whilst there may be some room for improvement in the transport facilities at Inala, as in other growing areas, I do not agree with the suggestion of the Honourable Member that they are inadequate. At present the licensee of the road portion of the road-rail co-ordinated service operates sixty-six round trips by omnibus per day between Inala and Darra to cover 29 time-table services and, with the co-operation of the Railway Department, has provided a sterling service to this growing community. During the financial year ended June, 1960, he carried 800,000 adults and 400,000 children, most of the latter being on school trips. It is too late now to criticise from a transport point of view the selection of this site by a previous Government for a Housing Project, but its location does present many transport problems. The Honourable Member for Sherwood, whose electorate previously included Inala, was most assiduous in his representations for this area and the factors now introduced by the Honourable Member for Salisbury do not break any new ground. The possibility of a rail link is out of the question for the present owing to lack of funds, but the Commissioner for Transport is examining a proposal for a direct bus service to Brisbane, a bus through Rocklea to link up with the tram at Salisbury, and a service for High School pupils direct to Corinda. Whilst the two latter proposals have considerable merit, I doubt that a through service to Brisbane, which must divide public patronage between road and rail, would be in the best interests of the area, or that it would result in cheaper fares. Also, it would add appreciably to the traffic problems in the city. The Honourable Member can rest assured that the transport needs of the Inala area are receiving the fullest consideration in the hope of devising a scheme which will best meet the needs of the community.”

DECLARATION OF FLINDERS SHIRE AS DROUGHT-STRICKEN AREA

Mr. HEWITT (Mackenzie) asked the Minister for Transport—

“In view of the drought conditions at present existing in the Prairie-Hughenden area, will he give consideration to declaring the Flinders Shire a drought-stricken area?”

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

“The district Charters Towers to Richmond and from Hughenden to White-wood is being declared a drought-stricken area and enquiries are being made concerning the condition of the area west of Richmond to Nonda.”

SUGAR AND TOBACCO PRODUCTION, LOWER BURDEKIN AREA

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin) asked the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry—

“(1) What was the total value of the sugar produced at the Inkerman, Pioneer and Kalamia Mills for each of the years, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958 and 1959?”

“(2) What were the tonnages and the value of tobacco leaf produced and, also, as far as is possible to advise, the value of other crops produced in the Lower Burdekin for each of the years aforementioned?”

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

“(1) It has been ascertained that the total value of the sugar produced at the

Inkerman, Pioneer and Kalamia Mills for each of the seasons 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958 and 1959 is as follows:—

Seasons	Inkerman Mill	Pioneer Mill	Kalamia Mill
	£	£	£
1955 ..	2,447,356	1,945,008	2,020,610
1956 ..	2,721,493	2,242,566	2,348,332
1957 ..	3,011,318	2,761,649	2,843,443
1958 ..	2,954,816	2,430,809	2,525,643
1959 ..	2,792,052	2,241,054	2,327,656

“(2) (a) The value of tobacco leaf sold from the Lower Burdekin District (Shire of Ayr) prior to 1958-1959 was grouped with other small quantities from coastal areas of North Queensland. The bulk of the leaf was however grown in the Burdekin area. Since 1958-1959 separate figures are available. The relevant figures are given below:—

Season	Coastal North Queensland		Burdekin District Only	
	Quantity Sold	Value	Quantity Sold	Value
	Tons	£	Tons	£
1955-1956	371	428,393	Not available	..
1956-1957	233	242,082	Not available	..
1957-1958	527	559,671	Not available	..
1958-1959	774	746,220	734	702,494
1959-1960	999	1,041,081	904	935,766

(b) No separate figures are recorded by the Bureau of Census and Statistics for value of production on a shire basis. The following rough value estimates for the

major crops other than tobacco and sugar cane grown in the Lower Burdekin District (Ayr Shire) have been made by the Division of Marketing:—

Crop	1954-1955	1955-1956	1956-1957	1957-1958	1958-1959
	£	£	£	£	£
Cotton	1,171	4,972	1,913	4,956	6,573
Beans	453	1,453	8,718	30,783	43,688
Potatoes	44,733	39,519	37,243	24,551	11,345
Pumpkins	7,763	12,290	19,736	10,327	6,520
Tomatoes	18,783	26,728	36,294	32,693	22,743
Total	72,903	84,962	103,904	103,310	90,869

SEWERAGE FACILITIES, BELGIAN GARDENS STATE SCHOOL, TOWNSVILLE

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

“(1) Is he aware that although the suburb of Belgian Gardens, Townsville, is now almost sewered the necessary facilities have not been erected at the Belgian Gardens State School to take advantage of this hygienic amenity?”

“(2) If so, will he inform the House how much longer children will be forced to use the present revolting E.C.'s, considering that the Education Department was first advised of the advent of sewerage in this area on April 11, 1958, and that reminders were sent on February 13, 1959, and February 12, 1960?”

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis) replied—

“(1) It is known that part of the Belgian Gardens area is connected to the City sewerage system.”

“(2) The connection of the school to this system is receiving the attention of the District Architect, Townsville, who is being asked to expedite his report.”

ALTERNATIVE EMPLOYMENT FOR WORKERS, RAILWAY ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) asked the Premier—

“In view of the already serious unemployment situation and in view of the reported proposed standing-down of hundreds of employees on the suburban electrification works with the consequent hardship that will be imposed on the families of these men, has the Government any plans for or given thought to alternative employment for these men?”

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

"Firstly, for the benefit of the Honourable Member and in reference to what he chooses to call 'the already serious unemployment situation,' I should like to state that the latest available official figures disclose that at the end of July of this year the number of unemployed in Queensland was considerably fewer than at the same time in 1957 following 25 years of Labour rule, and the number of persons registered for unemployment at the same respective dates had also materially decreased, whilst the registered vacancies showed a substantial increase. I feel I should state these facts to emphasise the improvement that has taken place in the unemployment position since this Government assumed office and to remove any misunderstanding which might be created by the Honourable Member's remarks. As to the purpose of his question, I can assure the Honourable Member that the Government will continue to pursue its vigorous policy of maintaining confidence among the business community and the encouragement of expansion in industry which constitute the main factors in creating a state of prosperity in which the spectre of unemployment becomes a diminishing feature."

RE-OPENING OF RAIL CROSSING, EAGLE FARM AIRPORT

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) asked the Minister for Transport—

"In view of the fact that its closure is causing considerable inconvenience, loss of time and trade to business and industry in the Pinkenba and Myrtle town areas, will he, as this matter is most urgent in the interest of industry in the area generally, take action to have the rail crossing at Eagle Farm Airport re-opened immediately with the necessary adequate safeguards installed?"

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

"The crossing referred to does not connect public roadways, but gives access to Commonwealth property. The re-opening of it, therefore, does not come within my jurisdiction."

NEW STATE SCHOOL, BLOOMFIELD

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon), for **Mr. ADAIR** (Cook), asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"Will he indicate when the building of a new school to replace the old temporary building now in use at Bloomfield will be commenced?"

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis) replied—

"It is proposed that a school building consisting of two classrooms with a folding door partition, a staff room and a library enclosure be erected at Bloomfield River so that the use of the existing temporary accommodation can be discontinued. The date for the commencement of work on the new building is not available."

TUAN AND OTHER FORESTRY AREAS

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

"(1) How many men are employed at Maryborough's Tuan Forestry at the present time?"

"(2) How many acres were planted at Tuan during 1959 and how many during this year's planting season?"

"(3) How many men are employed at the various Forestry Stations throughout the State at the present time?"

"(4) How many acres were planted in Queensland this year?"

"(5) How many feet of merchantable timber does the Forestry Department estimate to be on the land the Government intends to make available for grazing purposes in the Tully District?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

"(1) 54."

"(2) From April 1, 1958 to March 31, 1959, 682 acres; from April 1, 1959 to March 31, 1960, 852 acres."

"(3) 1,404 on reforestation work and 321 on other works—a total of 1,725."

"(4) 4,860."

"(5) 15,000,000 superficial feet. Merchantable timber will be marketed by the Crown."

INMATES OF SENILE ANNEXES

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

"In relation to his answer to my question on the matter of inmates of Senile Annexes on September 6,—

(1) Under what Act or Regulation are these rules laid down?

(2) What authority is responsible for their implementation?"

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

"The Medical Superintendent is the person responsible for the discharge of patients from Hospital. It is his decision as to when they are fit for discharge. Any patient leaving Hospital prior to discharge does so at his or her own risk."

DEVELOPMENT OF CATTLE INDUSTRY,
FAR NORTHERN QUEENSLAND

Mr. WALLACE (Cairns): I desire to ask the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry whether he has answers to the following questions, which I addressed to him on 25 August:—

"(1) What is the number of cattle-producing properties in the area bounded by a line drawn from the southern point of Mourilyan Harbour to the western side of Karumba?"

"(2) What is (a) the cattle population in the area named, (b) the turn-off annually over the last five years, and (c) the estimated turn-off for the ensuing five years?"

"(3) How many of these cattle were turned off for: (a) export, and (b) local consumption?"

"(4) What were the number of carcasses reaching 1st, 2nd and 3rd grade classifications?"

"(5) How many, if any, of the properties have made provision by way of ensilage or hay for drought or semi-drought periods?"

"(6) What was the number of cattle transported from the area during the period (a) by sea, (b) by road train, and (c) by droving plant?"

"(7) In view of the publicity given to the potential of the area in respect of development and the populating of Far Northern Queensland as the result of Government policy in relation to the beef industry has there been any new ground broken by applications from companies or individuals for leases of large areas of Crown land in the area? If so, how many, and by whom?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

"(1) The area as defined does not conform to the boundaries of any localities within which statistics of this nature are collected. Consequently some of the figures quoted are on a proportional basis. The number of properties in the area north of a line from Mourilyan Harbour to Karumba which were running beef cattle during 1959 was 324."

"(2) (a) The beef cattle population is 421,000 head; (b) Turn-off has ranged from approximately 43,000 head in 1955 to 67,000 head in 1959; (c) With the continued investment by producers and meatworks in this area, plus the establishment of more areas of improved pasture, improved roads and road transport, there seems no reason why the trend established during the last five years should not continue."

"(3) Two meatworks operating in this area slaughter cattle for export. For the financial year ending June 30, 1960, these

works slaughtered a total of 32,453 head of cattle. However, these works also slaughtered cattle from outside the defined area. In addition, some store cattle produced in the defined area may not be slaughtered at these works. Meatworks are not required to show the property of origin of cattle slaughtered. It is thus not possible to give a precise answer to this question."

"(4) Official records of grading (by the Department of Primary Industry) are not kept. Grading of beef for local consumption is not compulsory and is done on a very limited scale. Hence the information sought is unobtainable."

"(5) Of the 324 properties referred to in question 1, 55 conserved hay or silage while 26 also had some grain stored for stock feed. These figures are for 1958-1959. It is expected that the 1959-1960 figures will be available within a few weeks."

"(6) (a) An average of 4,000 head a year is being transported by sea within this area. None are known to have been removed from the area to any other State by sea; (b) Movements by road transport have been confined mostly to local movements from holding paddocks to slaughter yards. Last year a road-train began operations in the Peninsula area and along the Mount Garnet-Georgetown road. At this stage, exact figures of this major type of movement are unavailable, but it would appear that numbers moved in the area to date would probably comprise not more than 400 head. None are known to have been removed from the area by this means; (c) Major movements are by means of droving plant, or droving plant in combination with rail. Movements in the area by these methods involved over 60,000 head in 1959. Of these some 25,000 are believed to have been removed from the area by this means."

"(7) My colleague the Honourable the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation informs me that he has no knowledge of any application by Companies for leases of large areas of the Crown land in that locality. However, an investigation was carried out recently to ascertain the possibility of opening lands in the Tully area for cattle fattening purposes. The Committee comprised officers of the Lands Department and the Departments of Agriculture and Forestry. The Committee's report has now been considered by Cabinet and it has been approved that 9 blocks in that locality be opened under appropriate tenures. The blocks range in area from 760 acres to 2,200 acres. In addition it has already been approved that two blocks on the Tully River be opened for selection and these will go to ballot on October 6. The necessary formalities in respect of the blocks now proposed to be put up for competition will be completed as quickly as possible."

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE AT COMMONWEALTH
ENGINEERING COY. WORKS, ROCKLEA;
DECLARATION OF STATE OF EMERGENCY

Mr. MANN (Brisbane), without notice, asked the Premier—

“(1) Has the Premier’s attention been drawn to this morning’s Press report that the Government is expected to declare a state of emergency in regard to the industrial dispute at Commonwealth Engineering Company works at Rocklea, and, as this report is causing acute anxiety to both employers and employees throughout the industry, will he inform the House if it is the Government’s intention to take this drastic action?”

“(2) Is it true that at the same time as he appointed Messrs. Chalk and Morris as a two-man committee to try to resolve this dispute, the Government had set in motion the machinery to declare a state of emergency?”

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

“I have seen the report to which the hon. member refers. I am not aware of any anxiety it has caused in the minds of anybody except possibly the hon. member and his friends at the Trades Hall.”

PAPERS

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

Seventy-fifth Report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies.

Report of the Police Superannuation Board for the year 1959-60.

Report of the Golden Casket Art Union for the year 1959-60.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Regulations under the Diseases in Plants Acts, 1929 to 1948.

Regulations under the Fruit Marketing Organisation Acts, 1923 to 1956.

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

CITY OF BRISBANE ACTS
AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. L. H. S. ROBERTS (Whitsunday—Minister for Public Works and Local Government): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the City of Brisbane Acts, 1924 to 1950, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

BARRISTERS ACT OF 1956 REPEAL BILL
INITIATION IN COMMITTEE—RESUMPTION OF
DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 7 September (see p. 235) on Mr. Munro’s motion—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to repeal the Barristers Act of 1956.”

Mr. HART (Mt. Gravatt) (11.34 a.m.): When we adjourned yesterday I was discussing the technical aspects of this Act. The hon. member for South Brisbane said there was no logical reason for its repeal and I said that the most charitable thing I could say about him was that he had not read it. So I propose to draw the attention of the Committee to some of its provisions. In the first place the Act contains provision for its own repeal in certain conditions. Those conditions have now been fulfilled, so the only logical course is to repeal it. It is obvious that the Act contemplated that other States would adopt similar legislation. No other State in the Commonwealth has done so.

Subsection (1) of Section 2 reads—

“Subject to this section, a person entitled to practise as a barrister in any other State of the Commonwealth shall have the like right to practise in the Supreme Court or any other court of Queensland.”

Subsection (2) provides that all he has to do is go to the Registrar, sign the roll, and pay his fees.

Subsection (4) says that, if it becomes apparent that any other State has not adopted similar legislation, the Executive, on the recommendation of the Attorney-General, may—by Order in Council—say that the Act does not apply to that State. As no other State has adopted similar legislation, the logical course is to issue an Order in Council saying that the Act does not apply to any other State of the Commonwealth. However, it is far more sensible to repeal it.

Let us study the Act to see if it is a good one. First of all, it says that, subject to Section 2, a person entitled to practise as a barrister in any other State of the Commonwealth shall have the like right to practise here. Only in one other State—New South Wales—is there a legal division between the two professions. In Victoria people are admitted to the Bar as both barristers and solicitors; some of them practise as barristers and some as solicitors. In the other three States, people practise both as barristers and solicitors. So any solicitor in Victoria or Western Australia can come to Queensland, be registered under the Act, and practise as a barrister without anyone knowing anything about him. He could have been charged with theft in Western Australia and he could come up here, be registered, and practise. A barrister

could have been struck off the roll for three years in Victoria, could have just got back on again, and then come up here and there would be nothing whatever to stop him from practising as a barrister.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HART: Listen to all the bush lawyers in the Chamber!

Again, under the Act, no person has to take any oath. The hon. member for Bundaberg said that Dr. Evatt was admitted subject to his taking the necessary oath. I shall read that oath. It is—

"I"—and the name follows—"do swear that I will truly and honestly demean myself in the practice of a barrister of this Court according to the best of my knowledge and ability. So help me, God."

Every person who practises as a barrister in Queensland has taken that oath, and an oath of loyalty, and if one becomes a Queen's Counsel one takes a similar oath, with the words "Queen's Counsel" substituted for the word "barrister". Hon. members may think that there is nothing in requiring barristers to go through the formality of taking that oath, but I entirely disagree with them. I will remember at the time of my own admission—

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask hon. members on my left to refrain from continuous interjection. The hon. member is endeavouring to make a speech, and I want to listen to him.

Mr. HART: My own admission made such a profound impression on me that it has not been, and never will be, effaced from my memory, and I think every other barrister could say the same. It calls to mind in a solemn ceremony the duty one has to perform. The Act of 1956 made it unnecessary for a person wishing to practise here to do other than sign the roll.

Mr. Walsh: Would you suggest that they do not swear an oath in other States?

Mr. HART: Persons seeking admission in other States are required to go through a ceremony similar to the Queensland ceremony. If a barrister goes to the South from Queensland, he has to appear before the Supreme Court and be admitted.

Mr. Aikens: No wonder the Minister for Justice asked you not to speak this morning.

Mr. HART: The hon. member for Townsville South spoke at great length and in a most irresponsible way. He is a very able man; no-one will deny that. He has every possible gift that God could shower upon him in the way of eloquence and ability, but he has wasted and spoiled those gifts by his utter irresponsibility. Nobody in this

Chamber takes any real notice of what he says, and he counts for nothing here. I say that such a man is far more blameworthy than one who has little or no ability.

The hon. member's speech consisted mainly of abuse of the legal profession. Similar abuse has been going on for centuries. The first reported case that I know of was in the time of the Emperor Claudius, when the citizens of Rome made derogatory remarks about the legal profession. The justice dispensed by judges in this State, and in other parts of the British Empire, is proverbial and the envy of other countries in the world. The hon. member spoke for so long that I think he eventually showed one of the great loopholes in the Act. He referred to a gentleman named Gifford. I do not know Mr. Gifford, and I know nothing about him other than what the hon. member told us in this Chamber. I do not know whether or not what he said is true. He said that Mr. Gifford was a Q.C., but I believe that that is not so. He gave an account of Mr. Gifford's going round the North—

Mr. Aikens: Touting for business.

Mr. HART: If the hon. member's account is correct, Mr. Gifford should be struck off the roll. I do not know whether it is correct; but if it is correct, it is evidence of the very thing that one would expect to happen under this Act. People who are not fit to practise in Queensland can come here under the Act of 1956 and nobody can stop them practising and there is no check on them. I draw your attention to the fact, Mr. Taylor, that I have said nothing about Mr. Gifford. I have merely said that if what the hon. member for Townsville South said is true Mr. Gifford should never have been admitted as a barrister in Queensland. He came in under the provisions of the 1956 Act. If what the hon. member says is true that, in itself, provides the very best evidence of the need to repeal that legislation. A check has always been made on the character of people wishing to practice as barristers before the Supreme Court of Queensland. We have heard stories and rumours about other acts of misbehaviour by persons admitted under the 1956 Act, but whether they are true or not, I do not know.

I understand that the 1956 Act was the brainchild of the former Attorney-General, Mr. Bill Power. The wording of the Act shows a certain amount of trust in the mind of its originator. I believe that Mr. Power meant well and really thought that the other States would copy this legislation, but the 1956 Act stemmed from his abysmal ignorance and that of all other members of the then Government. Time has proved how utterly wrong Mr. Power was. The only logical action to take now is not to issue an Order in Council but to repeal the whole rotten Act.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (11.47 a.m.): I rise to oppose the Bill because, as other speakers have pointed out, it is wrong in principle. With the Leader of the Opposition I take particular objection to the Minister's casual approach in introducing it. When machinery amendments to legislation are introduced it is merely wasting the time of the Committee for the Minister to go into a full discussion of the amending Bill. We had a Bill of that nature yesterday when the Minister introduced a Bill to amend the Acts Interpretation Acts. Nobody expected the Minister to take up a great deal of time in introducing it as the Leader of the Opposition said. But this Bill which is to repeal legislation passed by Parliament in 1956 is a serious measure. Firstly, I draw attention to the wording of the motion moved by the Minister—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to repeal the Barristers Act of 1956."

The business sheet yesterday read—

"Consideration in Committee of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to Repeal 'The Barristers Act of 1956'."

In other words, at this Committee stage the Minister has to justify the very introduction of the Bill. If the Committee do not consider he is justified in bringing down the Bill it is competent for them to toss it out rather than let it proceed to the second reading stage. But the Minister in effect says, "We are the Government; we were opposed to the Bill in 1956 and we are going to repeal it now. You can like it or lump it." That was his approach and I do not think it does him justice. In fairness to him I say that possibly he has gone into greater detail with some Bills than was necessary but on this occasion he has shown contempt for hon. members and the process of Parliament, which is not fitting for a Cabinet Minister. He should have told the Committee who initiated the move for the repeal of the Act. Until he was asked by the Leader of the Opposition he did not even tell us how many southern barristers had taken advantage of the Act.

Mr. Munro: I will tell you when you finish your stonewalling and give me an opportunity to reply.

Mr. HANLON: That remark from the Minister bears out my complaint about the way he introduced the Bill. Yesterday the Committee spent about an hour on the Bill, and, so far, about 25 minutes today from the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt.

I do not know whether the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt was stonewalling or not, but with all due respect to him I certainly do not think he gave the Committee any information of great value. The Minister apparently wants to gag discussion on this matter. Why, if he wants that, does he himself or the Premier not get up and gag this debate? Is he suggesting that he does not want the Opposition to discuss it?

Mr. Munro: No.

Mr. HANLON: That is just the indication the hon. gentleman is giving and nothing more—the same indication as he gave when he introduced the Bill—because he gave no justification at all for the repeal of the Act. As I said, the Minister has yet to tell us the number of southern barristers who have taken advantage of it.

Mr. Munro: I am most interested in hearing the Opposition. Up to the present I have heard a lot of words and the only opposition has been completely irrelevant.

Mr. HANLON: That might be the Minister's opinion. He is entitled to that. We are also entitled to regard as irrelevant what was said by the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt. Very little was said by the Minister himself. We wanted to know, firstly, how many southern barristers have taken advantage of the Act, and, secondly, who asked for its repeal. We even asked the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt that, but he very carefully steered away from it. He did not tell us what group of people have been asking for the repeal of the Act, but the hon. member for South Brisbane told us that he believes there has not been any request for its repeal from the Bar Association. I do not know whether the Minister is going to deal with that.

Mr. Munro: I will tell you that.

Mr. HANLON: Why did not the Minister do so when he introduced the Bill?

Mr. Munro: That is not a basic consideration. I asked hon. members to consider the Bill on its merits.

Mr. HANLON: We have not been given any merits, or demerits.

Mr. Munro: Hon. members on the other side of the Chamber know enough to be able to make up their own minds.

Mr. HANLON: When this Act was introduced in 1956, if hon. members look at Volume 214 of "Hansard" they will find that the present Treasurer, the Minister for Justice himself, the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Transport, who were all in Opposition at that time, made lengthy contributions to the debate.

Mr. Munro: All relevant.

Mr. HANLON: Now, when the Act is to be repealed, the Minister dismisses the matter in about three or four minutes. It would appear to me that that is why the repeal of this Act is a sectional measure. The hon. member for South Brisbane has said that only a small section of the Bar is interested in seeing it repealed. I am lead to believe that leading members of the Bar, like Mr. Arnold Bennett, Q.C.—with all due respect to the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt, I do not think that as a

Q.C. he would consider himself to be equal to Mr. Bennett—fully support the principle of an open Bar in this State.

Mr. Bennett: He is not afraid of competition.

Mr. HANLON: No, he is not afraid of competition. I suggest that every senior member of the Bar adopts a similar attitude. They are not afraid of competition, nor are average members of the Bar who would participate in the great mass of legal work that comes before the District Court and Supreme Court in this State, and perhaps to a degree before the Magistrates Court. Those barristers would not be particularly concerned about southern barristers coming up here, because in a great number of cases it would not be worth anybody's while bringing to Queensland a barrister from the southern States. The ordinary barrister who is not a Q.C. and is not dealing with matters that call for a lengthy and difficult litigation is not concerned with seeing this Act repealed. The senior and top men in the State certainly are not concerned. I have instanced Mr. Arnold Bennett, Q.C., who is not worried about the Act. The only barristers who are keen to see it repealed are those who are trying to set themselves up as top legal men and who have not the ability to carry out the responsibilities entailed, or to command the corresponding fee—people who take silk and become Q.Cs. so that they can command work that gives a good return. They can then command substantial fees for their services although they have not the ability to do the work. They are the only people who would be affected by the advent of barristers from the South.

The Bill is sectional. To justify its introduction the Minister referred to many takeovers of local firms by southern companies, and said that more and more Queensland businesses are now controlled from Sydney and Melbourne. He said there was therefore a need to build a protective screen around Queensland barristers. From a purely monetary viewpoint there is no doubt that such a case can be advanced for local barristers, but why should it rest at local barristers? The Minister must know that, following a takeover, many employees of local manufacturing firms are detrimentally affected. When Myers, David Jones, A.C.I. or some other big company takes over a business that was formerly purchasing its goods locally and places bulk orders in the South for merchandise, employees of local manufacturing industries are detrimentally affected. Has the Minister thought about compelling southern companies that take over other companies, such as Allan & Stark, McWhirters, and so on, to buy, say, their footwear requirements and clothing requirements from Queensland manufacturers?

Mr. Munro: Are these questions relevant to the Bill?

Mr. HANLON: They are relevant, because the Minister used the argument, but only in relation to a very small section of one profession, that is, those professional men seeking the repeal of the Act who take silk and hold themselves out to be the top men of the Queensland Bar without the ability to back it up. He said those professional men would be affected by takeovers. But if this Parliament is justified in repealing an Act in order to protect a small section of one profession, measures should be taken to protect the great mass of people in other professions, trades, and callings generally. The process workers in clothing and shoe factories should be protected. A shoe factory may normally get substantial orders for footwear from such businesses as Allan & Stark and McWhirters, but after a takeover, by Myers or some other company, bulk buying is done in the southern States and we get a flood of southern goods. They replace in our shops goods of local manufacture. If the Minister thinks he is justified in taking this action to protect a small section of the Bar, let him take action to compel companies who take over Queensland companies to buy their goods in Queensland.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member has established the comparison.

Mr. HANLON: I point out that by this Bill the Government are giving protection to a small section of the legal profession rather than giving greater protection to the average person in the community against suffering, either monetary or otherwise, through the negligence of members of the legal profession.

I am not suggesting that members of the legal profession in this State have anything to be ashamed of in honesty, integrity, or ability. The record of Queensland barristers and solicitors bears comparison with that of legal men in any other part of Australia. But there are some instances in the legal profession, as there are in all professions, of men who are dishonest or negligent. The dishonest man would be dishonest in any circumstances. The negligent man in some cases is negligent because he becomes addicted to alcohol, for instance, and does not attend to his business, and the client then gets into a deal of trouble. I should like to mention a recent case that came to my notice.

Progress reported.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—FOURTH ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 6 September (see p. 218) on Mr. Row's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (12.1 p.m.): I, with other hon. members of this House, support the motion that has been moved by Government members on this occasion, and I add

my contribution of co-operation, loyalty, and devotion to the Crown and the British Commonwealth of Nations.

I wish to congratulate those new hon. members who have made their contributions to the debate. I wish particularly to congratulate the new members on this side who have spoken. I believe they have made valuable contributions to the debate, and have indicated to all hon. members that their contributions in the future will be of great benefit to the House, and to the Government, through their suggestions and criticisms.

The problems confronting us today are very serious, and they should be dealt with adequately and capably during this debate. We have had some contributions from the Government side of the House—not many, because very few hon. members opposite have spoken—but none has been of any great benefit in solving the problems confronting the State. We have seen three years of government that have indicated completely the inadequacy of hon. members opposite. During that time we have suffered from administration by people who may be placed in the category of enthusiastic incompetents or theoretical amateurs. We have the recent example by the Minister for Transport of a contribution towards the economy of the State, if it can be so called. The Minister has been excusing his inefficient administration over the past few months by blaming border-hoppers. Now, immediately following an election campaign, he has imposed, in some cases, savage and vicious increases in rail freight and passenger rates.

Since the shearers' dispute in 1956 there has been a gradual improvement in the carrying of goods and livestock by the Railway Department, and its earnings have increased. When we examine the figures for the financial year 1958-1959, we find that an excess tonnage of livestock and goods was carried by the Railway Department amounting to 7,500 tons, with an increase of £1,200,000 for goods carried. There may have been a deterioration this year, but we will not know until the Minister answers my question on Tuesday. The figures we have indicate that there has been a gradual increase in the tonnage of goods and livestock carried, although the Minister is blaming border-hoppers for a deterioration in railway finance.

Mr. Aikens: Any decrease would be due to seasonal conditions, not to the railwaymen.

Mr. LLOYD: There is no assertion, even by the Minister, that the railwaymen are responsible for the deterioration in railway finances. The Minister came before the House several years ago and said he intended to overcome all these problems. He robbed the Stores Suspense Account, and refused to continue ordering material. In some instances, he sold materials that had to be bought back from the people to whom they

were sold. Men in the railway sheds have even had to go to the nearest hardware shop to buy ordinary nuts and bolts that were necessary to maintain wagons in service in the Railway Department. That is what happened and it is not being disputed. We are told that several hundred men have to be displaced from employment. Several hundred men have already been displaced from employment in the Railway Department because no officer who has ended his employment through age, illness or some other reason has been replaced. That has been going on for several years. Now that several hundred men are being displaced, rightly the Brisbane "Telegraph" leader wants to know what the Government intend to do about providing other employment for them.

This morning the Premier produced figures in an attempt to show that there was no unemployment in Queensland compared with several years ago. Why, then, is it a fact that in many of the towns along the coast of Queensland a grave unemployment problem now presents itself for the consideration of the Government, who are, as usual, sitting down and allowing some fictitious or theoretical committee of business men within those towns to decide what they, the Government, should do to provide the necessary employment to give the people a living?

We could go through many of the Government administrations criticising them piecemeal. The Minister who is in charge of the Treasury benches this morning in the absence of the Premier—who is out submitting a proclamation to declare a state of emergency—is one who can accept some responsibility for the unfortunate state of Queensland's finances today. One of his first acts when he took over the portfolio of Minister for Justice was to relinquish rent controls and largely to abolish the price controls that had given the people of Queensland a reasonable standard of living. Today although this has forced up the basic wage by 36s. per week men and women in employment are not receiving, through adjustments to the basic wage, enough to enable them to buy the same goods as they could buy in 1956. The costs of Government have increased to such an extent that the Treasurer is very worried now, thanks to incompetent Government administration through the unfortunate legislation that has been introduced in that time.

One matter of grave importance to all working people is the industrial relationship between employers and employees. Several days ago the hon. member for Barambah said that the wage and salary earners should make a big contribution towards ensuring that the cost of living would not rise to such an extent that primary industries would be forced off the world's markets and he criticised those who pressed for a reduction of working hours and an increase in wages. We entirely agree that at this time, when we are on the verge of automation and increased mechanisation, the problem of industrial

relationships should cause all Governments grave concern, but the hon. member for Barambah has very little realisation of the vexed problems accompanying mechanisation in industry.

The hon. member for East Ipswich drew attention to the increased productivity of coal mines in the past few years. The figures he gave should be of great interest to the Government and should make it obvious to any reasonable, thinking person that where productivity is increasing, with attendant increased profits from industry, while at the same time the employment level is being reduced, the people engaged in the industry are entitled to a share in those increased profits. If it means reducing the working week within the industry, then it should be done; and it should be the responsibility of the Government to see that it is done to curb the growing incidence of unemployment within the State.

It is the same with other industries; but the Government are quite content to sit back and say that questions of wages and conditions in industry are matters solely for the Industrial Court. In New South Wales a committee of investigation has been appointed to consider automation and mechanisation, and make recommendations to the Government. Despite the contention of the hon. member for Barambah, and other hon. members on the Government benches, that the ordinary working people in the community should be forced to bear the heaviest burden of the impact—

Mr. Harrison: To share.

Mr. LLOYD: They are being forced to bear—bear, not share. Despite the fact that the working people are asked to do that in Queensland, other Governments in Australia will accept the responsibility of making decisions on these questions.

The Government have acted hastily and precipitately and in a manner that will cause the greatest possible industrial unrest. That is not a threat; it is simply a statement of fact. What is happening now? On Monday evening the Premier made a statement to representatives of the daily Press that he intended appointing a two-man Ministerial committee in an endeavour to resolve a dispute at the works of Commonwealth Engineering Queensland Pty. Ltd. Immediately that statement was made, the order was given to the Crown Law office of Queensland to prepare the proclamation, which was printed on Wednesday. The Minister for Labour and Industry, who was a member of that committee, went to Townsville to open a hotel instead of endeavouring to resolve this dispute. The proclamation was prepared on Monday at a meeting of Cabinet, and is at this moment being approved by the Executive Council. These provisions were designed originally to be used by a Government where the movement and carriage of goods were such that the very existence of certain towns in Queensland

was threatened by starvation or some other catastrophe, or where the livelihood of the people or the supply of food and clothing to them were being interfered with.

Mr. Windsor: You brought that in.

Mr. LLOYD: Of course we brought it in, because we could envisage that, in war-time or peace-time, the need for it could arise. We did not intend it to be used by a Government who have, as this Government have, a cloak-and-dagger arrangement with the secretary of the Metal Trades Employers' Association that the provisions of the legislation will be implemented and that they will support him and the employers in his association, not in an attempt to settle the dispute but to break down wages and force the unionists of Queensland to work for lower wages than are being paid in other States.

I intend giving the House a comparison of the wages received by employees in Queensland with those received by employees doing identical jobs in New South Wales and Victoria, and I shall refer not only to the employees of Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. but also to the ships' painters and dockers.

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen: You are not prepared to tell us why the unions will not raise the matter before the Court.

Mr. LLOYD: I thought the hon. member for Barambah, in his complete ignorance of industrial matters generally, and industrial disputes particularly, or some other member of the Government parties, would ask that question. If the hon. member will be patient, I will give figures not only for Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. but also for the Department of Harbours and Marine and compare them with figures for other States.

The Premier and the Treasurer came into this Chamber about 18 months ago, strutted proudly before hon. members, and claimed credit for having met the Queensland State Service Union in conference and agreed to increase the salaries of State public servants on a basis of "like with like". In other words, like us, they were concerned because the State Public Service was being robbed of many of its best brains by the Public Service of other States and the Commonwealth Public Service. The Government agreed to increase salaries in an effort to retain their employees, but no case went before the Industrial Court. No statement was made by the Premier, the Treasurer, or any member of the Government that the union had to go to Court to get an increase in salaries. Apparently there is one law for one section of the community and another law for another section who are interested in receiving wage justice. I am not discussing the merits or demerits of the action taken by the unions on this occasion, but every unionist is entitled to take this action if it is impossible for him to receive wage justice by way of an award judgment—I remind the hon. member for Barambah that

I say "an award judgment". If employees of the same firm in other States are receiving better pay he is entitled to ask for a conference with his employers. Would the hon. member for Barambah disagree with that? In this case, the irresponsibility of which the unions were accused by the Premier, who talked about settling the dispute, was really that of the Metal Trades Employers' Association—its secretary in particular. In 1956 Mr. Grounds made his famous statement that never again would he allow the employers in the metal trades to meet and come to agreement with their employees, such agreement to be ratified later in the Court, but that in future so far as he was concerned the union must go to the Court for improved wages and conditions. That was his stand. The Government should be giving the lead in the settlement of the dispute, but rather are they aiding and abetting the man who made that statement on behalf of the Metal Trades Employers' Association.

We recognise, and have the greatest admiration for, the work of Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. in Queensland. At all times that firm has been a fine employer. It is unfortunate that it should be the subject of the dispute. The unions have the greatest admiration for the industrial record of Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. since it commenced operations in Queensland, but it is tied hand and foot to the decision of the Metal Trades Employers' Association expressed by Mr. Grounds. Mr. Grounds is the irresponsible factor in the present dispute.

Mr. Knox interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: I expected many more interjections from the hon. member for Nundah, but I am glad that he has not been interjecting because it means that he is quite convinced that there is something wrong about the handling of this dispute. I am convinced of that, just as I am convinced that the lengthy Government party meeting yesterday centred round whether or not it should agree to Cabinet's decision to issue the proclamation which is to be announced today and gazetted on Saturday.

Mr. Windsor: It is holding up the whole country to ransom. (Opposition laughter.) Laugh as much as you like, that is true.

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member for Ithaca is the person who several years ago stood up in this Chamber and said what a good employer he was. He said that he gave his men five weeks' annual leave. I agree that he was a good employer, but let him study the facts. In the past two years the unions of the metal trades have been endeavouring to have a conference with the Metal Trades Employers' Association, but every approach by the unions for a conference on wages and conditions has been rejected. They have refused to do it in the instance of this dispute which commenced on 14 July this year.

Mr. Windsor: Do you claim they should give it?

Mr. LLOYD: In every other dispute within the metal trades—in the dispute on the wharves, the sugar industry dispute, the B.H.P. dispute, and others; they are innumerable—compulsory conferences were called by the Industrial Court. In this case not one compulsory conference has been called by the Industrial Court in an attempt to resolve it. In every other dispute of any importance in this State it has always been accepted as the responsibility of the Premier to endeavour to persuade the parties to get together and discuss their troubles, and to endeavour to resolve or iron out any dispute that is holding up the production of goods in Queensland.

The present Government have not made one attempt up to the present time, nor has the Premier attempted to act as a leader of the Government by calling a conference between Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. the Metal Trades Employers' Association, if necessary, and the unions concerned, in an endeavour to settle out of court the dispute that exists. We have had to wait until the Government's promise to Mr. Grounds was fulfilled, that is, that they would, if necessary, implement a state of emergency by the proclamation that is to be issued today.

Let us see the actual comparison, and I hope the figures will give hon. members some idea of the merits and demerits of this dispute and whether there should be a dispute at all. Hon. members should bear in mind that since 14 July there has been no attempt by the Industrial Court, or by the Premier, to call a compulsory conference of the parties to the dispute. There has been a steadfast refusal on the part of Mr. Grounds and the Metal Trades Employers' Association to confer with the unions. Another factor is that the employees themselves have isolated this dispute to one organisation; it is not an industry-wide dispute, and rightly so. It is a dispute with one firm, unfortunately, at the moment, controlled by the Metal Trades Employers' Association. It is a firm that has given over-award payments of wages to identical classes of employees in the other States.

Let me take one case in point. The main contract at present with Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. is for the construction of stainless-steel carriages for an air-conditioned train, the parts for which are pre-fabricated at Granville in Sydney. Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. send them to their works in Brisbane for completion and supply to the Railway Department. The men in both States are engaged on identical work. Indeed, the hon. member for Barambah said, "Why shouldn't the men go to the court?" The men cannot receive anything from the court because the court has no power to grant, nor can it agree to, any increase in wages other than on a basis of "like with like." At the present time the

marginal amounts are comparable in Brisbane, Sydney and Melbourne, but increases were granted in the South outside the award, on agreements reached between the Metal Trades Employers' Association—the head office of Mr. Ground's organisation—and the union, yet in Brisbane the same organisation is refusing to confer with the men in this State.

Mr. Knox: You are not suggesting that the people in Brisbane are being paid under the award, are you?

Mr. LLOYD: No. Does the hon. member for Nundah want to draw a geographical or astronomical line on the map and say, "You are working in Queensland on this side of the line. You get so much. If you are working over the line you would receive £3 more?"

Mr. Knox: What body put the imprimatur on the agreement in New South Wales?

Mr. LLOYD: The agreement was made between the employers' association and the employees, and it was then ratified by the court. The terms of it were not included in any award. I am giving these facts so that hon. members opposite will realise the cause of the dispute. If an award provision was at issue, the award could be amended, but the conditions to which I refer are not contained in the Victorian or New South Wales awards. In Queensland these employees receive £18 15s. 6d. a week, made up of the basic wage of £13 13s., the margin of £3 15s., and an amount of £1 7s. 6d. paid under the power-house agreement. In Sydney the counterparts of Queensland employees receive £21 12s. made up of a basic wage of £14 3s., a margin of £4 16s. and an over-award payment of £2 13s. Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. in Sydney was paying, until recently, 20s. a week over the award. The Metal Trades Employers' Association then came to an agreement with the employees to increase that amount to £2 13s. I understand agreement has been reached on a further increase, and that the agreement has been presented to the Industrial Court, has been ratified by it, and is now in operation. In Melbourne the employees receive £20 7s. a week, made up of a basic wage of £13 15s., the margin of £4 16s., and an over-award of £1 16s., irrespective of classification. In this instance also a further agreement has been reached which will increase the wage above £20 7s.

The over the basic wage payments including margins are as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Brisbane	5	2	6 a week.
Sydney	7	9	0 a week.
Melbourne	6	12	0 a week.

The figures for the southern capitals do not take into account additional payments which are being made at the present time by agreement.

Mr. Knox: To use your argument, you suggest that if we adopt the like-with-like principle and the amount being paid in Brisbane is not the same as in the South, there is a possibility that the over-award payments in the South will be reduced?

Mr. LLOYD: No.

Mr. Windsor: You want to channel the work down south, so that Queensland men will be out of work and you can then say the Government are crook.

Mr. LLOYD: Of course the Government are crook, otherwise they would have realised these facts and would have taken appropriate action. The Premier has a grave responsibility and should call the employers and employees into conference in an effort to hammer into the minds of the parties, particularly the employers, a little bit of sense. He should have endeavoured to counter the moves by the Secretary of the Metal Trades Employers' Association which will tend to bring about increased industrial unrest and more disputes. The attitude of the Secretary of the employers' association could cause tremendous industrial unrest.

Mr. Knox: What is that?

Mr. LLOYD: His statement that in future he is not going to allow any employer registered with the Metal Trades Employers' Association to meet unions in conference and come to some agreement which could later be ratified by the Court.

Mr. Windsor: Go to the Court.

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member for Ithaca is interjecting from time to time, but on how many occasions has he met his employees to discuss improvements in their conditions? How did his employees receive five weeks annual leave, of which he has boasted? Did he not discuss the matter with them and come to an agreement? He would not have said, "Go to the Court", because he would know very well that they would not get it there. But that is the attitude of Mr. Grounds at a time when the officers of his association in Sydney and Melbourne are conferring with unions outside the Court and coming to agreements which are later presented to the Court for ratification.

Mr. Knox: What has Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. done that is wrong?

Mr. LLOYD: Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. has not done anything that is wrong. It is known throughout Queensland as an excellent employer.

Mr. Knox: Why the industrial dispute if it is such an excellent employer?

Mr. LLOYD: I intend to tell the hon. member for Nundah something else. The Premier has appointed a two-man committee composed of the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Labour and Industry, both of whom are in cahoots with Mr. Grounds. Whilst they have been sitting

back waiting for this dispute to culminate in the issuing of a proclamation, the Leader of the Opposition has interested himself in the welfare of the working people in Queensland, and in industrial peace, and has discussed this matter with the general manager of Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. Because of his discussions with Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. Mr. Watson arrived in Brisbane last week and there was a wonderful opportunity, as a result of that conversation, for Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. to meet the unions. It seemed possible that the approaches of the Leader of the Opposition would be met with success and that the dispute would be settled amicably and separately between Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. and the unions. However, Mr. Grounds again stepped in and said, "No, you are ratting on the Federation!" It does not matter to the other employers registered with the Metal Trades Employers' Association how much Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. may lose; it does not matter to them how much industrial peace in Queensland is unsettled as long as they can force a system of low wages upon the people engaged in the metal trades industry in this State. It has already been shown conclusively that that is the Government's stand taken on this matter.

Mr. Aikens: Mr. Grounds can stand over Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. only if they allow him.

Mr. LLOYD: That is true, I agree.

Mr. Aikens: You are not absolving Commonwealth Engineering Ltd.?

Mr. LLOYD: I am not absolving them completely. The discussions that the Leader of the Opposition had with both the general manager and the manager of Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. were very harmonious, and he and the manager were in agreement on certain aspects. What has the Leader of the Government been doing? Has he made any attempt to intervene in this dispute? I have stated that he has made not one attempt to call the parties together; he has left it to the Leader of the Opposition to try to settle the dispute. The Leader of the Opposition can be proud of his action in the matter. It is my contention that the declaration of a state of emergency is a flagrant misuse of power by the Government. Certain Labour Governments have done it in the past, but in all cases it was a matter of necessity to have food delivered to the people in the out-back parts of the State. It was never done on such a puerile matter as this.

It has been said by the Minister for Transport that equipment and rolling stock for the Mt. Isa railway line will not be available because of this dispute. If there is any emergency the contracts can always be sublet. Only a very small percentage of Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. employees are engaged in making the equipment for the Mt. Isa railway line.

Mr. Windsor: Have you contributed anything towards this illegal strike?

Mr. LLOYD: I am making my contribution towards it now. This is a flagrant misuse of the powers granted by the State Transport Facilities Acts. The Premier has not taken advantage of every opportunity to resolve the dispute, and he is now taking this all-powerful action. I am not too certain that the Government did not withdraw their contentious Constitution (Declaration of Rights) Bill because of the powers existing in the State Transport Facilities Act to declare a state of emergency.

If the dispute was so serious that the emergency should be declared, why did not the Premier follow the example set by previous Premiers and call the employers and employees together in an endeavour to settle the dispute? No! He wants to declare this emergency and send the Public Service Commissioner to the Court to intervene. I am doubtful that the Court can do anything except send the workers back at the rates they were receiving before the dispute commenced. I think that is all the Court can do. That is the Premier's intention now. He intends to come here as if he has done something wonderful. He has refused to conciliate, just as the Treasurer is refusing to conciliate in another dispute that concerns Mr. Grounds and the Metal Trades Employers' Association. I am referring to the ship's painters and dockers. I have already quoted the figures showing the difference between the wages paid by Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. here and in the South.

Let us look at the ship's painters and dockers' dispute. The Treasurer says the men must go to court if they want the increases. The men have been to court. A new award was granted in February. It was the subject of an appeal by the employers' association and the appeal succeeded in some respects.

Mr. Knox: Did they get an increase in that award?

Mr. LLOYD: They got a reduction.

Mr. Knox: What rate?

Mr. LLOYD: The base rate of £16 15s. for the permanent-casual was reduced to £15 11s. as a permanent base rate.

Mr. Windsor: What do you do with union bosses?

Mr. LLOYD: Never mind about union bosses.

Mr. Windsor: What do you do with them?

Mr. LLOYD: I will give the hon. member some indication of the comparison here. What happened in the other States? The award is a Commonwealth award. In Brisbane the Department of Harbours and Marine and the Metal Trades Employers' Association decided

that they would accept only men on a permanent rate although this is casual work; it is not possible for the steamship companies or for the Department of Harbours and Marine to keep men in full employment in the industry. Up to the present there have never been more than four men employed on the permanent base rate in Brisbane—and they were employed by A.U.S.N. Two are employed at present but there have never been more than four. Now, whereas in Brisbane employers decided to employ men only on the permanent rate of £15 11s., the metal trades employers in Sydney agreed to pay 15s. over the award rate and granted 9d. an hour retrospective to December last year, plus 6s. 6d. on the ship repair rate. In Adelaide and Melbourne the work proceeded at the casual rate of £18 13s. 2d. a week. At Newcastle State dockyard the base rate of £17 3s. was paid, with 9d. an hour retrospective to December, plus a recent increase of 4s., and £2 a week in bonus payments. In Brisbane, besides endeavouring to force the men to accept permanent employment only, they have tried to abolish travelling time, although travelling time is included in the award. Other matters of contention between the Department of Harbours and Marine and the employees include smokos (morning and afternoon), washing time, and the shipping repair rate. Is it any wonder that the men are unsettled? It all flows from the Government's determination to keep workers in Queensland on a wage lower than those operating in the other States of the Commonwealth.

The Minister for Transport is one who has come to an arrangement with Mr. Grounds of the Metal Trades Employers' Association in this manner. He has given him an undertaking that the Government would declare a state of emergency.

Mr. CHALK: I rise to a point of order. I have just come into the Chamber and I did not hear the whole of the hon. member's speech—I have been at the Executive Council meeting—but I heard him say that I have an arrangement with Mr. Grounds of the Metal Trades Employers' Association to do something or other. I want to make it perfectly clear that I have no arrangement with Mr. Grounds or any other person connected with the Metal Trades Employers' Association.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to accept the Minister's denial.

Mr. LLOYD: I accept the Minister's denial, but I will put it this way: it would not be beyond my comprehension to think that members of the Government have come to this arrangement and have given an undertaking to the Metal Trades Employers' Association that they will stick with them right through and endeavour not to settle or resolve the dispute but to break a strike.

I do not think the Government's action is conducive to improved industrial relationships in Queensland, at a time when it is

of great importance that they should be improved. For instance, every day in the newspapers you see that large southern ship-building firms, the Victorian Railways, or other large companies in the south are advertising in Queensland for tradesmen. If we keep tradesmen in this State on the low wages that they are now receiving under awards of the court, we will continue to lose them to industries in the South, as we have in past years.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HERBERT (Sherwood) (12.41 p.m.): I endorse the sentiments expressed by the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I think the general standard of debate on the motion has been higher than it has been for many years, and hon. members on both sides of the House made very valuable contributions.

As we have a new Speaker in the chair, I should like to drag out my usual chestnut and refer to dress reform. You, Mr. Speaker, have the opportunity, by introducing dress reform in this House, of initiating a move that will be welcomed by most Queensland men. If you will permit hon. members to attend here without their coats in the summer months, your action will be appreciated not only by every hon. member but also by all long-suffering males. I realise that you would have to keep a close watch on some of the more irresponsible members, but I do not think the dignity of the Chamber would be impaired if we were allowed to attend in belted trousers, shirts with full-length sleeves, and ties. As a matter of fact, I think the dignity would be improved, and hon. members would possibly stay in the Chamber for longer periods. As it is, they spend a good deal of their time outside, where they can take their coats off, particularly in the hotter months of the year. The custom of wearing coats and waistcoats came from a country where snow is often on the ground and the temperature rarely rises over 80 degrees. It was brought to the tropical and sub-tropical climate of Queensland, and we still cling to it. Women have enough sense to regulate their fashions according to the seasons, but men do not. Men must be given a very strong lead, because in matters of dress they are naturally conservative and do not like to make the first move. If you, Mr. Speaker, gave a lead by permitting hon. members to sit in this Assembly without coats, I think the community would be happy to follow it.

Mr. Aikens: I was thrown out of the dining-room 11 times for going in without a coat before that became the rule.

Mr. HERBERT: We are permitted to enter the dining-room without a coat, and I do not think there has been any loss of dignity there. I suggest that you give my suggestion very serious consideration.

I also suggest, as I have on previous occasions, that the staff of the House be allowed to remove the blue serge coats that they have to wear right through the hot months. If they were allowed to wear belted trousers, a shirt with long sleeves, a tie, and an epaulette with their distinguishing mark upon it, they would be comfortable and would be able to perform their duties much more satisfactorily. The House would not lose any of its dignity by having those men suitably dressed for a tropical climate. You, Mr. Speaker, have certain robes of office, which would probably mean that you would continue to suffer, but I think if you were to allow this dress reform for members of the staff, you would start a very necessary dress reform in the City of Brisbane. It is rather strange to speak about it at this time of the year. Normally we wait till the temperature is in the hundreds before we start complaining; but nothing is ever done. Very few are game to attempt dress reform because they feel out of place in a group of people who are prepared to sweat it out. I have tried to do it on a number of occasions, but like most people I prefer to be one of the herd when it comes to dress. If you would give us a lead by granting hon. members permission to dress as I have suggested, I should be only too happy to adopt it and come into the Chamber appropriately clad.

Now that we have been in office for three years we can look back over our term of stewardship with a feeling of satisfaction for a job well done. There are many phases of Government activity to which I could refer, but as I have had a particular interest in education I shall refer to what the Government have done in this field in their three years to overcome 25 years of neglect. The State's education system is still not up to scratch but it is a long way along the road. For the past three years the State has had a Minister in charge of its educational needs who understands the problems that arise, and he has done everything possible to remove some of the more glaring anomalies. I shall mention but a very few of the improvements he has effected in his three-year term. I shall start with the youngsters in kindergarten. Had the present Government not taken office when they did the Creche and Kindergarten Association would have collapsed, purely and simply through lack of funds. The people who were running kindergartens were desperate. The previous administration did not regard kindergartens as important, in fact, they ignored them altogether. Not only was the present Minister able to save the Creche and Kindergarten by substantial cash subsidies but also under the system of cash subsidies to kindergartens, particularly in the metropolitan area, they have been given access to additional funds for capital expenditure and running funds for maintenance. The small committees that previously struggled to raise money now have added incentive

in that they can get £500 towards their capital expenses—a big help when it is remembered that a creche and kindergarten can be built now for between £3,000 and £4,000. That £500—£250 from the local association and £250 from the department—is a very big help along the road and, in addition, the £150 for some and £250 for others each year is a big help towards the payment of wages. I should like to see the aid increased, but considering the financial situation we are faced with at the moment, we must be grateful that the Minister has been able to assist creche and kindergartens to that extent in his first three years of office.

I move on to the primary schools and shall refer to the latest attendances figures. The State's education system has had to meet a big influx of children following post-war births. That increased number of students passed right through the primary schools, to the secondary schools, and next year will start to worry the University. But from the figures available it seems that we are not to get any relief by way of a reduction in the number of youngsters attending secondary school because, strangely enough, we are getting almost the same number in each year. In other words, they have levelled out at approximately 25,000 per year per grade. The following figures of attendances at Queensland State schools in the various age groups illustrate how the numbers have levelled out:—

6 years	24,450
7 years	24,616
8 years	24,200
9 years	24,192
10 years	23,378
11 years	23,333
12 years	24,930

On top of that, we have an attendance at non-State schools—that is, Church and other schools—of approximately 6,000 each year. In other words, for every year, we have 30,000 youngsters in each age group in the schools of this State.

That gives the department a breathing space in which to prepare for additional secondary school education. This secondary school education has not become necessary, as in the past few years, because of a large increase in our juvenile population; it is because of the awakening of the community to the need for secondary-school education. When most hon. members were in their teens, secondary-school education was unusual. Very few of the overall population ever had the opportunity to proceed to a secondary school. Many of them went to school at night or obtained secondary education by correspondence, but secondary-school education was not regarded as a necessity—the vast majority of youngsters went as far as the Scholarship standard and then left school.

In the main, parents realise now that for their youngsters to have a chance in life, they must go as far as the Junior examination, preferably as far as the Senior. So with those 30,000 a year going through our entire State education system we have to prepare for a larger number of them to enter secondary schools. By "a larger number" I mean that most of them will go through to Junior standard, and we are waiting with interest to see the findings of the committee appointed to inquire into secondary education, because the State will be faced, within the next few years, with the problem of providing secondary school facilities for nearly all those youngsters.

At the moment, if a man enters this State with a growing family and decides that he will give them a secondary education, and he inquires at any of the private schools in Brisbane, he will be told that if his child is now in the fourth grade State school standard, the secondary school is booked out. In any of the big schools in the metropolitan area he will receive that reply, which means that parents who decide now that in the next few years they desire to give their children a secondary education they will have to attend a State secondary school. That means we must think particularly of the development of those secondary schools because they are becoming more and more the only avenue available. I do not like that position myself. I should like to see the development of other supplementary systems. At the moment, we have church schools as an alternative to State high schools, but I should have liked to see, in past years, the development of a grammar school system similar to that in Great Britain. We are now paying for the errors of omission and commission in the past, and that is something we are unable to control.

With this number going through to our secondary school system, we have to be very careful that we do not make further mistakes. I compliment the Minister on the stand that he has taken up to date in the building of new high schools. We have a number of them now in the periphery of this city but they should have been built years ago. Unhappily, they were not, and the Minister has taken very strong steps to correct this error. High schools are reaching the very dangerous situation where there will be attendances of over 1,000 pupils at each such school. A high school of over 1,000 pupils presents a very dangerous situation. It is perilously close to becoming a factory to turn out diplomas at the end of two years' study. A secondary-school education should be more than just a diploma at the end of a course, if one manages to pass an examination. Some of these periphery high schools with heavy enrolments are unable to give much of the training required by a boy or girl during secondary education.

Mr. Aikens: What do you suggest should be the maximum enrolment?

Mr. HERBERT: For a primary school 600 is regarded as the maximum and the absolute maximum for a high school is somewhere between 600 and 1,000, but it is quite obvious that many high schools will exceed that limit. I have the problem in my area, but it does not affect only my area. It is a matter of concern to every parent with children growing up and requiring secondary education.

The Corinda High School is an example. In its first year the enrolment was approximately 300, in the second year we expect 400, and there will be 700 students in Junior and sub-Junior classes. Even with the opening of the Inala High School, nothing can prevent the Corinda High School from going over the 1,000 mark in the next three years. The story about Brisbane high schools can be repeated over and over again, and this state of affairs exists not through a large increase in the number of children, but because many more children are now proceeding to high school than in the past.

Church and private schools are not expanding rapidly enough to cater for the children who normally enrol at them. Many of the students at the Corinda High School came from private or church schools that were unable to take them for secondary education. The problem is such that I cannot see any resurrection of the grammar school system. Fortunately we have a number of grammar schools that are functioning satisfactorily, but the resources of the State will probably not allow further development of the grammar school system. It would seem, therefore, that we are tied to the State programme.

I am not going to presume that the committee inquiring into secondary education will make certain findings. But a number of thoughts have occurred to me, particularly when I was on the committee inquiring into youth problems. Until that time I had an open mind on one point, but I am leaning more to the opinion that we should consider very closely our present system of having boys and girls attending the same high schools. This is an old chestnut that we could argue until the cows came home, but more and more teachers are of the opinion that separate high schools for boys and girls at different locations might be an advantage. I am not going to elaborate on that point. It is a subject that could be debated with psychologists on one day and practical teachers on the next and no conclusion arrived at, but it seems to me that in certain circumstances separate high schools for boys and girls might be desirable. Whatever conclusion we come to, the important thing is that we need more high schools and we need them quickly in order to avoid turning them into factories that will turn out a thousand diplomas a year but not give to youngsters secondary education in its many aspects that they should get.

The latest figure for enrolments at State secondary schools each year is 22,000, which is slightly less than the total of 25,000 in any one year for primary schools. There are at present in State schools 210,000 primary students and 22,000 secondary students.

The figures for the non-State schools are quite interesting. There are only 53,367 students in the non-State primary schools, and 13,909 in the non-State secondary schools. It is quite obvious that a considerable proportion of the community does not want to use the non-State school in the primary grade but wants to use it after the Scholarship.

If we change the age for Scholarship entry—personally, I think that will come; we must put the Scholarship starting age back 12 months—it will have a very marked impact on the non-State secondary schools that are at present taking a fairly large proportion of students. At the moment they are taking just under half those who attend secondary school. If we tack another year on to the secondary grades, those schools will either have to increase their capacity or decrease enrolments. In most cases they will have to decrease enrolments because they have not the financial resources to extend their schools. When the change comes—as come it must—we will have to expect an added impact on the State secondary schools to take in youngsters who normally, under a four-year course, would go to the non-State secondary schools. The department will have to face the problem of increased numbers of students seeking secondary education. The number is increasing every year, and the increased numbers will not be able to find accommodation elsewhere.

It is extremely unlikely that very many of the non-State schools will be able to increase their enrolments or start new branches within the next few years. The State secondary schools will therefore have to face an extreme problem, because you cannot manufacture secondary school teachers out of thin air. We are approaching that position now. We could provide money for high schools, with an effort, but no amount of money will produce a teacher. At present, we are just managing to keep ahead of the demand. So far no child has been refused secondary education, and the students are getting a very good secondary education within the limits imposed on such a rapidly growing system. However, as I have said, we are rapidly approaching the time when we will either have to restrict some entrants or restrict training in certain subjects, because science and language teachers cannot be acquired from the ranks of primary-school teachers. They can take over most of the humanities, with the exception of languages, and leave the languages and science for teachers trained in those subjects.

Unfortunately, scientists are in such demand from other organisations that are prepared to pay them big money, that all we

have left for the Teaching Service are either those dedicated souls who want to teach and will accept nothing else, or those who would like to get the higher pay but have not enough ability. We have to face the prospect of either paying our teachers more or being forced to accept slightly lower standards in the Teaching Service. The latter alternative would be extremely dangerous, because as soon as you lower the entry standard for teachers, you necessarily lower the standard of output from the schools.

We cannot in this community refuse education to anyone. We certainly do not want to reach the position that has been reached in other countries, where students have to go to school in shifts, and where, in many cases, children are refused education.

We are indeed fortunate that we have at the helm a Minister who appreciates the problem. He is a practical teacher with a degree and he understands the difficulties he has to face. He has already provided the answer for next year but he will have increasing problems in the future because in the last few years State High Schools have doubled their intake and it looks as though the figure will be doubled again. No Minister on earth can produce trained teachers out of thin air. Among the problems that the State will have to face are training more teachers in the sciences and the arts and paying them more. That will mean a financial commitment that will make our £20,000,000 for education look extremely small.

I do not for a moment suggest, as has been suggested in the Federal Parliament, that education should be taken over by the Commonwealth. That would be one of the greatest mistakes ever. The day education is taken out of the hands of the State will be the beginning of the end of the Federal system. Education should be left entirely within the control of State Governments.

In the university sphere the Federal Government have given us considerable financial support. Recognising that the shortage of skilled technical men and technical teachers is a national problem, they have provided finance for our universities on an unprecedented scale. They are to be complimented for that, but I do not for moment suggest that Federal intervention should go any further than financial assistance to the educational institutions. The Commonwealth aid that has been given to our universities will have to be materially increased to handle the influx from bumper post-war births now going through the secondary schools when they reach the university. The university at St. Lucia, admirable institution that it is, is already over-crowded, and the university colleges established in the North will not take very much of the weight because the main pressure is coming from students within the metropolitan area. Just as more and more students are looking for secondary school education, so more and more are demanding

tertiary education, and more and more employers are setting tertiary-level standards for applicants for positions with them.

The shortage of teachers is very vividly demonstrated by the figures. The latest figures available show that in 1958 the grand total of teachers in the State Service was 7,374 while in 1959 it was 7,927. The increase of 600 looks good in that form but it is not quite so good when dissected. In 1958 there were 1,659 Class I male teachers while in 1959 there were 1,679. In other words, there was an increase of only 20 in the number of Class I male teachers, and they are the backbone of the teaching service; they are the men who might be transferred to secondary service; they are the future principals and head teachers, and they are the men who hold the schools together. Further down, we find that in 1958 we had 737 teachers on probation while in 1959 we had 1,031. That means, of course, that in years gone by we did not train the number of teachers necessary to cater for this huge increase in the number of students. The present Minister has endeavoured to overcome the problem by taking in a large number of trainees, and he has overcome it to some extent during his three years in office. However, the majority of schools now have a large proportion of junior teachers, and many trainees are being given the opportunity of teaching higher grades than they would have been given years ago. Because of this large number of teachers on probation and very young teachers, a much greater weight is necessarily thrown on the shoulders of senior teachers, and in many cases they have to do far more work.

In ten years we will have a magnificent body of teachers, with adequate experience and training to meet the needs of our primary schools, but there is no way of overcoming the problem at present. Every hon. member knows of schools in his area where there are only one or two really experienced teachers on the staff, and the Minister is to be commended for introducing at long last the two-year training scheme for teachers. Previously youngsters have been given only 12 months at the training college and have then been sent out to schools to teach. Mistakes have been made in the past, and mistakes will probably still be made under the new system, but at least people will have an opportunity to be trained properly for their job. I compliment the Minister on taking this step when it would have been easier to say, "The one-year system has been going on for a long time. We will let it go on a little longer." If we had waited the move may never have been made.

A large number of teachers on probation are coming up through the service and graduating as Class II and Class I teachers, the people upon whom the greatest burden falls in the teaching profession. Hon. members may find these figures interesting. In 1958 there were 3,815 male and 3,532 female teachers; in

1959 there were 4,147 male and 3,780 female teachers. It will be seen, therefore, that the profession still depends to a great extent upon women teachers.

When considering the qualifications held by our teachers, we must bear in mind one very important fact. A number of our teachers in secondary schools do not hold university degrees, but many of them are infinitely better teachers than those who do. They have passed first-year university examinations, which gives them a little more knowledge than the students, even those who have passed the senior examination, and have the experience acquired during years of teaching in primary schools. We should not be uneasy because a number of these teachers do not possess a university degree. Some years ago a degree was an accepted qualification for a secondary school teacher, but that has now gone by the board because we have not sufficient people with degrees, and also because the possession of a degree can bring a person much greater remuneration in other fields. The salary paid by the C.S.I.R.O. to a science graduate gives an indication why we are not getting many teachers with degrees in the State teaching service. In the future a larger number of secondary-school teachers will not have the full qualifications of a degree, but that will not detract from their ability as teachers at secondary-school level.

Departing abruptly from the subject of secondary and tertiary education I should like to touch briefly upon school transport services that have been sponsored by the Minister in his three years in office. The amount of money spent on school transport services reached an all-time high in 1959-1960 when £463,806—almost £500,000—was made available for this purpose. It is a great deal of money but every £1 spent has helped to bring a child into proper teaching, and taken him away from the correspondence or other less satisfactory types of teaching. The number of services in operation are—

Primary pupil services	517
Secondary services	36
Weekly vocational services	150
Total	703

The number of pupils travelling on school transport services are as follows:—

Daily primary services	13,632
Daily secondary services	1,476
Weekly vocational services	4,193

The aggregate distance covered for primary pupil services was 21,466 miles. The average cost per mile for daily primary services is 1s. 9d. and the average annual cost per child is £29 6s. 6d. That means that £29 6s. 6d. per child is paid by the Department of Education, which in many cases would be far more than some parents would be able to afford. It is very gratifying to know that most of these youngsters are receiving an education now that would have been

denied them before the extension of the school transport service by the present Minister.

The average cost per child for daily secondary services is £27 15s., slightly lower than the cost for daily primary services.

The extension of school transport services means that at most places in the State children are not only within reach of a primary school whilst living at home but also within reach of a secondary school. It means that wherever people go in Queensland they can be assured that their children can receive an adequate education. In the past parents have refused transfers to jobs in the country for the very good reason that education would not be available for their children. Today it is not only the city children who can demand and get a secondary-school education. That service would not be available now but for the very welcome change of Government three years ago. The inadequate service provided by the previous administration condemned many youngsters in the country to leave school at Scholarship standard—if they got even that far—giving them no chance whatever to continue with a secondary education. The present Minister is to be commended for the steps he has taken in this connection. My time of speaking has almost expired; I could speak for hours on the improvements and increases in educational services throughout the State. Nevertheless most of them are known to the people and they appreciate this fact that at last Queensland is beginning to build a really worth-while education service.

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) (2.35 p.m.): I would like to join with the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply motion by offering, on behalf of my constituents in Rockhampton North and myself, allegiance to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I join also with other hon. members who have spoken on the Address-in-Reply in the remarks they passed about the Governor of this State. He has been prepared to mix with people from all walks of life and be an Australian in every way. He is prepared to meet men working in mines as well as those in the top strata of society and that, to us, is a wholly Australian outlook. In my view, that is why he and Lady May have endeared themselves to the people of this State and why they are held in such high regard.

I should also like to thank the Queensland Central Executive of the Australian Labour Party for endorsing me as their candidate for the seat of Rockhampton North. I also pay tribute to my local executive, the various branches in the electorate, and the trade-union movement generally, for the support they afforded me during the election campaign, and to the people of the electorate for electing me. I am deeply indebted to them all.

It has been amply demonstrated from the addresses of hon. members on both sides of the House that the new members on this side have more than held their own with those on the Government benches, whose speeches have contained nothing more than a continual patting of each other's backs. They have said nothing about either the Governor's Opening Speech or the Government's policy. They have simply told each other what wonderful fellows they are. The only other content of their speeches savoured of a witch-hunt.

I say without fear of contradiction that neither the Premier nor any other member of the Government has lived up to the promises that were made during the election campaign. Many of those promises definitely have been broken. I say without hesitation that outside of this Chamber the Premier is a gentleman and I have a high regard for him. But as a politician he is a vicious man and is prepared to stoop to any level to win the Government benches; he is prepared to go to any lengths, even to using his gracious smile on television. Hon. members will probably have seen a television broadcast in Brisbane in which the Premier was asked why he did not introduce preferential voting in this State. He replied that he was directed by his own party not to bring it in because it would not be in its best interests. That is the man who comes into this Chamber and denounces the Australian Labour Party because of directions given by the Queensland Central Executive. What hypocrisy!

In 1957 this Government promised to introduce the Constitution (Declaration of Rights) Bill, commonly known as the Bill of Rights, the intention of which was to provide protection against outside direction and outside influence, including the direction that the Premier stated openly in his television broadcast had come to his party from outside.

Mr. Fizzey: Did you hear the broadcast?

Mr. THACKERAY: Yes, I did.

This is a great State, which hon. members represent in this House. We are here to look after the interests of the people of the State, yet the Premier and his Government openly supported the Commonwealth Government in opposing an increase in the Federal basic wage. He also openly moved to oppose a 35-hour week for the miners in New South Wales. And hon. members opposite talk about the so-called Bill of Rights! In June, 1957, the Federal basic wage was £11 18s., and in July of the same year the State basic wage was £12 1s., a difference of only 3s. Now, however, the Federal basic wage is £12 18s. and the State basic wage £13 13s., a disparity of 15s. The basic wage is supposed to be based on the cost of living, but those who are employed in Queensland under the Federal basic wage have to use the same trams and busses and buy the same bread and commodities as those employed under

the State basic wage. However, despite the difference of 15s. that I have just referred to, the Leader of the Government has stated that he went to Canberra primarily to oppose an increase in the Federal basic wage. At the same time, employers' organisations such as the Chamber of Commerce and Chamber of Manufacturers said that the State basic wage would have to be frozen. If that happens, the result for the workers will be disastrous.

The Government contend that productivity is increasing, but they want to put a stranglehold on the wages of workers. They do not want the workers to enjoy a share of the profits of the big monopolies operating in Queensland. They do not believe in giving the workers a fair and just wage and have refused to confer with unions who seek a fair wage for their members.

The following newspaper article is of interest:—

"Professor Clarke Kerr, Dean of the Faculty of Industrial Relations of a leading U.S. University, visited this country several years ago. He quoted the net productivity increase per annum as being at the rate of 3.2 per cent. This meant, said the Professor, that productivity would double itself every 20 years."

Among other things, he predicted an eventual reduction of the working week in Australia to four days, increased wages, and four weeks' annual leave.

During the week "The Courier-Mail" contained a report to the effect that the Sydney City Council is moving for a 35-hour week and four weeks' annual leave for its employees, but the Queensland Government are opposed to those improvements in working conditions. They do not believe in conciliating with departmental employees or unions in arriving at a fair basic wage. Having regard to some of the increases granted recently and the fact that tradesmen are underpaid, how can the Government claim to be fair? They are asking for more apprentices in industry, but how can they expect to get them when a semi-skilled person who has received a marginal increase is now paid 1s. a week more than a skilled tradesman?

What happened to this "3-D plan" that we heard so much about in 1957—"decent government," "decentralisation", and "development"? None of those things has come to pass in the three years the Government have been in office.

I shall now deal with some of the statements of the Minister for Labour and Industry, or the Minister for "tripping around", or, as a Pressman said to me, "Marco Polo the Third." Marco Polo the First discovered the world, the Prime Minister of Australia is Marco Polo the Second because he is never in Australia, and the Deputy Premier is Marco Polo the Third, because he is always tripping around

the State, finding new lands in the North, and looking at South Pacific areas. Let us consider some of his glorious plans and famous words which are, right or wrong, wise or unwise, the plans of the Government. In September, 1957, in one of his wild statements or dreams—and dreams are all right, if you can dream and not make dreams your master—he said to the people of Central Queensland, "The State Government are preparing a 5-year plan for the industrial development of Queensland." He went on to say how he had worn himself to a frazzle working on this glorious 5-year plan. Another statement on this plan was released in the issues of 7 and 9 September, 1957. He said, "So we are now preparing a wide survey of the Centre's resources and prospects, and this will be correlated in the five-year plan." He must have been overseas on one of his "Missions to Russia" on a 5-year plan, but unfortunately he did not bring the plan back here because we in Central Queensland have seen nothing of it.

We had another of his rich statements: "Big plan to expand Central Queensland." He said it was a big Cabinet plan to extend Central Queensland. That was when Cabinet members were up there on their holidays. This statement was made on 3 December, 1957. There was a big Cabinet plan to help Central Queensland and we were given further hope of a survey. I believe that somewhere in that survey the Minister for Development was mentioned. It says—

"The State Co-ordinator of Public Works would be responsible for making a full report to the Development Minister, Mr. Evans, who would make recommendations to State Cabinet."

He said Central Queensland had a big potential, and all the rest of it. The next thing that came out was, "Raw Deal Claim for Central Queensland." That was said by the flamboyant member for Rockhampton South, Mr. Pilbeam, who delivered his maiden speech in the House last Tuesday. He must have seen Dr. Noble first, because he was very subdued in his opening remarks. He is not as flamboyant in this House as he is in Rockhampton. He comes to this House as a member of the Liberal Party; you can belong to any party, and then join the Liberal Party so long as you win seats. That is entirely different from the Labour Party, because we do not have rejects.

On 6 April, during the election campaign, the Premier was reported in "The Courier-Mail" as saying, "The State Government has received the first report on a master plan—for the development of Queensland." He said it was already under way and was going ahead in Central Queensland. That is rather like the rest of these reports. We have heard nothing more about it. I was astounded at the hon. member for Rockhampton South coming into this House and not even mentioning unemployment in Central Queensland.

We have the famous words of the Deputy Premier, "More jobs than men to fill them." How untrue! What a fallacy it is for the people of Central Queensland, who are walking the streets of Rockhampton with empty stomachs! Then Senator Benn referred to it during the Address-in-Reply debate in the Senate. He was charged by a Liberal senator with making an untrue statement. They were unemployed, but he said they were seasonal workers. What difference is there between a seasonal worker and any other worker in industry? If he is unemployed, he is unemployed. All he wants is a job.

The Rockhampton Trades and Labour Council asked the mayor of Rockhampton to call the various authorities together to combat unemployment in that city. I have been appointed secretary of that organisation, and I say without fear of contradiction that I know what is happening. A committee was formed of people from all walks of life, and without political allegiance to any party, to look after Central Queensland as a whole.

I have here an article reading, "Mr. Morris gives another Press statement in regard to loans to combat the Central Queensland unemployment." Not one penny of that money was outside the ordinary revenue that the Government would be given on their loan programme. We asked Mr. Pilbeam, the mayor of Rockhampton, "How many men can you employ with your additional grant?" He wriggled around and he said, "Fifty." We wrote to all the other local authorities in the district asking what extra men could be employed and they said, "It is simply the annual grant that we get from the Government for our loan works programme." And they said, "This is the yearly grant we are given by the Government for our loan works programme and we cannot employ any more." We wrote to the Rockhampton Harbour Board and the Gladstone Harbour Board, and the answer was the same, despite the statement published in the Press with glaring headlines about the unemployment position in Central Queensland. How they whine about it! Do they cry in their beds at night about the unemployed in Rockhampton? No, they are not worried. So long as they can have their caviare at the Belle Vue and run around holding their Cabinet meetings all over the State, they are quite happy. They have no sympathy for the worker.

I challenge the Government to give us something concrete in Rockhampton to relieve the unemployment. No more of these sob tales, these sad stories, of their intentions. We need concrete action. So does Gladstone and so do all the towns along the coast. Read the last issue of the "Sunday Mail."

Mr. Graham: I will tell the story of Mackay.

Mr. THACKERAY: The hon. member for Mackay is worried about his own electorate, but what are the Government doing about it? Exactly nothing!

What about all the new industries we hear so much of? In the Governor's Opening Speech we read that the new industries in Queensland this year were an all-time record. Let us study that. To register an industry under the Commonwealth you must have four employees, but to register one under the State you need have only two, so every petrol station is an industry. That is how it moves along. It sounds well.

Let us have a look at some of the factories. The Deputy Premier told us of one factory that was registered with a paid-up capital of £250,000 or more, and the name of it was Fathom Fisheries. I ask the Deputy Premier does he know of one prominent man who is alleged to be associated with that company, a man who is today being prosecuted in the Commonwealth Supreme Court for libel and slander—a gentleman by the name of Mr. Smith? Did the Deputy Premier ever meet him and did the Deputy Premier ever put the screws on another Federal Liberal member in an allegation that he was guilty of corrupt practices, namely, 10 per cent. of a big construction firm in Queensland or in Australia? And this Mr. Smith was the very man who threw the Deputy Premier right over. He told him quite a story. He is a confidence man—he is No. 1 in Australia; I will grant that—but he told the Deputy Premier a grand old story, to such an extent that Mr. Charles Porter, the President of the Liberal Party in Queensland, put an S.O.S. out to this Liberal gentleman and put him on the mat, and when they put him on the mat they found that he was innocent and the Deputy Premier was wrong. So he said, "Look, Ken, you wriggle out of this one the best way you can." And that is exactly what happened. This is said to be one of the great industries for Central Queensland—one that is reputed to be by this gentleman. That is how it goes. I ask the Deputy Premier to say yes or no to my statement. I will not go as far as to name the man, but I can name him, and the Deputy Premier knows I am right.

Let us look at some other industries. He spoke about the great cement works for Rockhampton. We wholeheartedly agree that a cement works is essential for Rockhampton, but then we see the vicious octopus of the great monopolies moving in—squirrelling in. Already we see that, as soon as the establishment of another company is announced, North Australian Cement Ltd. and Queensland Cement and Lime Co. Ltd., Darra, move in. They lay down certain terms. They want freight concessions. I only wish the Minister for Transport were in the Chamber to hear me speak on freight concessions, but, of course, he has more to worry about right now. When we look at what North Australian Cement made last year and at what Darra made, and

the rest of the great monopoly that is operating in the cement industry, because the magic powder spells gold to the cement industry, we realise that this ring has tightened all over Australia.

The Hawke Labour Government set up a select committee to investigate the cement monopoly in Western Australia. Unfortunately for us in Queensland, and for all Labour supporters in Australia, that Government were defeated before they could bring before Parliament legislation to control that monopoly. The same monopoly operates in New South Wales, where £5,000,000 was lent by the Rural Bank to a cement company that was eventually bought out by the monopoly. I say without fear of contradiction that Mr. A. E. Axon, one of the top brass, the Adelaide Steamship Company, Jimmy Brett, a prominent member of the timber industry, and others, have this industry tied up in Queensland. That has happened in the paint industry and the chain stores, to name only two—a trade ring is operating. Such practices have prevented the establishment of a cement industry in Central Queensland. We have all the ingredients there for making cement, but we will never get cement works while this ring operates.

The hon. member for Aspley is politically naive, and he probably has not yet found his way to the parliamentary library. I suggest to him that he should go to the library and look at the "Courier-Mail" published this week to see what is said about restrictive trade practices and what Mr. Seddon, a member of the Liberal Party in Victoria, had to say on the question. He said that a group of 500 or 600 form an association and decide the price they will charge. If you do not abide by their decision, you are thrown out and crushed. I make some allowance for the hon. member for Aspley because he is a new member, but he should not have tried to pull the wool over our eyes by saying, "The boys are too pukka. They are above this sort of thing." It is too silly for words.

The Governor's Opening Speech says that a greater number of houses have been completed than in any of the previous seven years. However, from the Minister's reply to a question we know that there are 5,900 people in Queensland waiting to rent Housing Commission homes. We have seen this vicious amendment to the Landlord and Tenant Act brought down in this House that the Minister said would end the shortage of Housing Commission homes in Queensland. In Rockhampton there are 250 people waiting for homes. Only the other day the Treasurer said that the Housing Commission would build three blocks of flats in Brisbane and one in Townsville but he did not say that one would be built in Rockhampton. The figures for building approvals for May, 1960, show that only nine homes were built in Rockhampton, whilst 65 were built in Ipswich, 73 in Townsville, and 46 in Toowoomba.

Figures showing the increases in population in the major cities in Queensland outside the metropolitan area place Rockhampton at the bottom of the ladder. Only 38 Housing Commission homes are under construction in Rockhampton, and the Housing Commission has only 16 acres of land on which to build homes there. They will not take options on other land in North Rockhampton, which is the best area in which to build such homes. Let me refer now to the cost of living. Of course, the Government believe in free, healthy competition! They say that with no restrictive practices operating in Queensland they will develop the State, that supply will meet demand and everything will be all right. But look at the meat position for a start. The Government say, "Listen, boys, be fair, there is a shortage of meat and that is why the price has gone up." On the other hand the great barons of the sugar industry—where the supply exceeds the demand—say, "There is no shortage, boys. We want a bit more money. We made only about £4,000,000 so we want to put the price up 1d. a pound." what happens? The Liberal Party bow to their masters and say, "That is all right." The same has happened with meat. Since the decontrol of meat prices the price of small-goods has increased out of all proportion to the increase in the basic wage. The price of meat has increased far more than it should have during the term of this Government. In 1957 sirloin roast was 2s. 8d. a pound, today it is 4s. 5d. a pound; chuck steak has increased from 1s. 8d. a pound in 1957 to 2s. 11d. a pound today. In September, 1957, canned pork sausages cost 2s. 7d., 4s. 3d. today. Bully beef—the Army boys would know all about that—camp pie, 12 ozs., an increase from 1s. 10d. to 2s. 9½d. All of these items have been decontrolled. They are in the racket, all in the swim to get their big profits and they send their profits overseas. But the Government say we must have open competition in Queensland. One has only to look at the effects of their amendment to the Landlord and Tenant Act to see what has happened there. From 1958 rents were no longer controlled. A tenant can be asked to pay £5 5s. a week this week, and £6 6s. a week next week, and if he does not pay he is out in the street. How have the Government helped to solve the housing problem by introducing that special legislation?

Rockhampton is the gateway to the tropics. Central Queensland has a great future but unfortunately the Commonwealth Government have not acknowledged Queensland even though Queensland has been the decisive winning factor in Federal elections. Out of 18 Queensland seats in the House of Representatives 15 are held by Government members. With the exception of the Mt. Isa railway reconstruction scheme the Commonwealth Government have not given Queensland one penny in loan money for development schemes. They have made £20,000,000 available to Queensland but it has

to be repaid in full in 20-odd years. But for the standard-gauge line between Albury and Melbourne they gave the New South Wales and Victorian Governments two-thirds of the total cost, the other one-third to be repaid over 53 years. It is a shocking indictment of the Commonwealth Government in their treatment of Queensland. Arthur Calwell and Mr. Bob Whitlam realise the potential of the North and when the Australian Labour Party Government are returned in the Commonwealth sphere, as I am certain they will be after the next elections, they will do everything in their power to develop the North. They have said that £60,000,000 is needed in developing the North. That is what is needed in Central and North Queensland.

I must say something about a Country Party member from Central Queensland. I was ashamed when a Central Queensland Country Party member of Parliament, Mr. Jones, openly canvassed and voted against the election of a Central Queensland member of Parliament to Cabinet rank. It was reported in the Press and freely discussed in Rockhampton, and I have no doubt that that is what happened. Yet members on the Government side of the House tell us there is complete unity in the Party!

I have no axe to grind, nor do I hold any brief, for the former Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation or the present Minister for Public Works and Local Government, but as a Central Queenslander I must in all fairness assert that a Central Queensland Minister would be of great benefit to that part of the State. It worries me to think that in the first ballot, in which the hon. member for Whitsunday was elected by one vote—I would say it was the casting vote of Mr. Jones—and Mr. Hewitt was defeated. When the second vacancy in the Cabinet occurred because of the Country Party's decision to depose the former Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, who did such a wonderful job, it was decided that the former Speaker could have a second chance at the pudding. The Country Party in Southern Queensland decided, when he missed the first ballot but still had the Speakership, to gang up and say, "No, you are not going to have a secret ballot on whether he should stand down from the Speakership-elect." The result is that North Queensland has only two members in the Cabinet of the "Queen Street" Government. I am not pushing anyone's barrow, but a Central Queenslander with a broad outlook would have been an acquisition to the Cabinet and an asset to Central Queensland.

The hon. member for Rockhampton South has been in Parliament only a few days but already his absences from the House total 25 per cent. Yet he says he can do two jobs! This is the man who had a three-year build-up. He only had to take three monkeys from a train and he had his photo in the paper. He is not even the mayor of Rockhampton; in fact, the mayor is Mark

Hinchcliffe, the General Manager of Lake's Creek Meatworks. The hon. member has already spoken openly in this House against the wishes of the Country Party, which is the senior Party in the Government. He openly opposed what the Country Party believe, and what we believe, on an abattoir at Rockhampton because he is under the dictates of the C.Q.M.E. Company. He said the trade unions were wholeheartedly behind the Vestey empire and against the establishment of an abattoir. That is quite untrue. The trade union movement at no time has supported monopoly control by the Vestey empire, and its members remain firm and solid in their attitude. We are not pushing the barrow of the Country Party, but we believe in the interests of development of the cattle industry that a public abattoirs should be established in Rockhampton. The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity summed up the position about the cattle industry in Central Queensland. I say that any city that can offer only seasonal employment cannot prosper and cannot be fully developed. How can an area be developed if it has no other industries to absorb those who seek work?

Mr. Pizzey: Townsville has done well.

Mr. THACKERAY: Townsville is in a different category altogether, as the Minister well knows. The Premier acknowledges the truth of my remarks about a public abattoirs. In that respect the policy of the Country Party is the same as the A.L.P. The Premier knows that the hon. member for Rockhampton South ratted on the Country Party on the abattoir issue, and he cannot deny it. The hon. member for Rockhampton South is supporting monopoly control. I am not putting up the case of the Graziers' Association, but the graziers would have to assist in the development of an abattoir. In 20 years it would be much more than a local abattoir; it would be comparable with the Brisbane abattoir.

We do not want to see a great merger by the meat barons of Australia to buy up all the butchers' shops in Rockhampton and so control the buying and selling prices of meat. The establishment of a local abattoir at Rockhampton would be the first step in breaking the vicious ring that operates in Rockhampton and that is why I wholeheartedly support the Premier's policy. I only hope he has the courage to go ahead with the plan for a public abattoir in Rockhampton.

I am sorry that the hon. member for Rockhampton South is not in the Chamber. He would be in Rockhampton. He is now the Liberal member for the electorate and, as he cannot change his spots now, he will be the Liberal Mayor of Rockhampton and his Party will function under the Liberal banner, not the Civic Advancement Party banner. The latter Party has some members who are not affiliated with

the Liberal or Country Parties. It is freely rumoured in Rockhampton that, if the hon. member for Rockhampton South is returned as mayor of Rockhampton for another term, he will make the Town Clerk a civic administrator with unlimited power and deny the aldermen the rights they now exercise. In other words, the aldermen will be rubber stamps for the Town Clerk, who will have virtual control of Rockhampton.

The writing is on the wall for the Rockhampton Harbour Board, and the people should be informed of what is going on. Is the Treasurer investigating increases in port dues at Port Alma?

(Time expired.)

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (3.15 p.m.): In having the opportunity of speaking during the Address in Reply I am mindful of the honour and privilege afforded me in being a member of this assembly. It is therefore with a deep sincerity that I associate myself with the expressions of loyalty to the person of Her Majesty the Queen, and to the Throne. I also desire to record my respect to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Henry Abel Smith. He has taken a wonderfully inspiring and personal interest in Queensland and it can be said with safety that he knows more about Queensland than do most Queenslanders. His personal interest has been an inspiration to the citizens of this State. The same may be said, of Lady May, who has taken a great personal interest, particularly in women's organisations with their rightful place in the community. I extend to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and also the hon. member for Murrumba, my congratulations on being elected to the positions of Chairman of Committees and Speaker, respectively, in this Assembly. You have very onerous responsibilities, and I assure you that I shall always conduct myself with the dignity and decorum required in this Assembly.

I think it is incumbent on me to extend to the Ministers of the Crown my confidence in them, because I have a personal knowledge of their sincere desire to do things for Queensland. I am sure they will continue on that very high plane.

I place on record my sincere appreciation of the confidence that the electors of Kurilpa have placed in me, and I thank the many men and women who worked so hard to ensure my election. I express my appreciation to the Liberal Party Organisation which so ably assisted all Liberal candidates.

I pay tribute to my political opponents who were nominated against me in the State election because, while the fight was hard, they made me earn my place in this Assembly. It is unfortunate for them that there are no second or third prizes. I am cognisant of my responsibilities to the electors of Kurilpa and while they need no further assurance from me that I will carry out my duties to them, I stress that I will

be ever vigilant and mindful of their interests. I shall take an active and personal interest in the electorate; I make no apology for being here. I shall work for the betterment and progress of the electorate and the State and I shall fight for the rights of my constituents against any injustice.

With those thoughts in mind, I now submit for the consideration of the House certain suggestions to improve the lot of humanity and so further contribute to the progress and prosperity of this sunshine State.

As hon. members know, there are a large number of people in our community who are retired, aged, invalid, and physically handicapped.

Mr. Aikens: And there are those who are unemployed.

Mr. HUGHES: There are a few who will always be unemployed. I remember that Mr. Les Haylen, Labour, New South Wales, once said in Parliament that a figure of 2.4 per cent. of unemployed was a very good thing. There are the aged and physically handicapped in the community, and I will firstly relate my remarks to them. It is for those people in receipt of a pension that I express my concern. Whilst I am primarily concerned with the requirements of the people of Kurilpa, I realise that this is of city, State, and national interest.

I believe that in this group, a large majority suffer loneliness, frustration and economic insecurity, to a degree. I contend that both economically and psychologically, the present system of early and compulsory retirement is wasteful and unsettling. I do not believe in "a human scrap heap." I am concerned that in Brisbane there are many old and physically handicapped people, who are wasting away their lives, because of present circumstances.

Mr. Aikens: They are rotting away instead of wearing out.

Mr. HUGHES: Up to a point that can be said of them. I shall make further comments on that later. The State should have the benefit of the time and skills that older and handicapped people can offer. Many of them prefer to remain in retirement and to enjoy their remaining years in a leisurely way. For them I am happy—as I am sure all hon. members are—but I speak for the large majority who want to do something useful with their time while earning a few pounds to combat, or help combat, the effects of an inflationary trend. This number will increase rather than diminish and I will quote figures soon to prove it. My authority is the recently prepared Brisbane population forecast. The books are readily available to hon. members who wish to study them. The forecast has interesting aspects. For 1961 the population is estimated to include 80,851 persons over 60 years of age, or 11 per cent. of the population. The forecast for 1981 is that the Brisbane population will

include 141,783 persons over 60, or 14 per cent. of the population. Hon. members will see that the problem of this aspect of society will become more acute with an increasing population in view of the longevity or greater life—expectancy that medical science has brought about.

The community is willing to divert part of its total income to support a large group of the population in retirement. While this may have many advantages, there is a gap in the life of the community, a leeway to be made up. Something else is needed for the 60-75 years age-bracket and that is part-time work for them, taking into account their health and strength. On the latest figures available from the Commonwealth Department of Social Services, there are presently in Queensland 102,000 persons in receipt of pensions. Bearing in mind the figures I have given, I pose this question: To what extent do older people work less than full time because they wish to? In my research into this subject—which is of vital interest, and of personal interest to me as a member of this Assembly—I found a quotation from “The Census Bureau of the United States of America,” which has given a basis for judgment on this point. Taking a total number at work as 100 in the 65 years-and-over age group, the statistics from the census are—

	Per cent.
Worked Full-time	78.7
Worked Part-time	21.3
On a further breakdown they show—	
	Per cent.
Usually work full-time	3.8
Usually work part-time	17.5
Prefer and could accept full-time work	3.1
Do not prefer full-time work	16.0

The last figure is the one we should pay particular attention to because it proves that only 16 per cent. of the people covered by the census do not want full-time work. Therefore, having given mature consideration to this problem, I propose to establish in the electorate that I represent, for the benefit of elderly and partially incapacitated people who reside there, a means by which they will be assisted financially and still retain their sense of independence and self-respect. I have in mind a building in which the people of whom I speak may work for a day or two a week and receive some remuneration to supplement their present meagre income. The project will be conducted as a co-operative venture, the administrative reins being held by a committee of management. If it is conducted on sound business lines, it will also provide amenities, club rooms, a meeting place, and a haven for the lonely. I have already obtained the support of a number of persons and business organisations, and I shall be out seeking more help in establishing this centre. It should be of vital and humane interest to every person, and I am hopeful that the public, the church, businesses, unions,

and Government departments, will be interested in assisting its formation and its conduct. In particular, I will seek the co-operation of the unions, because I recognise that unions play an important part in a modern society, and I wish to see that the standards and amenities are kept at a high level.

I am confident that, upon presentation of the relevant facts to an industrial magistrate, an aged or infirm worker's permit will be issued to enable the project to reach fruition. I know that elderly and retired people and aged and incapacitated people do not seek luxuries. They think simply in terms of obtaining their basic needs. This project will enable them to have those things that they now find it almost impossible to get.

To give hon. members an example—the hon. member for Ithaca is present, and I am sure he will vouch for these facts—a visiting dignitary from the South was being conducted round a street in Ithaca, and he noticed that on every house there was a television aerial. It was a long street, and he remarked upon the standard of living in Queensland and the fact that every one of these houses had a television aerial. However, he noticed that the end house did not have one, and upon arriving outside the house a sign was seen on the front gate that said, “We have a fridge.” That makes the position quite clear. Undoubtedly therein lives an aged person. These people do not want luxuries; they want essentials. They want to live with self respect and do something productive in the remaining years of their lives, instead of living in idleness and loneliness.

According to the book “Old People in a Modern Australian Community”, a survey in Victoria showed that of aged persons in the community almost 50 per cent. would take a job if they could, and there is reason to suppose that this proportion would be larger if it were known that qualification for the pension no longer depended on a means test. Further observations show that the difficulties that retirement bring with it are divided fairly evenly into two groups. On the one hand, more than half the age group mentioned financial problems; on the other hand, 40 per cent. mentioned boredom, “being put on the shelf”, “being played out”, loneliness, and frustration because they have the ability to work but cannot find employment.

To the individual, satisfactory employment makes possible in most circumstances a degree of financial independence and a sense of communal partnership, and these together are the integral and basic ingredients of personal wellbeing. We need a positive approach to the problem of employment for the aged and physically handicapped, and I know something of these problems because I am a member of the Advisory Committee for the Training and Placement of Blind Persons. As an illustration, I will tell hon.

members of the most recent case we have yet to deal with. A man of 46 years of age has become blind. He was employed by a Brisbane engineering firm for many years and has now been dismissed. He went to the Commonwealth department and underwent a test for a pension. He has been rejected and is not eligible for a pension because he failed to pass the 6-60 test. That means that an object visible to a sighted person from a distance of 60 metres is not visible to one 6 metres away, which indicates blindness. He is not eligible for a pension and he is without employment, having been dismissed.

Mr. Aikens: You mean that he is not totally blind?

Mr. HUGHES: According to his employer he is totally blind, but, according to the Commonwealth department, as he has not passed this test he is declared not totally blind and therefore is not eligible to receive the pension. What is to become of this man? He cannot get into a workshop for the blind because they cannot take anyone over the age of 45. He has children; he cannot get employment in a sheltered workshop, he cannot get a pension, and he has been dismissed. It will be a difficult case for the committee.

Another case concerns a young girl now attending high school. It is hoped that this year she will pass the Senior examination. We have blind people on switchboards, working as typists, working at rope-works and in other factories. They are handicapped to some extent, but can do certain types of work. They want to take a rightful place in the community. These are the people that I am personally interested in, and I hope that the unions and all sections of the community—indeed, all public-spirited citizens—will also take an active interest in them. At this stage, I should like to express my very deep appreciation and thanks to Tickle Industries Pty. Ltd. for their help in this matter.

It is estimated that over 100,000 people in Australia are officially classified as being more than 85 per cent. disabled. That figure is known, because they are entitled to pension benefits. No-one can say with any authority just how many there are with a lesser degree of disablement who, because of their disablement, find it difficult to get employment. However, I understand that to that 100,000 with 85 per cent. disability we could probably add another 250,000 with some impairment that limits the type of work they can do. To the community the employment of physically handicapped people would mean reduced costs in taxes, increased production and increased taxable income. It is therefore in the national interest to see that they, along with the aged, are gainfully employed.

Mr. Aikens: Above all things it would mean happiness for the people concerned.

Mr. HUGHES: I appreciate the hon. member's point. There should not be a human scrap-heap—they are not derelicts of humanity and society—and greater interest should be taken in their welfare. Ultimately it means to the individual and his family the lightening of financial and other responsibilities, the freeing of relatives to carry on their own careers, the improvement of home-life and the reduction of strain and domestic worry.

In this regard I envisage the co-operation and understanding of the unions concerned. I base this premise on the statement of Mr. W. Ritchie, Industrial Officer of the Labour Council of New South Wales. In November, 1958, while attending the first Pan-Pacific Rehabilitation Conference held in Sydney, he said—

"It is a principle of the Trade Union Movement that physically-handicapped persons should be placed in employment by mutual agreement between the particular employer, the appropriate union, the man, and the Department of Social Services."

He also said—

"The Trade Union Movement will co-operate and is co-operating on this basis. In New South Wales where there is provision for a slow worker's permit, the Union arranges with the Department of Labour and Industry and the employer for a permit to be issued to allow the disabled person to be employed at a reduced rate of pay."

On that premise I base the hope that the unions of this State will demonstrate their co-operation. To support my contention that the electors of Kurilpa should and will have the same opportunity, I remind hon. members that in England there are 90 workshops for the employment of the disabled, under the sheltered control of the Ministry of Labour. They are known as "Remploy." I recall also in America there is an organisation known as U.S.A. Abilities Incorporated which commenced competitive business with 8,000 dollars of borrowed capital, and in just four years it has erected a building valued at over 1,000,000 dollars. There is also need for such an organisation in this community.

What can be done overseas can also be done in Brisbane; worthwhile things will be done in Kurilpa. Our own people can carry out their desire to live again because of the sincerity in our hearts. By our hands we will take such measures as will enable them to enjoy the remaining years of their lives in a productive capacity with some remuneration. That above all will overcome their frustrations by their skills and talents not being used. Today brains and fingers have replaced the strong back and brute strength type of employment. I appeal to all, but particularly to businessmen to join me in this venture, to employ physically-handicapped people. I have already approached many organisations about it, but with

mixed results. Some employers believe that because a person is blind, he is only a threat in employment. Nothing could be further from the truth. In Brisbane blind persons in employment have a better record for industrial safety, attendance and an aptitude for the job they do today, than many sighted people.

Mr. Windsor: The machines would have to be made safe.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member for Ithaca says that the machines would have to be made safe. I hope he will give me the opportunity to prove that his contention is entirely wrong. Will the hon. member allow me to visit his works with a blind person and, on his assurance and test that he can do a job, employ him?

Mr. Windsor: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you. I have here an example of what a blind person can do. I crave the attention of hon. members to look upon this object. It was made by a totally blind person who operates machines in his own furniture factory. It was made to specifications as a business letterbox. I will pass it around so that hon. members may see it. I repeat it was made by a totally blind man named Harold Dickinson. It is as perfect a job as obtainable anywhere.

I invited a committee of blind people to have lunch with me and to look over this House a few weeks ago. There were three blind people in the group, Miss Mercy Griffin, Harold Dickinson and the blind physiotherapist, Malcolm Bryce. I suggest without fear of contradiction that those persons could describe the intricate carvings and mouldings round the walls, and on your dais, Mr. Speaker. It was pointed out that there was an "S" through those intricate carvings on your chair. I feel sure they could describe those markings better than many hon. members who have sat in this Chamber for years, and I say that without reflecting on them. The blind people have perceptions and senses far keener than many sighted people.

Hon. members will see that this letterbox is an example of first-class workmanship and it was carried out by a blind person. It was made hurriedly from scrap timber, and according to specifications.

I have had inquiries for labour from many employers, and I hope more will be forthcoming. Admittedly, old people have certain limitations. I admit that physical strength and speed decrease with age but many essential jobs demand neither quality. Jobs as quality control and inspections are often handled better by older workers. While youth may have colossal speed, in comparison with older workers, the latter have the advantage of greater experience in performance of the task and in adapting themselves to the industrial climate.

It is my firm and sincere belief that increased facilities for employment of

aged and handicapped persons can be expected to have a beneficial effect on the economy of the country, particularly as the proportion of aged persons in the community increases—and that trend is borne out by the population forecast—and will at the same time do much to halt the process of personal deterioration which the hon. member for Townsville South said takes place when old persons are idle. That is a common feature of retirement. The problem is a difficult one and presents a challenge to public men, management, unions and public-spirited citizens. In this respect, as the representative of Kurilpa electorate, I pledge myself to strive for tangible and worthwhile results.

Before I conclude I think I should touch on another subject of great moment, the use of alcohol. Socially this is one of the most important subjects of modern times, with far-reaching effects on the community. We must consider all the factors associated with the use, or rather the misuse, of alcoholic beverages. I do not think any hon. member will deny that view. My thoughts, based on personal observations and facts gleaned from investigations into the subject, have been prompted by the opinions expressed by the hon. member for Wavell and the hon. member for Townsville South. I hold similar views. All intelligent persons must agree that we must face the facts, even if they are unpleasant. Some one has to bell the cat, and I join with those hon. members in expressing concern about the use of alcohol and its effect on the economy, the family, and human life generally. It calls for a close scrutiny. The hon. member for Townsville South spoke of drunken driving and manslaughter cases.

Mr. Aikens: Do you agree with my contention?

Mr. HUGHES: There is need to overhaul the legislation regarding liquor and the penalties for offences. We must take a realistic view. We cannot bring a person back to life, nor can we replace an injured limb.

Mr. Aikens: Have you a particular case in point on which you are making your observations?

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member asks if my views are based on personal experience. Yes. I mention a case that came up during the last election campaign. I knew the driver and the victim. The driver was taken to court and dealt with on two counts. He was fined the paltry sum of £30 and his licence was suspended for a few months, but the victim, a woman in her early thirties, had her sight impaired for life, she is on crutches and is almost paralysed in one leg. Her life has been ruined. The car driver is happy. He is walking around the city quite unconcerned; he can afford to be happy. Look at the terrible loss! Like other hon. members, I am concerned with the problem of those who are injured, mangled, and killed

by drunken drivers. This is cause for great concern. The hon. member for Wavell quoted figures and said that 6 per cent. of the population of Australia were alcoholics and that one in every 15 of our children would become an alcoholic. That is cause for alarm, and we, as responsible public men in the community, must look into it.

I shall refer now to another alarming aspect of this matter. I am sure every hon. member is concerned about the death toll on the road. A very recent publication states that in the United States of America the death rate from accidents has increased by 450 per cent. It is hardly an exaggeration to declare that the menace of the intoxicated driver is the most serious public-safety problem of the day, and one of the most difficult to combat. The ink on these figures which I now quote is scarcely dry, and they refer to persons appearing before lower courts on charges involving alcohol and being drunk in charge of motor vehicles. They are the 1959-1960 figures, and they reveal that in that year the total appearances in court on cases involving alcohol were 29,791. The report of the Commissioner for Police for 1958-1959 showed that there were 24,997 such cases; in other words, an increase of 16 per cent. For 1959-1960 there were 1,157 cases of drunk-in-charge of a motor vehicle, as against 1,000 cases in 1958-1959. That is cause for alarm. In the Police Commissioner's report for 1958-1959 it was shown that there were 528 road accidents directly related to drink, 28 persons were killed, and 283 were injured. Eleven motor cycle accidents are listed, involving 12 deaths. Of course there is cause for alarm! To the hon. member for Wavell, Mr. Dewar, who is seriously noting my remarks, this is cause for further concern: there were 782 cases involving drink, and drunk-in-charge of motor vehicles, relating to persons under 21. I received those figures less than one hour ago from the Bureau of Census and Statistics.

Our legislators, law-enforcement authorities, the Press, and all other authorities have a task upon the success of which will depend the security and happiness of countless lives and the welfare and safety of the entire motoring public. I believe that the Government should consider realistically all the community aspects associated with alcohol.

I wish to emphasise one aspect of the problem associated with modern times; modern times pose complicated modern problems. A few years ago, if John Citizen imbibed too freely there was more than a reasonable chance that he would get home safely and without injuring anyone, because "Dobbyn," his faithful horse, with sulky attached, would be waiting for him, and even if the drinker did not know the way home, then "Dobbyn" did. But, in 1960, if John Citizen gets drunk he wends his way unsteadily to a different form of transport: a "metal monster" with the super-surgic power of 100 horses locked under the bonnet, and waiting fiendishly to be released.

I submit that human behaviour patterns are the concern of Governments. Over the centuries the problem of alcoholic beverages was, primarily, not how to produce or market them, or how to make them palatable, but rather how to use them. That is the substance of my submission, and I think it is worth while to mention here the definition of "moderate" drinker given by Haggard and Jellinek in "Alcohol Explored," New York, 1945. It is as follows:—

"He does not seek intoxication, and he does not expose himself to it. He uses alcoholic beverages as a condiment and for their milder sedative effects. Alcohol constitutes neither a necessity nor a considerable item in his budget."

The use, or rather the misuse, of alcoholic beverages is a controversial subject. In the community are opposing groups who support extreme views. I beseech hon. members to view the problem dispassionately and objectively, while exercising a degree of tolerance. I lean to the sane, common-sense course of recognising that "an open mind that searches for the truth, and a tolerant view of opponents, shapes the path by which progress advances."

Medicine and science have made it very clear that alcoholism is a problem of personality and the forces of the environment that play upon it. Let us face the facts. Alcoholic beverages are here to stay, and a sane, responsible, orderly and friendly enjoyment of such beverages by an educated public is possible. I sound a note of warning, an entreaty for the proper use of alcohol and not its excess use, which ultimately ends in disgrace, disruption of the home, or an offence against person, property or society, such as committed by drunken drivers, youthful drinkers, drunks throwing bottles from moving cars or smashing bottles on roads, footpaths, public parks and beaches, the problem of the aged drinker, and the skid-row types who daily come before stipendiary magistrates.

Hon. members are surely aware of the large number of misfit skid-rowers who, by an excess of alcohol, are reduced to metho drinkers. They frequent public parks, such as Musgrave Park, Albert Park and Anzac Square. I have seen them in front of the City Hall and down at Fortitude Valley; I have seen them, too, at the tram waiting-shed at the corner of Wharf and Ann Streets. They are a strange and pitiful fraternity, who abide seriously by weird drinking rites. For instance, one of their number is nominated to go to a nearby shop, where he purchases one bottle of methylated spirits and one bottle of Fanta soft drink. Hon. members will doubtless agree that Fanta is a delicious drink, but wait until I explain how these derelicts make it a skid-row super-special cocktail. Assume that in the club are Joe, Jack, Jim and John. Joe, who has been delegated the job of messenger to go to the shop and buy the drinks, brings back

both bottles and commences the ceremony in this way: he takes a mouthful of Fanta, spits it out, grimaces, "Ugh!" pours in methy-lated spirits and then passes the two bottles to Jack. Jack drinks a mouthful of Fanta, and then adds more metho to the Fanta bottle. That process goes on until all the methy-lated spirits is in the Fanta bottle.

So we have this procession of drunks. They pose a difficult public-health and social problem. I am reliably informed that 12 per cent. of the drunks in the community are over 60 years of age, and that 90 per cent. of them have had previous convictions.

Mr. Mann: Don't you believe that!

Mr. HUGHES: I can quote from the report of the Commissioner of Police. In fact, the hon. member is probably in this number. I read recently in the metropolitan Press where one such person has over 1,000 convictions. I bring these facts to the notice of the House as I believe the problems associated with alcohol should be recognised and a campaign for sane, sensible, safe and moderate drinking instituted.

Let us look, too, at the problem of how an excess of alcohol has its effect on the car driver, the economy, the home, and especially the young and the aged. Legislators in California, who are concerned for the public welfare, have recognised facts associated with the nature and effect of alcoholic beverages. This recognition is shown in sections of the California Education Code, from which I shall quote if time permits. However, before concluding let me say that in Queensland the drinking of alcoholic beverages raises many special and urgent problems. Therefore, while commending the Government on what they have done, I suggest that they further investigate alcohol, its place, its use, and its effect in and on the community. How else can the Government fully and properly ascertain matters affecting liquor and the legislation necessary, the advisability of reducing the alcoholic content in beer, the effect on the economy, the home and human life, and the advisability of instituting a programme of education?

Mr. Mann: What about gambling?

Mr. HUGHES: I am not speaking of the hon. member's Spring Hill interests.

Mr. Aikens: Don't you believe in gambling?

Mr. HUGHES: I am making this speech.

Mr. Aikens: I was talking to the hon. member for Brisbane.

Mr. HUGHES: I return now to quote the provisions inserted in the California Education Code by the legislators of California whereby they include "Alcohol" and its effect in the school education programme.

(Time expired.)

Mr. DUFFICY (Warrego) (3.55 p.m.): I convey to you, Mr. Speaker, my sincere congratulations on your elevation to the important office that you now hold in this Assembly, and I also congratulate the Chairman of Committees on his appointment.

Perhaps I should also congratulate the Government parties on their excellent gerry-mandering of the electorates, if they think that is anything to be proud of, and the hon. members for Somerset and Ashgrove, who I understand were the brains trust in that redistribution. If a perfect job of gerry-mandering is worthy of congratulations, then I extend my congratulations.

I did not interject when the hon. member for Kurilpa was speaking because he is a new member of this Assembly, but the hon. member made a remarkable statement that his predecessor in that electorate, Mr. Peter Connolly, was only entitled to run second. That was his place, he said. I think his opinion must conflict to some extent with that of the Premier and the Cabinet, because they saw fit to give Mr. Connolly and two others the important task of reviewing the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Surely nothing could be more important to the workers of Queensland, industry generally, and the economy of the State, than that Act. The hon. member for Kurilpa said that Mr. Connolly was a second-class kind of person.

Mr. Smith: The hon. member was talking about his Labour opponent.

Mr. DUFFICY: I am making this speech, and I am quoting what the hon. member said. The fact remains that the Premier and members of Cabinet saw fit to appoint Mr. Connolly to that position, and I shall have more to say about that later.

I think I should now speak about Western Queensland, which has returned me as a member of this Assembly for the past 10 years. While congratulations are the order of the day, let me congratulate the Country Party on their good sense in not opposing me on this occasion. I am sure that they realised they would merely be wasting their money.

Mr. HUGHES: I rise to a point of order. Although I was not in the Chamber, it has been brought to my notice that I have been quoted as saying that Mr. Peter Connolly had come second and that that was all he was entitled to. I point out that I have been misquoted. I said I paid tribute to my opponents; that they made me work hard in the election and made me earn my place; unfortunately for them, there was no second or third prize.

Mr. DUFFICY: After that interesting little speech, I will just repeat that the hon. member did say that Mr. Connolly ran second and that that was his place.

Mr. Dewar: He was referring to your mob.

Mr. HUGHES: I rise to a point of order. Having been misquoted, I am asking for the withdrawal of those remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! As the hon. member for Kurilpa has said that he has been misquoted, I ask the hon. member for Warrego to withdraw his remarks.

Mr. DUFFICY: If the hon. member says I misquoted him I am happy to withdraw, but I am going to consult an ear, nose and throat specialist as soon as possible to have my ears attended to.

As I said, I compliment the Country Party on their good sense in not opposing me, but I cannot compliment them for advising their supporters—the few they have in that area—to support my Q.L.P. opponent. They did not have the intestinal fortitude to oppose me themselves, and it seemed a “round-the-corner” attitude to adopt. The subject of unity tickets was raised in the House recently. I did not hear anything about a unity ticket between the Country Party and the Q.L.P. on that occasion. It did operate in my electorate.

I wish to make only one further comment on the debate so far, and it concerns the remarks of the Leader of the Queensland Labour Party who have endeavoured to smear the Australian Labour Party with an association with the Communist Party. Speaking personally—I shall speak on behalf of the party later—I was for very many years an official of an industrial organisation which I maintain has done more to combat Communism in Queensland than any other organisation that has ever been in existence. I refer to the Australian Workers Union, and I defy hon. members opposite to deny my statement. For 22 years I had the honour of playing an active part in that union and during that time I would say that the A.W.U. did more to combat Communism in Queensland than any other organisation has ever done. I challenge any hon. member of the Queensland Labour Party, or any hon. member opposite, to deny that I personally have done more to combat Communism in this State than any of them. It is all very well for them to prate about Communism in the Chamber. After all, there are no Communists here to attack them. It was an entirely different matter, particularly in the depression years, to stand up before hundreds of men and fight Communism on the job as I and many of my colleagues had to do.

How many of the so-called Communist-haters in the Chamber have ever done that? What right have they to smear hon. members of my party who have consistently fought Communism over the years and are continuing the fight? They have no right to do so, particularly when it is remembered that they have not taken a single step to attack Communism but rather are they breeding Communism by their actions. It was only during the depression years that

Communism played a significant part in the political and industrial life of this State. Let me give hon. members an instance of it. In Maryborough in 1932, which was in the midst of the depression, a Communist candidate who had no social standing and not a very great personal following opposed Jim Stopford, one of the most capable Ministers this State has ever known.

This person stood as a Communist candidate in Maryborough and his vote was 1,500 at that time, against a Minister of the Crown and a particularly capable and popular one. If a Communist stood in Maryborough today, he would lose his deposit.

Mr. Davies: He would not get 100 votes.

Mr. DUFFICY: I ask hon. members to tell me how many Communists have been successful in saving their deposits since the days when Mr. Fred Paterson was a member of this House?

Mr. Mann: None at all. They cannot answer it.

Mr. DUFFICY: This boggy of Communism is simply a political trick to smear the Australian Labour Party, and when it is done in this House by our political opponents, I resent it, particularly as I spent the best days of my life fighting Communism in this State. I resent the smear personally and from the point of view of the party to which I have the honour to belong.

It does not reflect any credit either on the Leader of the Q.L.P. or hon. members on the other side who, for purely political reasons, want to smear people who have attacked and fought Communism for years. I feel strongly on the matter and I think I am entitled to in view of my early activities in the industrial field.

I want to make some comment about the conditions existing in the West today and the problems that are facing the wool industry in Queensland. I want to bring all the facts under the notice of the Government and I appeal to them to give them earnest consideration.

The wool industry is our major source of income. Queensland and Australia generally are still riding on the sheep's back; there is no doubt about that. Most of our income comes from wool. Eighty per cent. of our total exports are rural and, of that 80 per cent., wool represents 60 per cent. That should demonstrate the importance of this industry to the economy of this State and Australia generally.

Most hon. members opposite have never been far from Queen Street and no Minister comes from more than a few hundred miles from the coast, comparatively speaking, and I might surprise them when I say that within a measurable period of time, perhaps within 15 or 20 years, there is a distinct

possibility that the wool industry will face a shortage of labour. I think that will be the position. I invite hon. members opposite to visit western shearing sheds. They will find that the average age of shearers is well over 50 years. There are not many young men in the industry, and I shall endeavour to give the reasons for that. If hon. members opposite think the subject is not serious, let them consider for a moment the effect of the wool industry on the economy of Queensland and Australia.

This industry is remarkable in that it is possibly the only one in which automation has not played, and probably will not play, an important part for many years. In other industries automation is being introduced. In the sugar industry we have mechanical harvesting, and the use of these machines will increase, thus reducing the number of men employed in cutting cane. We see automation even in the dairying industry and, possibly to a lesser extent, in the wheat industry. But scientists have not yet devised a mechanical process for shearing. The methods employed today are identical with those of 20 years ago. Shearing is hard manual labour, and shearers still use the types of combs and cutters and machinery that were used more than 20 years ago.

As automation will not play a major part in the wool industry for many years, if the industry is to survive we must have an effective work force of sufficient strength. I sound a note of warning. If the Government do not take steps to overcome the problem, in a short space of time we shall not have an efficient work force of sufficient strength. The young man of today is not prepared to put up with conditions accepted by his father—flies, heat, and dust, with little or no facilities for relaxation, and absolutely no opportunities for recreation—and I do not blame him. The conditions must be made more attractive if we want to induce young people to become efficient shearers or shearing-industry employees and remain in the industry. I do not wish to convey the impression that I think Shearing Industry Award conditions are unfavourable when compared with the award rates in other industry. Even in casual industry, such as the sugar industry, the wages and conditions are reasonably good. We must realise the work is carried out in the less favoured portions of this State. We must realise, too, that the accommodation—despite the fact that there has been continual improvement over a number of years—is still not up to the standard operating in other industries on the coast. In fact, the conditions under which these people work would not be tolerated by the city worker for five minutes; they just would not be tolerated!

I may say that the gradual improvement in accommodation that has taken place over the years has reached a standstill, more or less, since the present Minister for Labour

and Industry issued an instruction that accommodation inspectors were not to travel in the same car as union officials. My colleague, the hon. member for Barcoo, realises the significance of such an instruction and the effect it will have on accommodation in the west, as does every other westerner. However, that is by the way.

The very evolution of this industry, which must continue, has a tendency to decrease the effective wage of pastoral employees. Labour Governments in the past have agreed with the principle of closer settlement which has been in operation for a number of years. I might say that the ex-Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation agreed completely with me on this matter. I do not know if that policy is going to be continued. I will have more to say about it afterwards. Nevertheless, the implementation of closer settlement has a tendency to decrease the effective wage of pastoral employees. Before the advent of closer settlement we had large holdings in the west, and pastoral properties which would run 70,000, 80,000 and 100,000 sheep. The shearing industry employees would be working at the one shed for six, eight, and possibly ten weeks. Today, I venture to say the average length of a shed in Queensland would be less than two weeks.

Mr. Windsor: What is the reason for that?

Mr. DUFFICY: The reason for that is closer settlement. I have told the hon. member that. I can only tell the hon. member; I cannot give him the intelligence to understand. When one Minister said there was "a long tail" in the party, he must have been speaking the truth, and the hon. gentleman must be the last joint in that tail. Today, for a shearer to get the same number of sheep, he has to visit eight or ten sheds, and in doing so he has to travel many hundreds of miles. It is expensive travelling many hundreds of miles in the west. In spite of the union arguing on numerous occasions, along the lines I am arguing the travelling clause in the award at present provides for employees only 10d. a mile, one way. That is travelling expenses. Hon. members will realise the impossibility of travelling in that country at 10d. a mile. Those people are certainly not adequately reimbursed. With the shorter times of operating in the smaller sheds the tendency is to decrease the effective wage of the employees because there is an inevitable loss of time between sheds, even though what they earn during the time they are employed may be substantial. I do not argue that their award is inadequate. I simply say that the conditions now operating in the industry decrease their annual earnings—their effective wage over the year—to the extent that the industry is not an attractive one for young people to enter. What is far more important is that it is a seasonal industry and the Government have

not set aside any public money for amenities in the West or for giving the workers some continuity of employment in western towns.

Unless the Government face up to their responsibilities—unless they put on long-distance glasses instead of looking only to Queen Street and the coastal strip—and provide adequate amenities in western towns and employment for pastoral workers in the slack season, this great industry, on which the economy of the country depends, will, within the next 15 or 20 years, be hampered and hamstrung and probably destroyed through the lack of sufficient labour.

Mr. Pizzey: You must admit that it is a difficult problem and that you people could not find a solution in 40 years.

Mr. DUFFICY: Oh yes, we did.

Mr. Pizzey: What was it?

Mr. DUFFICY: I will tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Pizzey: I will be interested to hear you.

Mr. DUFFICY: I know the Minister will be interested and I hope he and his Government will follow the example we set. It is a rather remarkable fact that the first town in Queensland to be seweraged was Cunnamulla, and a subsidy of 50 per cent. was granted on both materials and labour. That is to say, the total cost of the scheme was subsidised to the extent of 50 per cent. by a Labour Government.

The second town in Queensland to be seweraged was Quilpie—620 miles west of Brisbane—and the same conditions applied there. The third town in Queensland to be seweraged was Goondiwindi.

Mr. Pizzey: They are still being seweraged. Take Barcaldine, for example.

Mr. DUFFICY: That is right. We were seized with the necessity to go ahead with that work.

Mr. Evans: That subsidy still applies.

Mr. DUFFICY: If that subsidy still applies, it is rather remarkable. What is the subsidy for swimming pools now?

Mr. Evans: We are talking about sewerage.

Mr. DUFFICY: What is the Government's subsidy for swimming pools? When swimming pools were built in Mitchell and Cunnamulla the Labour Government gave a subsidy of 33½ per cent. I venture to say that this Government have reduced the subsidy to 25 per cent. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. Evans: That is right.

Mr. Pizzey: That is right.

Mr. DUFFICY: Of course I am right. That indicates how much consideration the Government have for the people of the West.

How many houses have the present Government built in the West since they assumed office?

Mr. Evans: A whole lot more than your Government built.

Mr. DUFFICY: Oh no, they have not. How many have they built in Charleville, and how many in Cunnamulla?

Mr. Evans: What about Longreach?

Mr. DUFFICY: What is the Government's expenditure on main roads in that country? Public expenditure on western parts of Queensland has been virtually non-existent since this Government took office. The use of more efficient methods in the pastoral industry has lowered the effective wages of the workers, and no public money is available to provide employment. Consequently, the population in western Queensland is decreasing. I ask hon. members opposite to deny that if they can. The population in Brisbane and in coastal areas is increasing. Because of their lack of consideration for the people of the West, the Government are going the right way about destroying not only western towns but also the great pastoral industry, on which we are so dependent.

Mr. Evans: What about the Channel country?

Mr. DUFFICY: I am making this speech, and I have finished with that subject for the moment. I shall be interested to hear what the Minister has to say at a later stage.

I am particularly interested in land matters, and I have made many speeches on the subject in this House. After all, our wealth springs from the land, and the land policy of any Government is one of the most important phases of Government. The hon. member for Condamine said that 5,000 acres in the brigalow belt might be a living area at present, but that in years to come, with the help of science, 1,000 acres might be enough. In effect that is what he said, and I could not agree with him more. I made precisely the same statement when we were arguing about the fallacy of freeholding 5,000-acre areas in the brigalow belt. I said that after all the Crown loses authority over that area immediately the land is freeholded, that it should be left under leasehold tenure, and that when science progressed sufficiently the land could be subdivided into the living areas required under the then-existing conditions. In future I am looking for support from the hon. member for Condamine when land matters are being debated.

In the little time at my disposal I wish to refer to the late Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation.

Government Members: He is not dead.

Mr. DUFFICY: From a ministerial point of view he is dead—much to the discredit of the Government. I suppose there is

nobody in the Chamber who at times disagreed more violently with the hon. member for Fassifern than I. While he was Minister there were some phases of his policy—the Government's policy because I suppose it was not only his—with which I violently disagreed but I pay him the tribute that he had the courage of his convictions, and probably that was the rock he perished on. I know that many of the big pastoral companies and big landholders in Queensland were violently opposed to him, because they told me so. I know, too, that a good deal of pressure was brought to bear by financial interests in this State to displace him. It is to the discredit of the Government, particularly the Country Party section, that they allowed outside pressure to influence them to displace a person who had the courage of his convictions and was, after all, a very loyal member of the party. In this instance it was the tail wagging the dog because I think most of the pressure came from the Liberal Party, or at least some members of the Liberal Party, who caused that pressure to be applied.

Although I have the very highest regard for his successor, the hon. member for Cunningham, it is unfortunate that the Country Party selected a person with absolutely no knowledge of the outlying parts of the State, a gentleman who, when opening the Cunnamulla show said, "This is my first visit to the West, and I just don't know anything about it, but I am happy to be out here." He did not know then, of course, that he was going to be Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, but it was a fact that probably he had never been over the Great Dividing Range before. Everybody must realise that land problems are not along the coast but out in the West. Land problems along the coastal belt have been dealt with. It is in Western Queensland, where large areas must either be subdivided or dealt with in some other way, that the real problems of land administration are posed. Although I have great respect for the hon. gentleman I am afraid that his inexperience and lack of knowledge of land matters and western conditions make him completely unfitted to hold his portfolio. I doubt very much whether he will have the intestinal fortitude to withstand outside pressure from large pastoralists and industrial groups, and be able to do the right thing as the hon. member for Fassifern did on numerous occasions when he held the portfolio.

(Time expired).

Mr. SMITH (Windsor) (4.35 p.m.): I join with the mover and seconder of the motion under debate in their expressions of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. I congratulate the hon. members for Hinchinbrook and Bowen on their entry into the Chamber which is, I consider, the richer for their presence. On my own behalf and on behalf of my constituents I again express loyalty to the Crown.

As time passes it becomes more and more apparent that in our beloved Governor, Sir Henry Abel Smith, Her Majesty has as her representative in Queensland a person possessed of an extremely high sense of duty and one whose desire to concern himself with the problems of his people and with the people themselves is becoming a household word today. Every Queenslander, I feel sure, hesitates to think about the time when our Governor and Lady May must leave us. I extend to His Excellency and Lady May best wishes for good health and full happiness in their position.

During the course of the remarks that His Excellency addressed to this Chamber there were one or two comments to which I must refer later on. Before doing so, might I extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations on your elevation to your high office, and to the hon. member for Clayfield on his reappointment to the other high office in this House, that of Chairman of Committees. I congratulate, too, all the new members on both sides of the House. With the extremely high percentage of new members, we can expect new thoughts and new approaches to old problems and, if each of those hon. members devotes himself with keenness and interest to those problems, I am sure we will go a long way towards solving many of them.

Mr. Davies: You will get some good thoughts from this side of the House.

Mr. SMITH: Some of the thoughts I have heard from the opposite side scarcely bear the appellation the interjector gives them. However, a man can judge only according to his own lights.

It was interesting to listen to the hon. member for Warrego describing how, as an organiser of the A.W.U., he was forthright in his fight against the Communist peril. It was more interesting, and a deal more suspicious, to note that the same hon. member slipped over or failed to mention how the A.W.U., in this forthright fight against Communism, dissociated itself from the Labour Party. He chose to ignore that point.

From His Excellency's Opening Speech I take the first statement on which I wish to comment today. His Excellency said—

"My Ministers have been distressed by the ever-increasing toll of the road."

I have made it a point, and I have said on more than one occasion in this House that, as long as I am here, I will raise my voice on every possible occasion to ensure that the welfare of road-users in this State is paramount in the minds of those people concerned with legislating for roads and their use.

Mr. Houston: What about road hauliers?

Mr. SMITH: If hon. members of the Opposition want mention of road hauliers, I will do it now.

Mr. Bennett: You should have them produce their books.

Mr. SMITH: It is good to see that my learned colleague reads the law reports in the papers. It might be better for him if he were to read the law reports as published by authority. A common hazard on our roads are unattended trailers, broken-down trailers, prime-movers, and sometimes broken-down prime-mover and trailer together. That is a common sight. As His Excellency points out, his advisers are distressed by the ever-increasing toll of the road, so I commend to the Minister concerned very serious consideration of the problem that confronts a road-user when he is driving on a fairly narrow roadway, as we are forced to in this State, and is faced with a broken-down trailer.

Mr. Houston: Didn't you raise this matter three years ago?

Mr. Aikens: Didn't you reduce the sentence of the killer of a young boy from five years to 18 months?

Mr. SMITH: I did not raise this matter 18 months ago. I am raising this problem today for the first time, and, if the interjectors opposite and the hon. member for Townsville South would join with me instead of trying to hinder me, the State may be better for it, because it may well be that one of those interjectors will be injured in an accident.

The particular matter I have in mind at the moment is the practice of leaving trailers, often loaded with 15 or more tons of produce or goods on the side of the road. A road user driving along that road—perhaps at night when it is raining—can be confronted with a particularly awkward obstacle. At night oncoming traffic and the headlights of those vehicles can render this unseen obstacle a fatal trap. Drivers are required to switch on the warning lights of unattended trailers, but I am referring particularly to the practice that has developed among hauliers of leaving trailers for more than a day by the side of the road. I have no quarrel with the man whose vehicle breaks down at 2 o'clock in the morning. All we can expect him to do is to pull as far as possible off the road and put on his warning lights, but I submit that no haulier has any warrant to leave a trailer by the side of the road during the hours of daylight, because, wherever he may be, he can go to the nearest town, get a truck and unload his vehicle or get some other vehicle to pull the trailer clear of the highway. It is not uncommon to see these large vehicles stuck out in the middle of the roadway, causing unbeknown perils to people coming in their wake.

This matter brings me back to my previous statements, which hon. members opposite have referred to, about a nominal defendant for motor vehicle insurance. I raised the

subject of the institution of a nominal defendant on my entry to this Chamber three years ago.

Mr. Aikens: Why won't your Government introduce it?

Mr. SMITH: I have mentioned it since and I will continue to mention it until the Government can be prevailed upon to institute it. It is a creature of Statute, and a very worthwhile creature, and, as long as we go on without it, there will be homes prejudiced and families distressed because they cannot recover any damages after an accident.

Mr. Bennett: What is their objection to it?

Mr. SMITH: Without going into the objections to it, I point out that all I am concerned about is that I should make as strong a case as possible for the institution of this instrument.

Mr. Bennett: Have you approached the Minister for Justice?

Mr. Aikens: Why can you not sell such an excellent idea to your own Government?

Mr. SMITH: The interjectors are not doing the case any good whatever; they are merely wasting time.

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. SMITH: If the hon. member for Townsville South who has a bull-like voice and possibly other bull-like attributes will restrain himself I will be able to proceed. As so many new members are in the Chamber, I think it is an appropriate time again to canvass the subject of a nominal defendant and to point out to hon. members, not as well endowed with legal knowledge as the hon. member for South Brisbane the need for it.

Mr. Aikens: And the hon. member for Townsville South.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member for Townsville South has shown on previous occasions, particularly when advising his constituents on alimony pendente lite, his lack of knowledge of the law, and he is not showing any improvement now.

In an accident involving a car that absconds, leaving the victims without any knowledge of the identity of the car, the owner or the driver; in the case of a car which stops but is not insured; and in the case of a car which although insured is being used for some purpose other than that for which it is insured—for example, a farm vehicle which should not be used on the road—there is a distinct risk that the person injured will be left without redress, and I do not want that to occur. It is my ambition to provide for all injured people as soon as possible the means whereby they can be assured of the protection the statute envisages they should have. There is

no doubt that the statute envisages that all vehicles using the road should be covered by an insurance policy, and that people injured by those vehicles will be able to claim. Despite what I said three years ago, this has not been accepted or acted upon. I would have thought that in such a worthwhile matter three years would have been, politically, time enough for some action to have been taken on it. When we consider that the money does not come out of the Government's pocket, we must come to the conclusion that the Government have had adequate time to implement it. This money is not even in the Government's purse; the money is provided by the premiums paid by car owners, so there cannot be any reason financially why we cannot institute this benefit. There is perhaps the possibility of a slight increase in premium. I say "slight" advisedly. There have been various forecasts that the claims will increase, but until such time as they do, I am prepared to say a "slight increase", and any increase that is suffered will be borne by the road user—the owner of a car. As many hon. members here are car owners, and as many hon. members present have heard the submissions and endorsed them, I can only take it that their reaction is indicative of the reaction of other car owners who, realising the worth of this institution, the nominal defendant, will accept any increase in premium, in the spirit in which I am making the suggestion. It is well worthwhile, for the sake of a few extra shillings to have the added protection for ourselves and our families.

Mr. Hughes: You have my approval.

Mr. SMITH: I am indeed pleased that the hon. member for Kurilpa, one of the new members, has indicated his approval of the scheme. It is not only in cases of death that this institution of the nominal defendant is worthwhile, particularly when one considers that the claims that have been made recently for the loss of use of limbs, the loss of sight, and the loss of hearing, are mounting in size. We see claims for £12,000 and £15,000 being awarded to some claimants. This makes it all the more necessary to provide that the person, or his dependants shall have available to them the means, or the wherewithal whereby that claim can be met. It is scant satisfaction to that person to have an empty judgment, or a piece of paper from the Supreme Court of Queensland telling him he has succeeded in his action and is entitled to recover £15,000. There is not one financial institution that will give him a penny on that, if the person against whom the judgment is given has not the funds. I make the request with the utmost sincerity, that the Government act on this submission.

Mr. Aikens: Have you ever brought this up at the party meeting?

Mr. SMITH: I have made the submission to the Government in this House, and I

hope that in three years' time when I again mount this rostrum to make my Address-in-Reply speech—

Opposition members: You will not be here.

Mr. SMITH: Many of those in Opposition will not be here, and I hope that those new members on this side of the House who will be replacing them do not have to listen to this speech.

Mr. Aikens: It is certain I will be here. I will be singing out for Peter Connolly.

Mr. SMITH: There is no doubt the hon. member will be singing out, wherever he is.

I hope that in the case of the uninsured vehicle, in the case of the hit-and-run vehicle, and in any other case where the nominal defendant is needed, this State will join with all the other States in implementing this worthwhile institution.

I have the good fortune to have the Treasurer in the Chamber and I should like to mention another matter on which I have previously made submissions, and that is the question of workers' compensation claims, in very doubtful cases. Twelve months ago I unsuccessfully submitted a case to the House or the change in onus of proof in matters where there were two or three contributing causes of death and it was impossible to ascertain which was the actual cause. In such a case, where you have conflicting causes of death, one of which might have been attributable to his employment, unless the applicant can satisfy (a) the Insurance Commissioner, and failing him (b) the Industrial Magistrate, and failing him (c), the Full Bench of the Industrial Court, that the death was the result of the industry, or the occupation, the deceased's dependants will not recover. I think that is very harsh. It is grossly unfair. The money is not public money. It is not the public purse that is being picked. It is money found by the employers. I have no brief whatever for saving employers any contributions on this score. For the sake of the deceased worker and his dependants I would willingly involve the employer in extra expense.

I agreed with the answer that the Treasurer was kind enough to give me on the occasion of my previous submission. That was when I wanted the complete reversal of the onus of proof. I now submit a modified version of that submission. I do not request him to change the onus of proof but to investigate the possibility, in such cases of death and in such cases of competing causes, of making provision in the Act for the benefit of the doubt to go to the applicant where there is any circumstance or cause or matter in doubt. At the present time if the applicant cannot satisfy the Court as to the cause of death, he loses. In view of the fact that workers' compensation has a strong analogy with insurance, with a policy in force, if the Court is not satisfied as to what happened the benefit of the doubt should go to the worker;

his dependants should be allowed to claim. Remember, I make this submission in respect of death, not injury. As I said a year ago, if the person is alive he can point out something that might influence the Court to find one way or the other. The case of death is totally different.

Mr. Aikens: A person who is alive can be submitted to tests, too.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, and I think there are many men alive who should be submitted to tests.

I turn now to a parochial matter affecting the Windsor State School—a school with over 700 pupils. I know I will be accused by some of the grandiloquent statesmen in the Chamber of adopting a parish-pump attitude, but in this instance I make no apology for it. I am forced to renew, three years later, a submission I made in 1957 requesting the removal of some large stores located in the school grounds. The girls attending the school are denied adequate playgrounds. We have heard throughout the length and breadth of Australia, and indeed throughout the world, commentaries upon juvenile delinquency and the need in childhood especially for recreation and for healthy sport. These subjects are frequently mentioned in the daily Press and from both sides of the House, but when half of the playground at the Windsor school is taken up by large buildings occupied for purposes other than the immediate needs of the school, I submit we are not doing our utmost to assist the girls of that school to reach their appointed status in life. The girls cannot play softball because they have not a pitch on which to play it. The boys have a cricket pitch of limited extent. If the stores buildings were not there the girls could have not one but two softball pitches. Moreover, removal of the sheds would leave a large concrete slab, which would in itself provide an ideal playing surface for many of the sports envisaged by the school and by the school masters. There would be no need to root out at great expense any of that concrete slab. All that need be done is move the buildings. They can easily be removed. They are only of frame construction and they could be shifted, if necessary, to some other spot.

Mr. Windsor: Are they Commonwealth buildings?

Mr. SMITH: They are used by the Education Department for school stores. I suggest that there should be ample space in the Teachers' Training College building for school stores, and that would mean that the girls at Windsor State School could have the playing facilities to which they are entitled. I think it is a mistake for us to continue for one day longer than we have to with anything that interferes with the use of the school grounds by the pupils. Many schools in Brisbane today, because of lack of space, are forced to look outside

their own grounds for playing fields. One sees children from the Ascot State School going to Fox's Paddock, with which I am familiar because it was on the boundary of my former electorate. But when we have space within the fences of the school grounds, I submit that we should move the buildings elsewhere and make the ground available for the use of the school.

I also wish to draw the Minister's attention to the state of the ramp leading to the infants' section at the Windsor school. During the war, as I think I have pointed out in the Chamber previously, the infants' school was used as an auxiliary hospital. That was an emergency measure, and a ramp was constructed to give vehicular traffic access to the school. That ramp has now become slightly unsafe. I would not say it is very unsafe, but it is sufficiently unsafe to warrant the closing of the gates. As there is an opportunity school in the building, there is a good deal of vehicular traffic to it. To get there, the vehicles cross the playground of the other sections of the school, where in playing hours there are from 700 to 800 children, because they cannot use one gate. It would be a very good thing if the ramp could be repaired—it is only a short one—to allow vehicles to use it. The lives of the children in the playground would not then be endangered unnecessarily. I know that the drivers drive cautiously, and I know the children know the cars go through there. But in the heat of the game and the excitement of their amusements the children can become careless, and I think it is a pity that the vehicles have to cross the playground. I make a plea for two things: firstly, the removal of the buildings; and secondly, the repair of the ramp to make accessible that part of the school building which is now accessible only by driving vehicles through the school grounds.

Another matter that has come to my notice is of concern to the parents of children at schools, particularly high schools, where new tuck shops are installed. Many of our State schools are under construction and the tuck shops have not yet been installed, and I wondered whether the charter under which the Butter Marketing Board works could be enlarged to allow the Board to make special refrigerators for use in school tuck shops. Possibly the Board, which at present makes farm refrigerating machinery—and makes it very well, if I may say so—could make a refrigerator ideally suited to the needs of high school and State school tuck shops. An ordinary refrigerator is not really suitable in a high school with 700, 800, or 1,000 pupils, when counter space has to be considered. I suggest that it would be a simple matter for the refrigeration department of the Butter Board to design an ideal type of refrigerator, standardise it, and supply it to the parents without profit, or at a minimum profit.

Mr. Wallace: Socialism!

Mr. SMITH: I heard an interjector from the Opposition benches suggest that Socialism was involved. In this case I support Socialism, if it is Socialism, but I do not think it is.

Mr. Davies: What are your opinions on Socialism?

Mr. SMITH: I will give you my opinions on Socialism when I think the time is opportune. At the moment I am trying to get refrigerators suitable for school tuck shops at a reasonable cost. The price of refrigerators affects the purse of the parents. If they could be obtained in the way I suggest we would be going a long way towards improving the lot of school children.

The other remarks of His Excellency to which I said I would refer were—

“My Ministers inform me that the Railway Department whose true value lies in its continued contribution to the development of the State, had an excess of expenditure over cash collections.”

My purpose in referring to the Railway Department is to ask the Government at this stage to undertake immediately an investigation of the possibility of using Hovercraft vehicles on the railways—I do not mean on the railway line but on the permanent way. A considerable amount of development in this field has been carried out in England and America. At present four different types of vehicles are in use that use the air-thrust method of propulsion. The first type, the plenum chamber, uses an air space to support the vehicle. The second type, known as the annular jet type, is used in the British Hovercraft and in types developed in America; the third type is known as the labyrinth seal, which is perhaps a more useful adaption of the annular jet, and the fourth is the levapad. I submit that the latter type would be more applicable for use by the Railway Department.

Mr. Davies: Would the hon. member make this point clear: does he intend the State to undertake this or to leave it to private enterprise?

Mr. SMITH: I suggest that if the hon. member had not been making inane comments to other hon. members opposite he would have heard me say that I commend to the Government an immediate investigation of the possibilities of using this system on the railways. I do not know whether hon. members are familiar with any one of the four types. The use of wheels is rather restricted for travel use. We must face the fact that there is an ultimate in the usefulness of the wheel. We can achieve only a certain amount of speed with the wheel and it can run only on the rail itself. If we could dispense with that form of movement and replace it with an air pad we would not be so restricted and not constrained to use

rails, but could use a permanent way on which rails had previously been laid but had been taken up. It is unfortunate that we have not done anything about this matter before now. We could use the permanent way as it is laid down, even the roughest permanent way. All of these craft operate about five or six inches above the ground and are able to operate under either wet or dry conditions. The levapad is ideally suited to moving over a rail.

Mr. Duggan: Whilst I commend you for your research, I must say that in three years you did not get very far with those buildings.

Mr. SMITH: I shall continue to try to get the school buildings moved. The Country-Liberal Government came into office only in 1957. Those buildings were put in the Windsor State School grounds during the years 1940 to 1945 and they remained there until 1957. No action was taken by the then State Government to have them removed.

We would do the State a good service if we investigated as expeditiously as possible the use of the levapad system. It is not new. It has been in vogue for 30 or 40 years and I understand that it is intended to introduce the air pad principle into the ferry service in New South Wales in a couple of years.

Mr. Morris: It is being investigated here.

Mr. SMITH: I am glad to hear that. I hope the Government will institute it in the near future. It would overcome the necessity for the maintenance of rails and permanent way, and rail freight could be transported at much greater speeds.

Hon. members opposite apparently have not made very much research into these matters, and it might interest them to learn that the ultimate speed of this principle is in the vicinity of 400 to 500 miles an hour. The wheel has an ultimate speed of about 150 miles an hour. A rail service using wheels can never hope to achieve the speed of these vehicles and I am happy to hear the Deputy Premier say that an investigation is being carried out.

Mr. Duggan: It might be interesting to get from Elizabeth Street to Queen Street at 50 miles an hour instead of at the present speed.

Mr. SMITH: That interjection gives me the opportunity to congratulate the Minister and his traffic experts on their solution of our traffic problems in the last year. I did not want to raise it but I think the interjection by the hon. member allows me to.

It is amazing to note that, with all these achievements coming to pass, our opponents have not one modicum of approval or appreciation for what is being done. They want to knock, knock, knock. That has been evident even in the simple matter about which I was speaking. Not one of them was prepared to help. All they could say was,

“Didn’t you raise that 18 months ago?” I might have, but if hon. members opposite had the welfare of the State at heart, and if they could think of anything at all, they should get behind me and help me in my fight.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Davis, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.10 p.m.
