

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 20 SEPTEMBER 1960**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## TUESDAY, 20 SEPTEMBER, 1960

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

### SCREENING OF FILMS

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Hon. members, arrangements have been made for two films to be screened in the Legislative Council Chamber at 7.30 o'clock this evening. One film deals with last year's Commonwealth Parliamentary Association General Conference and the other with the Queensland Centenary celebrations. There will be other features on 35 millimetre slides and hon. members are invited to attend.

### QUESTIONS

#### SPECIAL BRANCH, QUEENSLAND POLICE FORCE

**Mr. HANLON** (Baroona) asked the Minister for Labour and Industry—

“What was the numerical strength of the Special Branch of the Queensland Police Force as at June 30, 1957, 1958, 1959 and 1960?”

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

“1957, 17; 1958, 17; 1959, 17; and 1960, 17.”

#### COMPENSATION ON ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR ROAD WIDENING

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) asked the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—

“In view of his reply to my question of September 14 on the subject of the acquisition of land for road-widening purposes by the Townsville City Council, will he in the interests of simple justice see to it that the Council informs the landholders concerned of the protection afforded them under the law, instead of attempting to stampede them into action that would be unnecessary and costly?”

**Hon. L. H. S. ROBERTS** (Whitsunday) replied—

“Since the Honourable Member asked this question, I have asked the Townsville City Council to send me a copy of the notices which it has given to land-holders affected by re-alignments. These notices set out in full the provisions of Section 35 (10) of the Local Government Acts insofar as they relate to land-owners, including the provision to which I referred in the answer to the Honourable Member's previous question on this subject. The matter does not seem to call for any further action by me.”

## TRANSCRIPTS FOR CRIMINAL APPEALS

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) asked the Minister for Justice—

“(1) Is he aware that a prisoner wanting to appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal against a conviction and/or sentence in the Criminal Court must pay for the transcript, which can amount to £35 and more?”

“(2) Is he aware that this charge is made even when the prisoner's counsel is prepared to appear without fee?”

“(3) Is he aware that the transcript is made available free of charge to the Crown Prosecutor?”

“(4) Does he consider that this charge is fair and just, when it deprives a prisoner in poor circumstances from having his own counsel appear in the Court of Criminal Appeal because of the absence of the transcript?”

**Hon. A. W. MUNRO** (Toowong) replied—

“(1 to 4) I refer the Honourable Member to Rule 36 (c) of Order IX. of the Criminal Practice Rules which provides that a transcript of the shorthand notes taken of the proceedings at the trial of any appellant shall not be supplied free of charge except by an order of the Court of Criminal Appeal or a Judge thereof upon an application made by an appellant or by his Counsel or Solicitor assigned to him under Chapter 67 of The Criminal Code. The State Reporting Bureau does not specifically charge the Crown for the copy of the transcript supplied to it. However, this is merely a matter of internal accounting seeing that the Crown is responsible generally for the overall costs of carrying on the Bureau.”

## MANAGER AND STAFF, PRINCESS ALEXANDRA HOSPITAL

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

“(1) Is there a permanent manager of the Princess Alexandra Hospital?”

“(2) If not, why has the position been maintained as an acting one for so long?”

“(3) Does the manager of the Brisbane General Hospital at Herston Road also manage the Princess Alexandra Hospital?”

“(4) If so, how many days a week does the manager spend at the Princess Alexandra Hospital?”

“(5) Is the manager able to divide effectively his time between the two hospitals?”

“(6) How many acting appointments are there at the Princess Alexandra Hospital and for how long have the appointees held these positions?”

“(7) What is the number of employees on the establishment of the laundry staff at the Princess Alexandra Hospital?”

“(8) What is the total number of vacancies in the laundry staff at the present time?”

“(9) What is the reason for these vacancies in the laundry staff, if any?”

“(10) Is it correct that no relief is provided for the office staff at the Princess Alexandra Hospital when on annual leave?”

“(11) Is he aware that twenty-five more wardsmen are required at the hospital?”

“(12) Is he aware that the one man on duty in the canteen at the hospital between the hours of 5 p.m. and 8.30 p.m. cannot cope with the demand for his services?”

“(13) Will he give consideration to appointing an assistant in the canteen?”

“(14) Is he aware that 300 extra nurses have been employed since the opening of the Princess Alexandra Hospital, but that there has been no increase in the domestic staff?”

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

“When the Princess Alexandra Hospital was opened it was realised that the utmost co-operation would be required between the managements of that Hospital and the Brisbane General Hospital if wasteful duplication and competition were to be avoided. It was therefore decided firstly that the Brisbane and South Coast Hospitals Board would control both Hospitals for the initial period. For the next period, and with the creation of the South Brisbane Hospitals Board, the plan has been that there be a common Chairman and Board Member on both the North Brisbane and South Brisbane Hospitals Board and that the Manager of the Brisbane General Hospital act as Joint Manager. The ease and absence of disturbance with which the development of the Princess Alexandra Hospital has been achieved is proof that this policy has been a wise one. I can understand that the Honourable Member who is endeavouring to hold three jobs simultaneously might, from his own personal experience, feel that this is impossible to do successfully. I can assure him, however, that the case of the common Manager for the North Brisbane and the Princess Alexandra Hospitals is not a parallel one to his own. It is a fact that acting appointments have been made to vacant classified positions on the clerical staff at the Princess Alexandra Hospital. This, however, is for the special purpose of protecting the appeal rights of Officers of the North Brisbane and South Brisbane Hospitals Boards, and has been done after consultation with the Clerks' Union. It would appear that the Honourable Member has been misinformed regarding the staff position at the Princess Alexandra Hospital. For example, the laundry staff is up to establishment, and there is no man employed in the canteen at the times mentioned in his question. He is just as astray regarding the domestic staff. In the period in which he suggests that no domestic staff has been appointed there have, in fact, been over 100 appointments made.”

## PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Proclamation under the State Transport Acts, 1938 to 1943.

Regulations under the Inspection of Machinery Acts, 1951 to 1958.

Regulations under the Inspection of Scaffolding Acts, 1915 to 1959.

Order in Council under the State Transport Acts, 1938 to 1943.

Order in Council under the University of Queensland Acts, 1909 to 1957.

Barbers' Shops Regulations under the Health Acts, 1937 to 1959.

Order in Council under the Magistrates Courts Acts, 1921 to 1954.

Ordinance under the City of Brisbane Acts, 1924 to 1959.

## POLICE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

## INITIATION

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

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Police Acts, 1937 to 1959, 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 15 September (see p. 337) on Mr. Munro's motion—

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

on which Mr. Hilton had moved the following amendment:—

“Omit the word—

‘repeal’

and insert in lieu thereof the word—  
‘amend’.”

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) (11.24 a.m.): As the Leader of the Opposition said in opposing the amendment, it is difficult to know what is intended by it, and whether any specific amendment is contemplated by the mover. For instance, does he suggest that the Act should be so amended that the Barristers' Board will still have its say and grant its certificate prior to the admission of an applicant to practise in Queensland? Incidentally, there has been provision for many years, and still is, for a solicitor to practise in both New South Wales and Queensland, and that has never

been opposed or resented by any member of the legal fraternity or any member of the public. The right of a solicitor to practise in both States is not queried, yet the extension of that right to senior members of the profession seems to be a bone of contention. It might be contemplated by the mover and seconder that the Act should provide that barristers who apply for admission in Queensland should apply to the Full Court of Queensland. It might be argued that by those means reciprocity is maintained. However, let me assure the hon. member for Carnarvon that, as the rules stand at present, there could be no possibility of the admission of a barrister from New South Wales to practise in Queensland, even with such an amendment of the Act. There have been cases in the past, and perhaps the Minister for Justice has been informed of them. One such case is in re Evatt, and another in re O'Sullivan, a 1940 case.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member has been seeking the reasons for the amendment. With that I agree, but when he elaborates on why his reasons should be considered, I think he is going beyond the amendment.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I am merely justifying it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member should remember what I said before. This is the fifth time that I have asked him to confine himself strictly to the point, whether he approves or disapproves of the alteration of the word “repeal” to “amend.” I cannot allow him to expand his thoughts on the amendment.

**Mr. BENNETT:** In considering whether an amendment should be made and in order to apply oneself successfully to the problem one needs to canvass all possible amendments that could be made. There may be some that I would support, and others that I would oppose, but in dealing with amendments one is entitled to canvass all the possibilities that could be involved. We have not been given one reason for the amendment, and I am pointing out the possibilities that might have exercised the mind of the mover. I am showing that if such things did exercise his mind, they could not apply validly as an amendment to the Act so as to bring about reciprocity between the States.

The latest case in point is the 1944 case of in re Holmes. I doubt whether the Minister is acquainted with it. This man applied for admission to practise before our Full Court. He had all the necessary qualifications, and they were submitted by the Barristers' Board to the judges constituting the Full Court. There was nothing against his character, but his admission was refused on the one and only ground that any barrister desiring to practise in Queensland must have residential qualifications. The members of the Full Court that refused

his admission were Mr. Justice Macrossan, Mr. Justice E. A. Douglas, Mr. Justice Philp, Mr. Justice Mansfield, who is the present chief Justice, and Mr. Acting Justice Stanley. Their decision to refuse his admission was unanimous.

I notice, Mr. Taylor, that you are getting uneasy, so I shall make one final observation. It was rather significant to read a statement last Saturday by no less a figure in public life in Australia than the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, when he made the public pronouncement that undue emphasis on local and State parochialism was preventing the creation of a national spirit in Australia. His own Liberal Party and his Liberal Minister for Justice in Queensland are acting in disagreement with the statesmanlike pronouncement of the Leader of the Australian democracy at the present time. Apparently they are not prepared to help their own Prime Minister in the establishment of a national outlook.

**Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (11.30 a.m.):** I was interested in the remarks of the hon. member for South Brisbane indicating that, even if the Act that it is proposed to repeal is amended as suggested by the Leader of the Queensland Labour Party, it would have no effect on the admission of a barrister to practise in the Queensland Supreme Court. It is a rather interesting opinion coming from a legal man because the Act that the amendment moved by the Leader of the Queensland Labour Party seeks to amend has, if I remember rightly, two sections. The main section has about seven subsections and subsection (2) of section (1) provides that to the extent necessary to give operation and effect to the Act, every other Act, or Law or Rule of Law shall be read subject to the Act. I do not know whether it is suggested that the court would still have the power, even if the Act is amended as suggested by the Leader of the Queensland Labour Party. The Minister says that it will. He has been very emphatic in his attitude on both the repeal of the Act and the amendment. He has made it quite definite that he does not propose to accept any amendment from this side of the Chamber, whether it be from the A.L.P. or the Q.L.P. He has made up his mind that the Government are going to proceed with the motion submitted to the Committee and will not listen to anything that may be put up by way of suggested amendment.

**Mr. Aikens:** They never do.

**Mr. Munro:** We listen and consider suggestions on their merits.

**Mr. WALSH:** That is the most I can say for the Minister; he has been emphatic in his opposition to any amendment of the Bill moved from this side of the Committee. The Minister did say that, as and when the Act is repealed, and if it is not amended, the Rules of Court will apply. I do not want to misinterpret his remarks if that is not what

he said. The Minister nods his head in agreement. Hon. members can imagine the confused state of thinking in this Chamber, particularly when legal men who analyse these points—

**Mr. Aikens:** They are more confused than the rest of us.

**Mr. WALSH:** I have a recollection of the Premier informing the Chamber when he was in Opposition that an 1848 Act, passed in New South Wales, still applied in Queensland up to the passing of the Barristers Act of 1956, the amendment of which is now sought. In that case, I am intrigued to know if any statutory law is applicable here that the Minister says he is not prepared to amend. I am at a loss to understand how any court, exercising its powers, could justify a decision to refuse admission to a barrister merely under the Rules of Court.

**Mr. Aikens:** He wants to leave the matter entirely in the hands of the barristers themselves.

**Mr. Munro:** No, in the hands of the court.

**Mr. WALSH:** That is one of the suggestions that the Leader of the Queensland Labour Party made and that the Leader of the Opposition acknowledged—that the Barristers' Board had no control in the matter.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. WALSH:** Was it not reasonable to suggest that, if the 1848 Act applied until the passing of the 1956 Act, the Barristers' Board in this State should have a say equal to that in New South Wales or any other State where similar legislation has been applied? The Leader of the Queensland Labour Party, by interjection, pointed that out to the Leader of the Opposition.

The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt said that in other States the applicant must appear before the Supreme Court. I hope I am not misinterpreting the hon. member's remarks as he misinterpreted mine. By interjection the hon. member for Baroona said the Government could have included a similar provision in the Bill, so that at least some hon. members would seem to think that there is scope for amendment of the law.

We are not taking to ourselves the right to include in the amendment all the ways in which the Act could be amended. It would be a very long amendment if such a course was adopted. But I suggest the Minister could with advantage consider the Commonwealth Judiciary Act, which gives to any barrister or solicitor the right to practise in any Federal Court in any Australian territory or territory under the control of the Commonwealth. The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt will not deny that that is so. The provisions of that Act could be incorporated in the Queensland laws.

We speak of the need to consider problems on a national basis. If it is good enough for

the Commonwealth Government under the Judiciary Act to provide for barristers, and even solicitors, to practise in police courts or any Federal court, not mentioning particularly the superior courts, would it not be better to amend the Barristers Act by including a similar provision rather than repeal legislation that has been accepted by members of the legal profession and many other people in the community as worth-while legislation?

I have something to say now about the speech by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not want him to take my comment in the wrong way, but, when speaking to the amendment he more or less took over the functions of the Minister. He pointed out all the reasons why it should be rejected. He gave us what might be regarded as a very interesting outline of the procedures adopted in the Chamber. I have been long enough in Parliament to know some of the pitfalls in procedure and to learn when to move an amendment to extend a debate and so on, and I realise, Mr. Taylor, that, with an eye to the Standing Orders, you would consider very carefully whether an amendment came within the scope of those orders. Any hon. member with a knowledge of the procedure on the repeal of legislation must realise that there is only one course. As it is a straight-out principle of repeal, it has to be dealt with accordingly, and that is why the hon. member for Carnarvon, in moving the amendment, suggested to the Government that they withdraw the Bill and then amend the Act in the way the great majority of the legal profession think it should be amended. The Leader of the Opposition said that unless an hon. member, or a group of hon. members, or a party in Opposition, had the concurrence of the Leader of the House or the relevant Minister the prospect of acceptance by the Government of the proposal would be remote, and he added that if the Bill was referred back there was no guarantee that it would be amended in the way desired by the proposer of an amendment.

That point was perfectly correct, but I hope that, in respect of every amendment likely to be moved from this side of the Chamber, the Leader of the Opposition is not going to adopt the attitude that we should throw up our arms and surrender to the Government or do nothing about the matter if the Government do not see fit to accept an amendment or there is no likelihood of the amendment being carried.

**Mr. Duggan:** You need have no worries in that regard.

**Mr. WALSH:** I am glad to have even that observation at this stage, but I should like the Leader of the Opposition to be more explicit on these matters. If I remember rightly he said that the Australian Labour Party was not going to follow anybody. I shall draw attention to another interesting statement. I would expect him to follow a

common-sense approach, as we have suggested should be done in this Chamber. He himself suggested that some regard should be had to the functions of Parliament and its members. He made this interesting observation: "We are answerable to nobody except the electors and the great body of public opinion outside." I hope the Leader of the Opposition will stick to that because, if he does, he can be assured that as long as he has regard to that responsibility with every issue he brings before this Chamber, the members of the Queensland Labour Party will give him their wholehearted support.

I had some difficulty following the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, just as he said he had when he read the speech of the hon. member for Carnarvon on the amendment. The Leader of the Opposition said, "It is true we have some objection to the Bill, and we have very strong objection to the repeal of the Act." We have a straight-out objection to the repeal, but we have very strong grounds for supporting any proposal to amend the Act. Then, to show that the Leader of the Opposition had not quite made up his own mind—

**Mr. Duggan:** I will tell you now we are against the Bill, so there is no need for further talk.

**Mr. WALSH:** I am trying to work out the basis of thinking from the various statements that have been made. We do not expect the Minister to get up on the second reading of the measure and give reasons why the Bill should be repealed. He took barely five minutes in introducing the measure and in less than one and a-half minutes he referred to the principal phases of, and grounds for, the Bill. To throw some further doubt in our minds, the Leader of the Opposition said, "Unless more convincing reasons can be given by the Minister on the second reading, the Opposition will oppose the Bill." If the Leader of the Opposition had come straight out and said they were against the repealing of the legislation, and also the amendment, I would know where we stood. He said that in relation to the amendment, but I am still in doubt as to the attitude of the Australian Labour Party on the repeal of the Act.

**Mr. Mann:** We think the Act is very sound and we oppose any alteration or repeal of it.

**Mr. WALSH:** I realise that the hon. member for Brisbane is referring to the Barristers Act of 1956, and that it is quite satisfactory to the Opposition. Personally, I am not raising any objection to the Barristers Act of 1956. As I heard the debate in 1956, and on this occasion also, my mind is open enough to listen to anybody who makes proposals that would give an advantage to those who are carrying on their profession as barristers in this State. That is why I say the Government should amend the Act. To their own way of thinking they have brought down a measure that provides for

some of these things. No doubt we will find ways and means of moving further amendments to it. We are faced with the position that existing legislation, as applicable to this State, has in one instance been definitely decided by the Full Court of New South Wales, where, in effect, it was laid down that there was no alternative to admitting a particular applicant, Rofe, because the Barristers' Board had given a certificate. If it is of any satisfaction to the Government, or those people outside who are behind this proposal, I have no objection to the proposal here, as long as a similar provision is inserted for the Barristers' Board having to give a certificate in Queensland, requiring the applicant to appear before the Supreme Court, as is required in other States, according to the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt. I am not setting myself up as a legal authority on that point. On the one hand the Full Court decided that that was the law in New South Wales; but the same Act was applied differently in Queensland. I hope the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt has looked at the judgment of Sir William Webb. When he was on the Bench of the Supreme Court of Queensland, he laid it down that, although the 1848 Act had not been repealed, it could be regarded as obsolete. I do not think it is the function of any judge to throw statutory law aside lightly and proceed to give his views based on what might be termed the Rules of Court.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I trust that the hon. member is referring to a point of amendment and not a point of repeal.

**Mr. WALSH:** No, it is a point of amendment. There has been such confused thinking about the law that even the legal members of Parliament have not relieved our minds—as to the application of the statutory law. The Minister said that the Rules of Court are the machinery that will apply.

However, I do not wish to delay the Committee. The Minister is emphatic that he will not listen to, or consider, any suggestion for the amendment of the measure, and the A.L.P. will not support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Carnarvon. He is in hospital at the moment and I do not propose to press the issue.

Amendment (Mr. Hilton) negatived.

**Hon. A. W. MUNRO** (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (11.47 a.m.), in reply: I have already replied in part when speaking to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Carnarvon. I then pointed out the inconsistency in the argument put forward by the Opposition and said that the argument used by some Opposition speakers virtually cancelled argument used by others. Since then we have had further discussion and, with due respect, I must express the opinion that we have devoted a great deal more time to this relatively simple question than it justifies.

**Mr. Aikens:** Do you think putting a legal fence around Queensland is a simple question?

**Mr. MUNRO:** I will deal with that. I think the procedure of moving an amendment to such a simple question is merely a political expedient. It might be regarded as quite clever politically as it gave all those hon. members who had already spoken up to 25 minutes each, the opportunity to speak for a further 25 minutes; but, having listened to them very carefully, having noticed the considerable degree of irrelevancy and the amount of tedious repetition, I would say that the tactics that have been adopted—

**Mr. Aikens:** Isn't that a reflection on the Chair?

**Mr. MUNRO:** It is not a reflection at all. Standing Orders are fairly flexible. Nevertheless, those tactics indicate clever politics rather than a sense of responsibility in relation to the affairs of the State. They are not unusual. Within the last two years we have had shocking examples of them. In the early stages of the Parliament we have these lengthy discussions on matters that are not of any great importance and later we have to come back and sit till 2 a.m. to rush Bills through. Because of these delaying or stonewalling tactics by some members of the Opposition, Parliament is forced to put important legislation through without adequate time for its proper consideration.

**Mr. Duggan:** Why do you not convene Parliament earlier, and why adjourn after the Budget is presented? We are prepared to meet the following week.

**Mr. MUNRO:** Those may be quite useful suggestions. I am prepared to consider them and discuss them with the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Aikens:** How much time are you wasting now?

**Mr. MUNRO:** I am making some very important remarks. Even that would not justify the stonewalling tactics that we often see on relatively unimportant measures.

Having said that, I propose to limit my remarks to the real substance of the question and then to clear up some of the legal points that appear to me to have become rather confused because of the varying opinions expressed by hon. members opposite.

The real kernel of this problem is the need for recognition of the background facts. I doubt whether any Minister of the Crown has done more than I have in working for uniformity of law and administrative procedures among the Australian States when it is right and proper that we should have uniformity. However, this desirable purpose must be considered against the background that Queensland is a separate State and has its own Parliament, its own State laws, and

its own judicial system. There are six Australian States; but, by reason of the difference in the financial and industrial strength of those States, there is no real equality among them. With the trend to mechanisation, automation, and takeovers, the financial and industrial dominance of Sydney and Melbourne is increasing year by year. In this particular matter, there is at present no complete uniformity in the law and no complete reciprocity among the States, and with the background that I have mentioned, even if we attained theoretical uniformity and reciprocity in the law, we would not attain it in effect.

**Mr. Walsh:** Would you not say there was uniformity under the Commonwealth Judiciary Act?

**Mr. MUNRO:** The Commonwealth Judiciary Act is not relevant to the question under consideration. The repeal of the Barristers Act of 1956 is necessary, therefore, to preserve and strengthen the Queensland Bar, particularly in its function as the logical training ground for future members of the Queensland judiciary. I should like to emphasise that the substantial question is not the protection of the rights of Queensland barristers, as has been suggested by some hon. members opposite, but rather that our Queensland barristers will be given substantially fair and equal opportunities and will not be handicapped because they are not residents of Sydney or Melbourne and are not in close touch with the solicitors associated with the affairs of the large financial and industrial undertakings there.

**Mr. Bennett:** Do you not believe that you get briefs on your ability?

**Mr. MUNRO:** I have already mentioned that I have full confidence in the ability of the leaders of the Queensland Bar. I again emphasise that in engaging professional assistance there is a quite natural trend towards engaging people who are well known, and therefore quite obviously large financial and industrial undertakings with headquarters in Sydney and Melbourne have as their solicitors firms in those cities. Thus the solicitors tend to advise the engaging of barristers who are well known to them as residents in those places. If we do not watch this position very carefully, there could be a very grave danger of an intensification of this trend. That would make Brisbane, to an even greater extent than it is at present, merely a branch manager's city and, so far as the legal profession is concerned, one in which the standing is not very much better than that of a circuit town.

**Mr. Aikens:** That is the real nigger in the woodpile.

**Mr. Walsh:** You know of southern firms that employ Queensland accountants in this State.

**Mr. MUNRO:** Yes, there are examples of that, but that does not diminish the importance of what I have said.

A suggestion has been made that there is no need to repeal the 1956 Act, as substantially the same result could be obtained by an Order in Council under Section 2 (4) of the Act. That is true. We could have obtained substantially the same effect by an Order in Council as will be obtained by the introduction of this measure.

**Mr. Bennett:** Why introduce the measure here?

**Mr. MUNRO:** Because we are completely democratic and I should not like to take this action by issuing an Order in Council. I much prefer to have the matter placed before Parliament, even at the risk of subjecting myself to the penalty of having to listen to all this tedious repetition and argument, because I say that the merits of this Bill are such that they can be justified in free discussion in this Chamber.

**Mr. Bennett:** Did you refer it to the Country Party?

**Mr. MUNRO:** The hon. member for South Brisbane is unwise to interject because I have seldom heard in this House so many inaccuracies as those contained in his two speeches.

**Mr. Bennett:** Name them.

**Mr. MUNRO:** Very well. I have endeavoured not to do so out of a certain amount of deference for the hon. member for South Brisbane, who is a new member, but, as he has asked me to do it, when I resume my remarks tomorrow I shall point out the serious mis-statements that he has made. He is a barrister, and he should have known better. I do not suggest that the mis-statements were deliberate, but I do say that they indicate a lack of sense of responsibility. When a person is not only a member of Parliament but also a trained lawyer, he should take more care in satisfying himself that his facts are correct before making statements of that kind.

**Mr. Bennett** interjected.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member must remain silent while the Chairman is on his feet.

Progress reported.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

#### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SEVENTH ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 15 September (see p. 367) on Mr. Row's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

**Mr. JONES (Callide) (12 noon):** At the outset, on behalf of the citizens of the Callide electorate, I want to express loyalty to the Throne and at the same time convey their

compliments to His Excellency the Governor and Lady May for the wonderful work they are doing in the interests of this State.

Queensland is fortunate in having, as a representative of our Sovereign, a man of the calibre of Sir Henry Abel Smith. The sterling service rendered to Queensland by His Excellency and Lady May is greatly appreciated by the citizens of this State. He has travelled extensively throughout the State and has made himself thoroughly familiar with both the interests and the problems of the people.

In opening this 36th Parliament, His Excellency told us of his visits to many country shires and towns. Such visits by him thrill the citizens and give them courage and faith. They made the people realise their importance to the State and that their efforts were appreciated by those who depended upon them.

You will agree, Mr. Speaker, that the people in country areas need courage, especially at the present time when the State is in a very dry condition. The drought that the State is experiencing today is more State-wide than any previous drought has ever been. Usually, when some districts are dry we can look to other areas for relief, but on this occasion, there is no relief country available anywhere in the State. Unless rain falls immediately this State will have the worst drought on record.

**Mr. Ewan:** Then they will say the graziers are holding cattle back.

**Mr. JONES:** That is right. Waterholes are drying up rapidly and, in some cases, water has been bought for stock; cattle are being driven long distances to it.

Last Sunday, in my own area, I passed a dairyman driving a herd of 250 cattle 2½ miles to Gogango Creek for water. That is an example of the hardship that is being felt today. Dairymen have been so hard hit that production has fallen below the State's requirements and butter is being imported from other States. Dairymen's earnings today are practically all expended in an endeavour to keep herds alive. The cost of fodder is rising every day and has already reached a level beyond the economics of the industry to meet it.

In this debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, so ably moved by the hon. member for Hinchinbrook and seconded by the hon. member for Bowen, there have been many fine contributions from both sides of the House. Much has been said about development. Hon members from Central and North Queensland have mentioned the subject and they should remember that only 5 per cent. of the nation's population live in the tropics, a fact undoubtedly realised by the Asiatics. Australia, a half-empty country, presents a temptation that is ever becoming more irresistible to the starving, crowded hordes on our northern doorstep. Australia's only defence against this overshadowing threat lies in increased population and it can come only with development. The development of Central and Northern

Queensland should not be regarded as only of local benefit, but should be classed as national development, and the Government have no greater duty than the development of that area.

The Fitzroy River basin is a centre with very great potential for development. We know it has the highest production rate per head of any comparable district in Australia. Indeed, it has tremendous potential for development. There is no doubt that harnessing the many rivers in Central Queensland and the extension of irrigation would be the gateway to greater population, prosperity, and security.

In Central Queensland we need one major developmental scheme, that is, the western road from Rockhampton. It is a very vital link in the economy of the district, but today it is in an appalling condition between Emerald and Barcaldine. That section is nothing more than a bush track, as those who have been on it will agree. In wet weather many of the sections are quagmires, and the creek crossings are dangerous in dry weather and impassable after rain. The report of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works on the regional survey and investigation into development in Central Queensland is very interesting. The Government asked the Co-ordinator-General to report on the potential of the area, as they are anxious to plan for co-ordinated and economic development.

In his report the Co-ordinator-General disclosed that the Main Roads Department recommended that roads connecting coastal ports with the immediate hinterland should be given No. 1 priority. The Rockhampton-Longreach road is cited. The report stresses the importance of roads and recommends that the standards of highways and roads generally be raised. The Banana shire is an important area in the scheme outlined by the Co-ordinator-General.

We of Central Queensland are not proud of what previous Governments have done for the district. Although enormous sums of money have been expended in other districts, Central Queensland has been neglected. Some money is being spent at present, but the tempo of expenditure will have to be increased considerably if we are to carry out essential road works. The Co-ordinator-General realises that this is so, and in his report pointed out that the greatest amount of money should be spent in the Banana shire. The amount recommended is £2,203,000, and of this sum road works to cost £2,022,000 are classed as "A" priority.

**Mr. Walsh:** Is that in your electorate?

**Mr. JONES:** Portion is my electorate, and portion in the electorate of the hon. member for Mackenzie. I shall have more to say about that later.

We are anxious to co-operate and do everything possible in the interests of our district. "B" priority is given to works that will cost £116,000, and "C" priority to other

work that will cost £64,500. The sum of £2,203,000 for works in the Banana shire is the greatest expenditure recommended for any shire in Central Queensland, and in all 25 are listed. To complete this western road from Rockhampton it is also necessary to spend money in the Duarina shire, the Emerald shire, and most of all in the Jericho shire. Central Queensland affords more scope for development than any other area in Queensland.

In recent years the Department of Public Lands has made 24 more blocks available, covering an area of 70,000 acres. I believe that we must keep abreast with this policy of closer settlement and provide adequate roads for the settlers. Agriculture and dairying have been established industries in the Callide and Dawson Valleys for over 30 years. It has been proved that there is adequate underground water in the Callide Valley for irrigation farming, and in the last three years there has been tremendous expansion in this field, to such an extent that one farmer was able to consign a full trainload of lucerne hay

The Banana shire has an area of 6,200 square miles. The increase in its population since 1933 has been the greatest increase of any local authority area in Central Queensland. It rose from 6,786 in 1933 to 9,560 last year or an increase of 41 per cent. It is interesting to learn from the Government Statistician's report that the Banana shire produced more primary produce than all the other shires in the Central Division, including Rockhampton and the Central Western Division, embracing Broad-sound, Calliope, Duarina, Fitzroy, Livingstone, Miriam Vale, Monto, Mt. Morgan, Taroom, Aramac, Barcaldine, Bauhinia, Belyando, Blackall, Emerald, Ilfracombe, Jericho, Longreach, Peak Downs and Tambo.

Let us consider the value of the primary produce from those areas. The Banana shire was responsible for 91 per cent. of the total production of cotton; it has 38 per cent. of the dairy cattle, 10 per cent. of the beef cattle and 41 per cent. of the pigs. Only 1 per cent. of the wool in this area is produced in the Banana shire. The area under crop in the Banana shire represents 46 per cent. of the total. Here are some further interesting comparisons—

	Banana shire Percentage of Total Area Production
Wheat	62
Barley	26
Oats	28
Sorghum	58
All other grains	39
Peanuts	57
Green fodder	40
Butter	47

With the assistance of this Government under the Farmers' Water Supply Scheme,

the use of underground water by farmers has been so satisfactory that it has encouraged other farmers to enter the field of agriculture. The increase in the area under irrigation has brought about a steadily growing demand for electricity.

Investigations already carried out indicate that the Callide coal-field will be required for a new power station that will be needed to meet the requirements of the Capricornia Regional Electricity Board from 1964. The present power house at Rockhampton was designed to meet the requirements of the Capricornia region for another couple of years. A large quantity of water will be needed for the generating station but a suitable dam site for the storage of cooling water is available. The coal resources at Callide are ample and they warrant the construction of a new big power house, and, with coal from mine to bunker, the final tariff should be favourable, particularly for industry.

During this debate, some hon. members devoted part of their time to expressing their opinions of persons outside the House. The hon. member for Rockhampton North and the hon. member for Port Curtis were unjust in using certain expressions about people who have not the opportunity of replying in similar circumstances. It seems to be the policy of the A.L.P. to kill the spirit of any one who has the ambition to assist in any matter of benefit to the public.

The other day the hon. member for Rockhampton North spoke of representatives of Central Queensland and said that the manager of Lakes Creek was the unofficial mayor of the city. He spoke about me, too, but I am in a different category because I have the opportunity to reply. He said I openly canvassed the election of the present Cabinet and he added that it was reported in the Press. That is untrue and I challenge him to prove it. It is easy enough for anybody to rise in the House and say that something was reported in the Press. He went on to say that Cabinet was elected on a majority of one vote. That, too, is untrue.

He tried to belittle the new hon. member for Rockhampton South by saying that, since his election to Parliament, his attendance in the House had been only 25 per cent. of the time. The official records of the House will prove that to be untrue; his attendance has been better than that.

I am concerned about his talking about people who have not the opportunity to defend themselves here. He called Mr. Hinchliff the unofficial mayor of Rockhampton but the people of Central Queensland have the highest regard for Mr. Hinchliff. Only last Saturday week I attended a function for the Bush Children's Health Scheme and there I saw Mr. Hinchliff working in the interests of that organisation. It is unjust for any hon. member in the House to belittle anybody in that area.

The hon. member for Rockhampton North said we should have men of a broader outlook. We on this side of the House work together. No two members have worked more closely together than the hon. member for Mackenzie and I in the interests of the people and the areas we represent, and we are getting the closest co-operation from the newly elected member for Rockhampton South. It seems to be the policy of the hon. member for Rockhampton North not to co-operate but to try to drive a wedge between hon. members and to cause a feeling of discontent. That does not exist. Nobody has done more than I have for the hon. member for Mackenzie, and he will admit it. The unworthy remarks of the hon. member for Rockhampton North and the hon. member for Port Curtis are not welcomed by the people of our district. We are anxious to pull together in the interests of the development of the area.

The hon. member for Rockhampton North went on to express his views about the construction of an abattoir. It is not very wise for him to jump on side in that matter at the moment. I have a letter here from the Minister for Agriculture and Stock in a previous Labour Government.

**Mr. Lloyd:** Is that an official Government file?

**Mr. JONES:** It is my own file. If anybody wishes to peruse it, he may do so. The letter reads—

“With further reference to your personal representations on behalf of the Rockhampton Local Abattoir Board”—

I supported them on that occasion, and I have always respected their views—

“I desire to inform you that the Board’s request for authority to build a Local Abattoir at Rockhampton has been considered by Cabinet but a decision on the application has been deferred until the advice of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, as to whether funds may be available for this purpose, is received.

“In the circumstance, new proposals involving expenditure of great magnitude may be required to be deferred to a later date.”

The hon. member for Rockhampton North cannot now shed crocodile tears and say what this Government ought to do. We subscribe to the principle of abiding by a Board’s decision. There is a properly-constituted Abattoir Board in Rockhampton, and it has available to it all the data showing the advantages and possible drawbacks to be considered in the establishment of an abattoir in that city. There are competent men on the Board, and when a decision is made, it is the right one. I do not think the hon. member for Rockhampton North or I have the right to make a statement on the establishment of an abattoir in Rockhampton when all the necessary data is not available to us.

**Mr. Burrows:** Would you not agree that there was a good deal of outside pressure brought to try to influence that decision?

**Mr. JONES:** I do not know anything about outside pressure. While a board is investigating the proposal, I do not think any hon. member should express his views about it in the way that the hon. member for Rockhampton North did. On behalf of the people in my electorate, I say that we fully subscribe to the Board’s policy and whatever decision it comes to in relation to the establishment of an abattoir in Central Queensland.

I am very pleased with the result of the recent election, and I wish to express my appreciation to the people of the new Callide electorate for returning me as their representative.

**Mr. Walsh** interjected.

**Mr. JONES:** The hon. member might be interested to know that the number of votes I received increased by 9½ per cent. in part of my new electorate and by 8 per cent. in the town of Biloela. It is only natural that at the next election it will increase still further, because the Government have already seen fit to develop a boat harbour at Yeppoon. The dredge now operating in that area will make the channels safe for the trawlers bringing scallops to Yeppoon, where there is now a thriving scallop industry. Last week there were 150 women on the payroll in that industry. Because of the circumstances associated with the industry in the South, particularly the closing of the Tweed River bar, trawlers are going North, and we can expect the industry to expand in the very near future.

**Mr. Walsh** interjected.

**Mr. JONES:** The hon. member would have more time to examine that than I have. We are not going to attempt that one. We on this side of the House are more interested in getting on with things than playing politics, as the hon. member did to such an extent that he nearly lost his own seat at the election.

**Mr. Walsh:** But I still won.

**Mr. JONES:** It is only by a stroke of good luck that the hon. member is not out on the street with his other colleagues.

**Mr. BYRNE (Mourilyan)** (12.27 p.m.): On many occasions I have had opportunities of expressing my loyalty to the Throne and person of Her Majesty. It is a pleasure indeed today again to express that loyalty not only on my own behalf but also on behalf of the Mourilyan electorate which I have represented since 1950, and, I think, with a certain amount of credit. On this occasion I was returned with nearly a record majority, although it is admitted that in 1957 things were a bit tougher and I did not have the same majority then as I did on this last occasion.

I desire to compliment His Excellency and Lady May on the excellent services that they have given to the people of Queensland. His Excellency's thirst for knowledge is recognised all over the State, and I think very few people know Queensland better than he does. He has certainly had opportunities to gain that knowledge by the way in which he has travelled far and wide and met people from the border to the Gulf of Carpentaria and he has come to understand their problems and to endeavour to relieve their difficulties. In this way, his very great knowledge is not being lost to the community. I regard Sir Henry as a splendid advocate, a man of easy approach, and Queensland is very grateful to him.

I desire to acknowledge the services of our new members. They have acquitted themselves very well. I refer of course, to hon. members on both sides of the House. I realise that they are making their debut in political life, and my good wishes go to them.

I particularly desire to place on record my appreciation of the new members of the Australian Labour Party. They are men of good calibre and the type that the Australian Labour Party wants. They have been loyal to their members, and the electorates that they represent have the utmost confidence in them. I foresee the day not very far off when the Australian Labour Party will once again be returned to power, and when that day comes we will have the progress that we expected in the past three years but which has not yet come about. If we want to see some of the progress made in Queensland, we will have to go back to the years 1950 to 1957, when the hydro-electric works were being constructed, and there was considerable activity on all sides. Since 1957 that activity has not materialised and work has not been available except to carry out those projects that were initiated by the Labour Government. When the present Government came to power, we were led to believe that there would be full employment, that employees would be absorbed in various undertakings and that there would be jobs for all—no unemployment and full-scale development. Those promises have not materialised. They have been proved to be empty and we are no better off today. What the position will be in the next three years is anybody's guess. In my area—Innisfail and Tully—the position, far from even remaining stationary, has become worse. When the sugar season ends this year there will be a tremendous amount of unemployment. Already people are anxious to get out, realising what is going to happen when the sugar mills close about the middle of November.

At the moment, agents in Innisfail and other northern towns have large numbers of houses available for sale. We cannot expect people with growing families to be content with seven or eight months' work a year. It appears that the trend throughout

Queensland is such that the next few months will be indeed difficult. I do not like to see people disposing of their homes in these districts and moving to larger centres where they might expect full employment. Such an occurrence hurts me very much because I believe that, when a person erects a home in one of these places, he should have continuity of employment to enable him to bring his family up the way he desires.

I have also been alarmed at the manner in which the northern parts of Queensland are being denuded of investment capital. It is extremely difficult to obtain capital in the North for building or business purposes because most of it is being invested in the South. The banks are not helpful. In fact, they are tightening up. I was recently told by one bank manager, "We are more concerned about getting in the money we have lent than giving new loans."

Under Labour Governments North Queensland did progress. The hydro-electric schemes at Tinaroo Falls and Mareeba-Dimbulah were instituted and the sugar industry was expanded from a production of 800,000 tons of sugar to 1,200,000 tons, thereby providing a large volume of work.

In the years 1950 to 1957 there was very little unemployment and general contentment. Today, general unemployment stares us in the face. Employment is not available for when the seasonal industries finish in November.

Much irresponsible and foolish talk has centred around the cattle-fattening industry. Much that has been said has been purely and simply propaganda. Recently the North was visited by a Federal Committee on Agriculture. They paid my district a fleeting visit, arriving at 7 o'clock at night and departing again early in the morning. Like the Arabs, they arrived at night and left early in the morning. We entertained them and listened to their fluent speeches. They complimented us, and spoke of the great potential of the district although they had not seen it except from the air or the back of a motor-car. In those circumstances how could they make recommendations about the cattle-fattening industry? I was given the opportunity to reply, and I pointed out that we had been used to very fine words and speeches by visitors from the South but that we wanted some practical assistance from the Federal Government rather than discussions about the potential of the district. What have we gained in Queensland from the many visits of southern people? What have they been able to do for us? Have they recommended the spending of a penny in Queensland, or have they just told us what we should do? They have not indicated that the Federal Government will come to Queensland's assistance, despite the fact that the Queensland people have given their support to many Country and Liberal Party candidates in the Federal sphere. Unfortunately the Prime Minister pulls the strings and his supporters are obliged to dance to the tune he calls.

I should like to know what these visitors have achieved. Have they recommended the opening up of the Tully lands for cattle fattening? If they claim as their achievement the opening-up by the present Government of the territory known as Munro Plains, I should like to point out that I have made representations for at least 10 years for the opening of the Tully land, and the previous Labour Government drew up a plan for two blocks of 1,000 acres. The survey was made many years ago, but, owing to hostility between the Department of Public Lands and the Department of Forestry, the plan was never carried out. It has been on the books for a considerable time.

The previous Minister for Public Lands, a day or two before the last election, said it would be a criminal act to open scrubland in the Tully district for cattle fattening.

**Mr. Davies:** Who said that?

**Mr. BYRNE:** The previous Minister, the hon. member for Fassifern.

**Mr. Davies:** It would be criminal?

**Mr. BYRNE:** Yes. The word "criminal" was prominently featured in the newspapers. In his honest opinion it would be criminal to open up these lands for cattle fattening, but he was a little too sweeping in his statement. In the interests of increased production, much of the marginal land, not scrub land, in the Tully district could be used profitably for cattle fattening. I understand the objection of the former Minister to the destruction of valuable scrub, but in other parts of the Tully area such as El Arish and Silkwood, and on the Palmerston Highway, certain land is now overrun by all types of pests, particularly lantana and giant sensitive plant.

There will be hundreds of applicants for the two blocks that are to be opened up. They are on the Tully River, and are very fertile. About 300 to 400 acres of the 1,000 acres is scrub land ideally situated. The balance is plain land, which is not as fertile as scrub land. As I said before, the applicants will come from all over the country. There will be both experienced and inexperienced men.

**Mr. Ewan:** What sort of timber is growing on it?

**Mr. BYRNE:** All sorts of timber.

**Mr. Ewan:** Commercial timber?

**Mr. BYRNE:** Yes, really first-class soft-woods and other first-class timbers.

As I say, the applicants will come from all over the country; some will be experienced, but many will not be. It is likely that the successful, lucky applicant will be from outside the State with no knowledge of the Tully district and its difficulties, and no knowledge of the industry. He will be expected to go on the land and make a success of it, which is impossible.

**Mr. Ewan:** Will the Forestry Department allow him to do anything with it?

**Mr. BYRNE:** Yes. There is no objection to a man with experience coming onto the land, but anybody at all can go in for these two blocks; any woman, or any person at all who desires to make application, has the opportunity, whether experienced or not.

**Mr. Ewan:** The Forestry Department will not allow him to cut any commercial timber.

**Mr. BYRNE:** Of course, the timber will be reserved to the Crown. That is natural, and as it should be. In earlier days, of course, timber was not reserved to the Crown and people were able to benefit by disposing of the timber and doing anything at all to the land. There is plenty of evidence of that.

I suggest that later on, as the various Ministers go north, they take time off and look at the Palmerston Highway and the El Arish and Silkwood land and see the state to which some of those fine scrublands have deteriorated. It is probable that the fortunate applicants, who have no interest in the district, will be expected to go onto the land and live on it and do a certain amount of improvements. They may have very little finance, and naturally they will look for a way out. What are they going to do if they are not experienced and have no capital? They will try to dispose of the land and do everything possible to make a profit.

These lands adjoin sugar land and I should say, from the point of view of transferring sugar-cane assignments to this land, it would be a profitable transfer in certain circumstances. If an inexperienced person goes onto the land he will go "broke" and the land will deteriorate into a worse state than ever. An inexperienced person will gamble to make a profit out of it. I am opposed to that. I am all for the experienced man. I think these lands should be open to him. The inexperienced will buy into a lot of trouble and there is no doubt it will be a discredit to the district.

Any man who gets this land will have to fell the scrub, which will cost at least £20 an acre. He will have to erect yards, fences and a dip, and then build himself a home. All in all, it is not a project that will be easy to work. He will have to contend with all sorts of poison bush, including the Giant Sensitive Plant. Then he will be obliged to go out and buy cattle to fatten for sale. There is to be no screening of applicants.

I understand a further nine blocks are to be opened up at a later date, containing partly scrub and partly plain land. They are not surveyed yet but I understand that the timber will first have to be harvested and it may be a few years before they will become available for selection.

I recommend to the Premier and to those Ministers going to North Queensland for the opening of Mourilyan Harbour that they make an inspection for themselves to see

what is required. Let them form an opinion of the benefits to be obtained from opening up these cattle-fattening areas and of the restrictions that should be put on those taking up the land to ensure that they will deal with it to the advantage both of themselves and of the State.

In 1957 an inquiry was held by Messrs. H. R. Seddon and C. R. Mulhearn on cattle fattening in the coastal wet belt of North Queensland, and in their report they had this to say:

"It is not to be expected that even with the information now available the coastal fattening project can be simply left to develop without organised assistance. For it to take its proper place in the production of chilled beef demands—

(a) A proper survey of lands available with the selection of areas suitable for the purpose;

(b) The settlement of these lands in holdings of suitable size;

(c) The provision of proper access—roads and bridges—for much of the country, though within ten to thirty miles of the railway, is to be reached only through dense tropical scrub and by crossing rivers and streams prone to flood;

(d) A thorough study of the soil and pasture problems involved so that fertility may be retained and the most suitable grasses grown;

(e) The provision of adequate capital to ensure that pastures are properly laid down and established, the necessary subdivisional fencing erected and high-grade and not nondescript stock purchased. Dips and yards must be erected and dipping regularly practised. Introduced cattle must be inoculated against tick fevers and pleuro-pneumonia and their health properly safeguarded;

(f) The encouragement of men who will adopt proper animal husbandry methods and who will not, by overstocking, marketing of cattle before they are prime or other mis-management, adopt what appear to be 'get-rich-quick' methods."

That is my suggestion. To make a success of this industry a man must have experience, knowledge and a certain amount of capital.

**Mr. Windsor:** Do you suggest that only experienced men be allowed to ballot for those blocks?

**Mr. BYRNE:** I think the applicants should be screened so that men without experience and without capital will not go onto the land and later leave it, as so many areas in my district have been left, to be overgrown with all kinds of pests, such as the Giant Sensitive Plant.

**Mr. Armstrong:** What area would you suggest?

**Mr. BYRNE:** The Munro Plains blocks are 1,000 acres each, of which 300 to 400 acres are scrub. That is quite enough for that country. A man with 300 acres of grassed land will have all he needs to fatten a great many head of cattle as long as he has enough capital and experience. But success will not come easily.

I do not want to see first-class lands overrun with pests of all description, as they are now in certain parts of the area. I wish to make my position quite clear. I am in favour of making Crown lands available for selection—I have advocated that in the House for the past 10 years—but I do not want to see them misused. If the Government can open up these lands and ensure by appropriate developmental conditions that they do not become overrun with pests, I shall be very happy about it.

At Mourilyan there is an association called the Harbour Boating and Fishing Association, and I ask the Treasurer to accede to their request for the erection of a small wharf to be used in loading and unloading launches and fishing craft. I suggest that a small jetty be built, which could be used not only in the fishing industry but also any other industry that people in the area could engage in profitably. Only a small jetty is needed now, but one cannot say how the need will increase in the future, and there are no facilities for fishermen at Mourilyan Harbour at present.

Highways in the Johnstone Shire are also a matter of real importance. Up to the boundary of that shire there is a main road, which is repaired from time to time by the Department of Main Roads. In the Johnstone Shire there are no gazetted main roads. The responsibility for the upkeep of the roads falls on the ratepayers, and it is far too costly. I suggest that the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity consider declaring certain parts of the road a main road. That would relieve the ratepayers of at least part of their burden.

In regard to the transport of children from North Queensland to colleges and schools in South Queensland, I should like to read a letter from a prominent person at Innisfail, who puts the position very clearly. It reads:—

"I wish to thank you for your efforts on my behalf in trying to obtain sleepers for my daughter and her school friends to return to school in Brisbane today, but unfortunately sleepers were not available.

"After receiving your letter, I decided that we would just have to put up with it, and hope for the best, but after seeing the children loaded on to the train today, I can now only hope that they arrive in Brisbane safely on Sunday. I use the word 'loaded' carefully, as the train on which they returned today would be in the same class as a cattle train, and the conditions for putting them on the train even worse.

"Their carriage was three from the engine (a steam engine at that), over

40 yards from the platform awning and ramp, and it was raining. It would have made the owners of cattle cry to see them loaded, in such a way, lifting the girls and their luggage up over 4 feet, bundling their luggage in, in the pouring rain. To cap it all, their seats were in a compartment which is also an entrance, and it was a mixed carriage containing school boys and girls, and adults, and included in the adults were some foreign looking canecutters all of whom will be traipsing through their compartment day and night as it is the entrance and exit. The matter is over and done with now, and I was reluctant to let our girl go, but it would have meant she would have been late for school if I had kept her off the train. For the record, the train was "438 Up", Carriage No. 15, and the number of the carriage was 1092.

"As you mention in your letter it is very difficult to send the children away to school from the North with the conditions they have to contend with, and I can see now that they will have to be tough to survive. To add to the difficulties, if you use air travel, you cannot obtain tourist fares to Innisfail. They have to go to Cairns.

"I started this letter off just to acknowledge yours and to thank you, but I am afraid I was so upset over the episode I had to 'blow off steam.' However, I am not exaggerating and if you wish you can confirm my statements with any number of local people, all known to you."

I ask the hon Minister for Transport to have some endeavour made when the holiday season comes to provide sleeping accommodation for young people who are obliged to travel up to 1,000 miles from Brisbane to, say, Cairns, Townsville or Innisfail, and to give some consideration to providing facilities much better than those existing now.

I desire now to refer to the timber industry and to suggest that the time has arrived to deal very carefully with it. We must ensure that the sawmills in the North and other parts of Queensland are kept going at full capacity. We must exert all our efforts in representations to the Federal Government to see that there is no relaxation of controls to an extent that will be detrimental to this important industry. It appears that the Federal Government have relaxed this control, and the sawmills in North Queensland are very apprehensive of what might happen if there is sufficient relaxation to permit an influx of timber that would damage our own industry.

It appears that anybody can import timber and dispose of it on the market. It can be brought in from countries that we classify as black-labour countries, and provide considerable competition for the Queensland industry. We see in the sugar industry a shortening of the season and fewer men

now being employed in the slack season. We do not see at the moment additional machinery going to sugar mills. That means that we have to rely very greatly on our own sawmills for employment.

It is very necessary for the Queensland Government, in conjunction with the Federal Government, to see that the Queensland sawmilling industry is given a fair go. I am led to believe that timber can be imported from Japan and other foreign countries and landed in Sydney and Melbourne cheaper than it can be supplied by the North Queensland sawmilling industry. If that is to be the trend in this industry it is essential for the State Government to see that some protection is given to it. It is an essential one and the people in it are of a very fine class and are good employers of labour. They naturally desire to see their industry prosper and progress but, if they are to suffer unreasonable competition from foreign—and very often black-grown—timber the position might arise, if it has not already arisen, when they are in difficulty.

I ask the Government to use their influence to see that the Federal Government do not exercise their power unreasonably in regard to the timber industry. It is to the State's advantage that this industry should progress. In my district the position has become so serious that various organisations are protesting against the importation of timber from foreign countries and the effect it is having on the standard of living and employment in the district. Obviously if the interference continues and the industry suffers, the employees in turn will suffer, and unemployment is already so acute that we cannot stand idly by while further industries terminate operations. I ask the Government to give every assistance possible to the timber industry generally and to the sawmillers in the Mourilyan electorate in particular. Several joinery works in Innisfail have recently been obliged to close their doors because of difficulties encountered in this regard. It is not in the interests of the State that even a small industry here and there should close down because of unfair and unreasonable competition.

In conclusion, I ask the Minister for Transport to examine the Innisfail railway station with a view to improving the building. As a matter of fact, we want an entirely new railway station. Innisfail is a town of sufficient size and importance to warrant one. Over the years, in wet weather, carters and other contractors operating from it have been obliged to work out in the rain. Surely the time has arrived when Innisfail is entitled to a new railway station. If the Minister looks into the position, I am sure he will see the need for it. In fact he knows, I think, that a new station is necessary.

I compliment Mr. Speaker on his election to his high office. I think he will be a credit to it, and I wish him well.

**Mr. HART** (Mt. Gravatt) (2.21 p.m.): I assure the House of my loyalty and the loyalty of the people of Mt. Gravatt to Her Majesty. It is customary during Address-in-Reply speeches to do so, and although one hon. member was criticised for giving such an assurance I think such assurances are in order. Although the loyalty of no hon. member is in question, we must remember the coming generations. We should remind ourselves of the things of value in the community, loyalty being one of them, and for the sake of the younger people in the community I think we should mention them at least once a year.

I intend to deal with restrictive trade practices, monopolies and takeovers or mergers, as they have been called, my purpose being to review the position generally and to suggest to the Commonwealth and State authorities that company takeovers as well as restrictive trade practices should be investigated, especially when they tend to bring about monopolies. It appears that controlling legislation will probably be necessary.

I shall be referring to certain works, certain essays and books which have lately appeared. I shall refer to an essay on monopolies and restrictive trade practices by Sir David Cairns which appeared in a book called "Law and Opinion in the Twentieth Century" published in 1959. Sir David Cairns was chairman of the Monopolies and Restrictive Practices Commission. I shall also refer to the Law of Restrictive Trade Practices and Monopolies by Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Campbell and Mr. Elles published by Sweet & Maxwell in 1957, also to The Commerce Clause by M. Ramaswamy. I shall not always directly acknowledge the reference.

There are three ways broadly in which people may carry on business. I have taken these three ways from Sir David Cairns' article. They are, broadly speaking, competition, monopoly and restrictive practices.

Competition may be defined as follows: to buy or manufacture as cheaply as you can, and to try to sell a little more cheaply than others so as to increase your own volume of trade.

Monopoly, on the other hand, consists of getting by some arrangement or other so large a share of the market that you are not troubled by competitors and can fix your price at the highest price the public will pay. Sir Edward Coke said of monopolies that they were ever without the law but never without friends.

The third way of carrying on business is by way of restrictive trade practices, that is to make agreements with competitors to refrain from full competition with them and so be able to fix your prices at a level satisfactory to the whole group.

Restrictive trade practices are as old as trade itself and are nothing more than the attempts of intelligent men to interfere for their own advantage or that of the industry in which they are engaged with the free working of the law of supply and demand, and with the results of competition.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Would you not say that they are carried on almost completely throughout industry today, in any major industry?

**Mr. HART:** Apparently there are widespread restrictive trade practices in the community. For my last remark I was quoting Wilberforce.

So far as I am aware, the first recorded history of these restrictive trade practices was amongst the ancient Egyptians, about 3,000 B.C. There were attempts at cornering the market there. That was in instance of private monopolies in wool and cloth and a schedule of merchandise. There was much the same thing as is going on today, that is, attempts to fix prices in trades. In Greek days there was an astronomer named Thales who, having ascertained from the stars that there was about to be a bumper olive crop, bought up all the olive presses and made a fortune by cornering them. In ancient India some centuries B.C. there were regulations against trade and restrictive practices. In Roman times there was the Lex Julia De Annona, which established sanctions against combinations increasing the price of corn. In the 5th century we find the constitution of Zena, which became the precedent for much mediaeval legislation. That constitution was brought out in 483 A.D., and the object was the protection of consumers against artificial increases in the prices of all foodstuffs and other articles in everyday use. It laid special stress on the joint action of monopolistic organisations.

The English common law itself was against trade combinations. The first recorded case comes from the 13th century when certain people tried to put up the price of hoops, which resulted in an illegal conspiracy. Right up to the beginning of the 19th century the English common law declared trade combinations to be illegal. At about that time there was a change in the whole attitude of the common law towards these trade combinations. From about the beginning of the 18th century the English common law has allowed people to apply whatever restrictions they desire. There are two cases, one in 1783 and the other in 1815, that illustrate this difference. Lord Mansfield, in 1783, in the case of *R. v. ECCLES*, 11 Leach, 274, said—

"Persons in possession of any articles of trade may sell them at such prices as they individually please, but if they confederate and agree not to sell them under certain prices it is a conspiracy."

Till that time that had always been the law. In 1815 there was a change. Lord Ellenborough said in that year in the case

of HEARN v. GRIFFIN, 2 Chitty, page 407, when two stage-coachmen agreed to charge the same fares—

“This is merely a convenient mode of running two concerns which might otherwise ruin each other.”

There is a big difference in outlook there. In the year 1844 an Act abolished the ancient offences of engrossing, regrating and forestalling. Those offences all had to do with the cornering of goods either in, or on their way to, market and thereafter it became lawful to corner any goods.

It is worth while thinking of the tremendous changes that took place in our national life at the beginning of the 19th century. The population of the country, for one thing, reflected the tremendous changes. The increase in population in Great Britain and in the United States of America in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is clearly indicated in these figures—

Year	Great Britain	United States of America
1800	10,000,000	5,000,000
1850	21,000,000	23,000,000
1900	37,000,000	75,000,000
1940	46,000,000	131,000,000

I quote those figures mainly to show the tremendous surge forward in population—and also in wealth, incidentally—in Great Britain during the nineteenth century. During that century the Englishman thought it was more important for people to be able to associate as they liked, and to make money and to expand, than it was to restrict them in any way in their legal arrangements.

Another very interesting set of figures deals with the size of business concerns.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Would you say that the repeal of the Barristers Act of 1956 was a restrictive trade practice?

**Mr. HART:** I thought the hon. member for Baroona was about to ask me a sensible question—he usually does—but that was a silly one. If in future he confines himself to sensible questions I will endeavour to answer them.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the hon. member to address the Chair.

**Mr. HART:** In the middle of the eighteenth century, the size of the average business concern in England was not above 10 or 12 people; it was very small indeed. Incidentally, I am quoting these figures from Professor Hicks, who wrote a book called “The Social Framework,” a very interesting work. In it he said that by 1815 there were few concerns employing over 1,000 people. He wrote the book in 1942 and pointed out how, in the intervening period, companies and corporations had grown into huge organisations. At that time the biggest organisation in Great Britain was one of the railway companies, which employed 200,000 people. Enormous corporations have grown up all over the world.

A difference has come about in the way people regard trade combinations. The attitude of the law was that people might make whatever trade agreements they liked; they were not enforceable. The law would refuse to enforce these trade-restriction agreements. On the other hand, it refused to hold them to be illegal. It just would not interfere.

To enforce their agreements the traders had their own private courts and they issued “stop” orders. In *Thorne v. Motor Traders’ Association*, reported in 1937 Appeal Cases, the courts, held that these private courts with their “stop” orders were quite legal, and would not interfere with them.

**Mr. Graham:** Who was the judge who sat on that case?

**Mr. HART:** It was the House of Lords.

Agreements to maintain prices were not enforceable. This was accepted as good law in the case of *Mogul Steamship Co. v. Macgregor*, 1892 Appeal Cases, in which it was held that an agreement to form a ring and keep competitors out of the market was not an indictable conspiracy and gave no cause of action to a trader outside the ring who was damaged by it. The ground of the decision was that a person was entitled to look after his own business interests.

There was another case—*North Western Salt Co. v. Electrolytic Alkali Co.*, reported in 1914 Appeal Cases. There the House of Lords refused to hold illegal a contract between a combination of salt manufacturers and an outside manufacturer, one object of which was to maintain the price of salt. In the course of his judgment, Lord Haldane said—

“Unquestionably the combination in question was one the purpose of which was to regulate supply and keep up prices. But an ill-regulated supply and unremunerative prices may in point of fact be disadvantageous to the public. Such a state of things may if it is not controlled drive manufacturers out of business or lower wages and so cause unemployment and labour disturbances.”

Under the Monopolies Supply Act of 1948, a commission, of which Sir David Cairns was chairman, was set up to inquire into restrictive trade practices in many industries. The commission made extensive inquiries, and commenting on that statement by Lord Haldane Sir David Cairns said in the essay I have referred to—

“These observations will have a familiar ring to anybody who has listened in recent years to manufacturers arguing in favour of price-fixing agreements.”

As I said, that Act was passed by the English Parliament in 1948, and in about 1955 the commission made a general inquiry into the whole matter and published a report that it called the “Discrimination Report.” As a result of that report, the English Trade Restriction Act of 1956 was passed. The first thing that it required was that all these restrictive agreements between manufacturers

and traders be registered. After registration, there were established by Section 21 what were called a number of "gateways". A tribunal was set up to decide matters under the Act, and anyone who wanted to rely on a trade-restriction agreement and to have it declared lawful had to show that it escaped by one of the gateways. About seven or eight conditions were set out that the restrictive agreements had to fulfil before they were lawful, and if I might give a general description of those conditions I would say that they had to be against the public interest.

**Mr. Lloyd:** They established a restrictive trade practices court.

**Mr. HART:** Yes, they established a restrictive trade practices court, and that court had to be shown that the particular agreement escaped through one of the gateways established under the Act. The private courts that issued stop orders were also rendered illegal, but the Act did allow a manufacturer to fix the price at which other people might sell goods that he produced. It appears to be a good Act, but nobody knows how it will work out.

**Mr. Lloyd:** How could that apply to Australia under Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution?

**Mr. HART:** If the hon. member will possess his soul in patience, I will tell him.

This commission is still in existence in England. It no longer investigates restrictive trade practices, because the Act dealt with them, but it is now investigating monopolies.

There has been legislation in the United States since 1889 on restrictive trade practices and monopolies. Kansas introduced the first legislation on the subject in 1889, and seven other States followed before the Sherman Act was introduced in 1890. Wilberforce says in his book that the United States legislation is in accordance with the English common law; that must have been the common law before the change that I pointed out took place in about 1800.

Section 1 of the Sherman Act says—

"Every contract combination in the form of trust or otherwise or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations is hereby declared to be illegal — Every person who shall make any contract or engage in any combination or conspiracy hereby declared to be illegal shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanour."

The second section reads—

"Every person who shall monopolise or attempt to monopolise or combine or conspire with any other person or persons to monopolise any part of the trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations shall be guilty of a misdemeanour."

Those Acts were not found sufficient in themselves to stop monopolistic combinations, and in 1914 the Clayton Act was passed. Section 7 of that Act originally read in part that no corporation engaged in commerce shall acquire directly or indirectly the whole or any part of the stock or other share capital of another corporation engaged also in commerce where the effect of such acquisition may be to substantially lessen competition between the corporation whose stock is so acquired and the corporation making the acquisition or to restrain such commerce in any section of the community or tend to create a monopoly of any line of commerce.

There are a number of cases under the Sherman Act, probably the most famous of which is the Standard Oil Company versus the United States, which is reported in 1911, 221 United States Reports, page 1. That was a case in which the Supreme Court decreed the dissolution of the Standard Oil Company. It was an enormous affair. A bill of complaint was filed in the Missouri Circuit Court in November, 1906, charging the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, California, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, and 62 other corporations and partnerships and seven individuals with forming a conspiracy to restrain and monopolise interstate trade and commerce in crude oil, refined oil, and other products of petroleum. The prayer asked *inter alia* that a combination in restraint of trade may be declared to exist, and, secondly, that the parties be enjoined from any further act to give effect to it.

The Circuit Court dismissed the case against 33 of the defendant corporations. It declared the New Jersey Corporation was a combination in violation of the first section, and an attempt to monopolise in violation of the second section. It directed the dissolution of the New Jersey Corporation and directed the transfer of the stock back to the original corporators.

The Supreme Court upheld the decision of the Circuit Court and confirmed the decision that the corporation should be dissolved. Chief Justice White formulated the principle that the Act must be construed in the light of reason, and that the prohibitions laid down in the Act with respect to contracts and combinations applied only to those contracts and combinations that were exerting an unreasonable or undue restraint on interstate or foreign commerce, i.e., only those combinations and contracts that, by undue restraining of competition, were harming the public interest, were to be restrained.

There is another very interesting case called "The Steel Corporation Case" dealing with the United States Steel Corporation, one of the biggest corporations in that country and probably in the world. It is reported under the name "United States v. The United States Steel Corporation, 1920, 251 U.S. 417." In

that case the court refused to dissolve the corporation on the ground that the corporation did not achieve monopoly and no act of aggression was charged against its competitors. The court said—

“Shall we declare the law to be that size is an offence even though it minds its own business because what it does is imitated?”

**Mr. Aikens:** It would have to use its powers against the public good.

**Mr. HART:** That would appear more or less to be so. Another very interesting case is a very recent one in the United States. It is called “The United States v. E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co.,” reported in 353, U.S. 586, 1957.

The court found that acquisition by Dupont during the period 1917 to 1919 of 23 per cent. interest in General Motors, an important Dupont customer, violated Section 7 of the Clayton Act, which I have read. Just imagine that! Dupont held 23 per cent. of the shares in General Motors, and because General Motors was an important customer of Dupont, it was held that Section 7 of the Clayton Act was violated and Dupont was ordered to sell the shares.

I should like to withdraw those remarks. The court found that Section 7 was violated. The order that the court will ultimately make will be a matter of great difficulty because hon. members could imagine what would happen if 23 per cent. of the shares of General Motors were suddenly dumped on the market.

The acquisition was what was known as a vertical acquisition, by which a company acquires control or ownership of another company that is engaged in an additional stage of the production and distribution of the acquiring company's products. A vertical acquisition differs from a horizontal acquisition, by which the ownership or control of a direct competitor is involved.

I cite these cases to the House because I think they show what other countries are doing in this matter, especially that great country, the United States of America.

In Australia we have legislation that is based on the Sherman Act. I refer to the Australian Industries Protection Act of 1906, which, as its title shows, has been in force for a very long time. It was treated very unkindly by the Privy Council in the Adelaide Steamship Company case, after which it was amended, but it does not seem to be very effective and is not very often used. It does not seem to be effective in preventing restrictive trade practices.

There have been reports and inquiries on these matters in Australia. There is a report by the honorary Royal Commission on Restrictive Trade Practices and legislation by a select committee of the Parliament of Western Australia. It is in the Parliamentary Library and was issued on 7 November, 1957.

**Mr. Aikens:** Would it not be competent for this Government to pass a similar Act?

**Mr. HART:** It is not an Act. It is the report of a select committee set up by the Parliament of Western Australia. The report recommends action somewhat along the lines of the English Act of 1956. It recommends that all trade restriction agreements should be registered and that if any agreement is not registered it should be illegal. It recommends that there should be a registrar of these trade associations and that the registrar, if he found anything wrong, should have the power to report to the Minister. Then, if the Minister thought it should be done, court action should be taken against those engaging in restrictive practices. As far as I am aware that recommendation has not been implemented by the Parliament of Western Australia. Although in 1958 that Government amended their Unfair Trading and Profit Control Act they do not seem to have adopted the provisions for registration, which to my mind are the crux of the whole matter.

At page 17 of the report we find this comment by the chairman—

“The Chairman (Hon. A. F. Watts, M.L.A.), considers it is desirable to quote from an opinion received from the Solicitor General (Mr. S. H. Good, Q.C.) in response to an inquiry made of him by the Commission. The Solicitor General stated *inter alia*—

English law has always been opposed to monopolies, to allowing any person ‘to secure the sole exercise of any trade throughout the country.’ In my opinion the Royal Commission would be justified in its recommendation regarding monopolising in ignoring possible conflict with section 92 (of the Australian Constitution).”

I respectfully agree with the view expressed by Mr. Good, Q.C.

I should like to trace broadly the development of company law throughout the last century. Until the middle of the 19th century it was not possible for ordinary people to establish limited liability companies. Up to that time a person trading in any commodity had to do so in partnership and, if the partnership failed, he was liable to pay all the debts of the partnership. That is precisely what happened to Sir Walter Scott, who put some money into a printing business that failed and he spent the last years of his life trying to pay off his debts.

There were ways of establishing limited liability: by incorporation by the Crown, or by a private or other Act of Parliament. But by the middle of the 19th century the development of the English Companies Act as we know it began. The first Companies Act as we know them was passed in 1862, our Queensland Act being passed in the following year, 1863. They covered limited liability. The result was an

enormous expansion in the business of the whole country. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that I mentioned before the great expansion in that century in population and trade. These Companies Acts as we know them have been in force only for a little over a century and companies have been continually getting bigger and bigger. They have been subject to no restrictions whatever in the same way as corporations have been restricted by the Sherman Act in America. There have been no practical restrictions, although we have had the Australian Industry Protection Act.

I shall deal with the takeovers that have taken place recently in this State. In so far as these takeovers tend towards monopolies, I suggest that we should have special legislation such as has been passed in the United States, but that the plan of the English Trade Restriction Act of 1956 should be adopted so that each case can be considered individually. Recently the following businesses have been taken over:—

Edwards & Lamb; Allan & Starks; Pikes; Finneys; Penneys; McWhirters; Q.N. Bank; Bookers; B.C.C. Stores; Charles Hope; Matthews Thompson.

In addition, takeovers have been threatened in a number of other cases but have not eventuated. I have given only a few local instances, but all over Australia we find what I might call company cannibalism going on. A recent attempt was made to take over Weedmans, and another effort was made to take over the Queensland Cement and Lime Company

The Queensland Cement and Lime Co., gave a bonus issue recently that some people thought was the result of a threatened takeover.

If a company is an old-established one, just jogging along nicely and not attempting to expand or do very much for its shareholders, it generally has a lot of funds tucked away somewhere that represent a very nice morsel for some other company who might take it over. But if the directors constantly use their efforts to the best of their ability and issue shares corresponding with the financially improved conditions, they are not nearly so good for takeover bids. Let us take the case of the Queensland Cement and Lime Co. A bonus share issue of one for three was made; any company that took it over would have to work very hard to maintain the dividend rate on the bonus shares. Therefore, it would not be so attractive for a takeover bid. This takeover business is very complicated and difficult. Personally, I do not wish to be taken as in any way blaming the people who take over, or are taken over, because very few people who have paid £1 a share and can get only £1 on the stock market would refuse an offer of £2. I do not want to be taken in any way as blaming the people who have been engaging in restrictive trade practices because there is a good deal to be said in their favour. As against that, it was found

1960—o

by the Royal Commission in England that they are not good for the community, and I doubt that takeovers are good things for the community.

When I recommend an investigation of the position, I know that great care must be exercised. For instance B.H.P. Ltd. must be in the same position as the United States Steel Co. and any interference with it would probably cause a great deal of unemployment and a great falling-off in the general standard of industry. In many cases takeover bids are more or less defensive measures. The most recent one started when Coles offered to take over Matthews Thompson. When that happened Woolworths were treating for the shares, and it would appear on the face of it that Cole's offer was more or less defensive. If neither started it, we would not have any trouble. The trouble we may have is this: Supposing Coles take over Matthews Thompson, as they probably will do, Coles and Woolworths will then have between them the whole grocery business in Australia. The next step possibly will be a merger between those companies, and then there will be a complete monopoly.

Monopolies have never been considered a good thing in this country, and tendency of takeovers is towards monopolies. Therefore, takeovers are not good for the community generally. But not all takeovers are bad. For instance, the Federal Deposit Bank failed here a few years ago and its assets were sold to the Brisbane Permanent Bank. It would have been a much better thing if those two banks had merged before the failure of the Federal Deposit Bank. My point is that each of these cases must be considered on its merits. I am recommending an investigation into the matter generally to find the best way to deal with it. I agree with the opinion given by the Solicitor-General of Western Australia that it would not offend against Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. It is very doubtful if any legislation genuinely aimed at putting down a public mischief—and that does not interfere with interstate trade as such—would offend against Section 92.

**Mr. Mann:** That is only your opinion.

**Mr. HART:** Of course it is. Some action in this matter is so necessary against monopolies that it is worth while engaging in inquiries and, if necessary, legislating to put down what is a public mischief.

Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution is a general prohibition, both on the State and on the Commonwealth, against interfering with interstate trade. If the State cannot legislate on a matter because of Section 92, very probably the Commonwealth cannot either.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. HANLON** (Baroona) (3.1 p.m.): We are coming to the end of the traditional Address-in-Reply debate and I think it has

had some very good features as well as some very distasteful ones—the latter from the Deputy Premier. And the distasteful features, I feel, have been distasteful to hon. members on both sides of the House. I will have more to say about that later.

The most heartening feature of the debate has been the very high standard, both of contribution and of style, of the new hon. members, 17 in all. With one or two Government exceptions they have reason to be very pleased with their efforts.

Redistributions generally bring into Parliament some people who might not otherwise have the opportunity of coming here and some, even, who would not have thought of coming here. Often a person might previously have thought his electorate to be well represented, perhaps by a member of his own party or even by a member of the opposite party, but, through an alteration of boundaries in a redistribution, the creation of new seats, and so on, generally we have valuable new members in the House. On this occasion both sides have gained men of ability. In that respect, if in no other, this redistribution was good. At the same time, when we look across the Chamber at some of the political accidents thrown up in the freak storm of 1957—and I am not particularly looking at the hon. member for Ithaca, although he is poking his finger at his chest—whose political hides were preserved again at the 1960 elections by some incomprehensible wiggling of boundaries to co-ordinate Liberal booths, particularly in the metropolitan area, I am afraid the gain in quality with some of the new hon. members is sadly outweighed by the retention of others on the Government benches. One can understand the embarrassment of the Government at having the real reflection of the redistribution of boundaries hurled across the Chamber by the Leader of the Opposition. The real reflection of the redistribution that was carried out with the blessing of this Government is that they secured only 43.5 per cent. of the votes and yet managed to have 46 of their members returned in a House of 78, not to mention three Independents, who normally would be expected to support the Government, and who usually do. The A.L.P. secured 40 per cent. of the votes but gained only 25 seats. So the Government, with a vote equal to only 8.7 per cent. of the Labour vote, got 84 per cent. more seats. With 43.5 per cent. of the total vote, the Government got only 3.5 per cent. more than the A.L.P. Of the total, 3.5 on 40 per cent. is roughly 8.7 per cent. yet that was reflected in 84 per cent. more seats in the House.

The hon. member for Ashgrove, who was one of the architects of the Government's redistribution, naturally tried desperately to defend the indefensible. He was very agitated because the Leader of the Opposition had exposed this redistribution for what it was. He even went back to 1947 in an

effort to get some figures to bolster up his case, and he referred to the Liberal-Country group at that time. If I remember correctly, there were no members of the Liberal Party in this House in 1947. At that time they were members of the Queensland People's Party, and they loudly disclaimed any connection with the Liberal Party, as did the Liberal Party with them. I have here an advertisement that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of Saturday, 14th December, 1946, which set out the platform of the Liberal Party of Queensland. Just to show that they did not want to be associated with the Minister for Labour and Industry and others—I think the Treasurer was another—who were then members of the Queensland People's Party, I shall read what the Liberal Party, of which they are now members, said at the beginning of the advertisement—

"This Party has no connection with the Q.P.P. or any other political organisation."

They completely disowned the present Deputy Premier when they set out their platform—and who would not want to disown him?

Do not forget that the Country Party vehemently resisted any attempt to co-ordinate the Queensland People's Party and the Country Party, and it is very doubtful whether they could be validly grouped as a single vote. Even accepting the vote for the Queensland People's Party as being a Liberal vote that could have been linked with the Country Party's vote, the combined non-Labour parties did not get 50 per cent. of the vote. That destroys to a great extent, I think, the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Ashgrove. In 1949 the present Treasurer, the Hon. T. A. Hiley, called for safeguards to ensure that a minority vote could no longer elect a Government. The Premier, who was at that time Leader of the Opposition, said that if his Party were returned as the Government he would take steps to see that it would not be possible. It is no good hon. members opposite saying that they got more votes than we did. The point made by the Leader of the Opposition was that the Government parties did not get 50 per cent. of the vote under their own redistribution, and the Premier had said in the past that he would make it impossible for a party, whether the Liberal Party, the Country Party, or the A.L.P., to be the Government with less than 50 per cent. of the votes. He was talking with his tongue in his cheek, because the Liberal-Country Parties are now occupying the Treasury benches with only 43.5 per cent. of the votes.

When he was Leader of the Opposition, the Premier embarrassed the Governor by moving an amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply in which he asked His Excellency not to recognise the Australian Labour Party as a Government because they did not receive 50 per cent. of the vote. He is sadly lacking in

his sense of duty in not moving a similar amendment now, because this Government did not get 50 per cent of the vote. Notwithstanding the past history referred to by hon. members opposite, the Premier and his supporters now govern with less than 50 per cent. of the vote. There is considerable doubt in the minds of some people whether the Deputy Premier is actually a supporter, although he might give lip service to the Premier, and the same applies to some other hon. members opposite. We accept the fact, for all practical purposes, that the Government are there and that is all there is to it; but we reserve the right to point out, as the Leader of the Opposition did so ably, that they are a minority Government. They are blatantly accepting office under those conditions, and they have also handed an award to a person who took part in the distribution. One of the key men in it was Mr. Wright, who was appointed by the Government from under a bush, or somewhere. Very few people had heard of him before the redistribution, but he was appointed, as a barrister, I understand, to the Electoral Redistribution Commission. Naturally, he would have to be qualified as a barrister, but I do not know whether he practised much in that profession before he was appointed to the Electoral Redistribution Commission. I do not wish to embarrass him in his new position, but I think it should be exposed. Obviously the Government have appointed him to this post as a virtual pay-off for his services on that commission.

It is a poor reflection of the opinion of the Government held by the people of Queensland that, after three years in office, they were unable to get within cooee of 50 per cent. of the votes cast. Almost 60 per cent. of the people of Queensland voted against the Government and thus showed a lack of confidence in them. The hon. member for Ashgrove would have us believe that those who voted on this occasion for the Q.L.P. would have voted for the Liberal Party, but the fall in the Q.L.P. vote at this election was not at all reflected in a rise in the Liberal-Country Party vote. Except for the votes recorded for the new member for Redcliffe, the drop in the Q.L.P. vote was represented almost exclusively by a rise in the A.L.P. vote, and a further fall in the Q.L.P. vote in three years will be reflected by a further rise in the A.L.P. vote, resulting in the return of an A.L.P. Government in 1963.

If time allows me, I should like to point out why this Government will not be returned in 1963 and why the Australian Labour Party will be returned as a majority Government. I should like to deal firstly with some of the distasteful remarks which I regret were made by the Deputy Premier in the course of this debate. He seems to be offended by some of the remarks made in this House and appearing in the Press concerning himself. It is almost touching to

read a report of the Liberal Convention. The Deputy Premier talked the delegates out of anything that had any real substance in it, and instead they passed some pious resolutions which meant nothing at all. It was touching to look at the whole Liberal conference and even more touching to read the remarks of the Deputy Premier there. I quote this passage from "The Courier-Mail"—

"Mr. Morris said he thought his 'hide' was pretty thick after 16 years in Parliament, but in the last two days he had been subjected in Parliament to the greatest insults he had experienced."

We will not dispute that part about his hide! It goes on—

"Among things said—fortunately he had not heard them and was glad he had not—was his being called 'a dirty little mongrel' by the Deputy Opposition Leader (Mr. Lloyd)."

Mr. Lloyd did use the word "mongrel" but he did not use the other words. No doubt they were conveyed to Mr. Morris in the same way as all the information regarding suspected Communists, which he freely bandies round the Chamber, hearsay information handed to him by the special branch of the police in Queensland, or the Commonwealth Security Service. He complained that another A.L.P. member had said, "It is a pity you did not fall out of the plane you were travelling in." From the report of the Liberal Convention, we get a picture of the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt, a very gentle soul completely stunned by the use of such a word as "mongrel." Perish the thought that such terms should ever escape his own lips, or perhaps we should say, "Perish 'Hansard' Volume 22, 1958-1959, page 1655," because I am going to quote from it to show what hypocrisy permeated the contribution that he made to this debate in this Chamber. I shall read just a small passage from that page. It is as follows:—

"Mr. Power: You have not got the guts.

"Mr. MORRIS: I will meet the hon. member outside. He is nothing but a mongrel.

"Mr. POWER: I rise to a point of order. I want that remark withdrawn, as it is offensive to me.

"The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark.

"Mr. MORRIS: I apologise for using the term. I am sorry if I insulted mongrels."

He asked the Deputy Premier, a senior and responsible member of this House—or irresponsible member, to put it more correctly—to withdraw a remark in which he called the hon. member for Baroona a mongrel and the hon. member for Mount Coot-tha withdrew in the fashion I have read. In other words,

his apology was to offer a further insult to the hon. member for Baroona. He suggested that by using the term "mongrel" in association with that hon. member he was insulting not the hon. member but any mongrels who might have heard it.

Now, compare that incident with the incident the other day that the Deputy Premier complained about to the Liberal Convention. It is true that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did make a remark concerning the Deputy Premier but it was not made in the course of a debate and so appear in "Hansard," as the Deputy Premier's remark would. It was a remark of spontaneous disgust at the way in which the Deputy Premier was carrying on on that occasion.

It is absolute hypocrisy for the Deputy Premier to say to his colleagues at a Liberal Convention that he was offended by such remarks when he had deliberately used similar remarks in this Chamber. He complained, too, that someone had wished he would fall out of aeroplanes. In "Hansard," Volume 221 at page 81, it will be seen that the Deputy Premier said, in reply to an A.L.P. member who was talking about the Brisbane Line:

"It is a pity the hon. member is not under the Brisbane Line. Perhaps he will be of more use to the world when he is six feet below——"

Another very gentle expression from this kindly soul on the front Government benches! Compare that with the spontaneous remark of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I am not saying he did not mean it because that would be wrong but, at the same time, it was not a remark made for public purposes. It was not made in the course of debate but spontaneously to express disgust and it was made in the fashion that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition meant it and for which he does not apologise. But, he was gentleman enough, Mr. Speaker, to rise in his place to observe the traditional courtesies to you and to the Chair of this House by withdrawing the remark, something that the hon. member for Mount Coot-tha was not big enough to do in the case of the former hon. member for Baroona, Mr. Power.

The spontaneous remark made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was provoked by the calculated attempt of the Deputy Premier to use this Parliament to publish information that had come into his hands apparently as a confidential document, supplied to him in his capacity as a Minister of the Crown for purely party political purposes. He used this Chamber to smear people by labelling them as suspected Communists without giving them any right whatever to challenge the information where it originated. I am not defending some of the people who were listed by the Deputy Premier as Communists because quite a number of them are Communists and they could not care less whether somebody said they were. However, I addressed a question

to the Premier the other day asking him whether it was possible for people who were named as suspected Communists to do anything by way of redress. But there were others in the lists read by the Deputy Premier who are members of the Australian Labor Party and take the strongest exception to being called Communists or suspected Communists, and they would welcome the opportunity of appearing before an independent authority and challenging the remarks of the Deputy Premier.

**Mr. Morris:** A lot of people would like to know why you are so much with the Communists.

**Mr. HANLON:** I could take a point of order but I realise that nobody takes much notice now of the Deputy Premier. It is unfortunate that he is such an irresponsible person.

The Premier said that, if I wished to bring to his attention the names of any persons who were wrongly included in the Deputy Premier's list, he would be glad to have their cases investigated further. If the Premier would undertake that investigation on his own initiative I should have more confidence in accepting the offer, but I know the position will be, as it must be, that the investigation will be carried out by the Minister for Labour and Industry, who is in charge of the Police Department. Having regard to the marriage of convenience of the Government parties, the Premier is not in a position to question the advice of his co-leader. If I asked the Premier to investigate the matter further, all he could do would be to hand the matter over to the Minister for Labour and Industry, who would then hand it over to the same special branch policemen or Commonwealth security investigators who supplied him with the information originally. In those circumstances, what would be the point of my asking the Premier to have the matter investigated further?

I have no wish to smear any police officers who are attached to the special branch in this State. I know of the special branch. I know it has been in existence in Queensland for quite some time, and I am not going to make out that the officers attached to it are not men of integrity. I certainly have a greater measure of confidence in the members of the special branch of the Queensland Police Force than I have in the officers of the Commonwealth Security Service. I certainly should like to know much more about the special branch, and the public generally would like to know more about it. I am not blaming the Minister or the Government in this respect, but very few people in the community know anything about it.

**Mr. Knox:** Who started the special branch?

**Mr. HANLON:** I said it had been in existence for many years, but I think the public should know more about it. As a

member of the public and as a member of Parliament I should like to know a lot more about it, and I shall be asking more questions of the Minister in order to get more information about it.

I have said that I have more confidence in officers of that branch than I have in officers of the Commonwealth Security Service. There are very few hon. members on either side of the Federal House who are at all satisfied that there are sufficient safety checks on the Commonwealth Security Service to ensure that in safeguarding democracy they do not lose it by default.

Whatever we think about the special branch of the Queensland Police Force, even if I accept that the members of it are persons of integrity, I certainly do not accept that they are infallible. Even if we agree that their integrity is 100 per cent., we cannot pay them the compliment of saying they are infallible in the information they arrive at, particularly in view of the shameful abuse of privilege by the Deputy Premier, who gives all the signs of running riot in Queensland with contemptuous disregard for democratic processes.

While on the subject of security, I remind hon. members of the Gluckman incident. On arrival in Brisbane Professor Gluckman had this to say, and I think it is very accurate in regard to the operation of the security services, however well designed they may be—

“Professor Max Gluckman yesterday accused security men of ‘having very little ability to assess evidence or character. My experience has been that they never look for balancing information,’ he said. ‘They look at things out of context and collect only information which they consider adverse.’”

That would be substantially true.

Although it may be necessary to have security services, I do not agree with the campaign director for the hon. member for Ashgrove, who wrote in “The Grove News” of 14 September, 1960, “‘Secret Police’ in Australia—Thank God!”

I do not think anybody would thank God for secret police. The average Australian’s interpretation of the term “secret police” is completely different from his interpretation of the name “security service” or even “special branch” of the Queensland Police Force. Mr. Greg O’Dwyer, who I understand was campaign director for the hon. member for Ashgrove, endeavoured to brand Mr. Archie Dawson as a Communist. Mr. Archie Dawson is probably one of the strongest anti-Communists in this State. Mr. O’Dwyer used this term: “Secret Police in Australia—Thank God!” I think a person who thanks God for secret police has reason to be not very highly regarded by the people of this State.

The Deputy Premier has given all the signs of running riot with contemptuous disregard

for democratic processes. Who would accept him as being in charge of a special security branch when it is remembered that he said, “Whenever I see a head, I will kick it.”? When we have a person like that in charge of a security branch, or in charge of the portfolio of Labour and Industry, where conciliation is necessary, and when Labour members on this side of the House point out that conciliation should be the keynote under our arbitration system, and when he says, “If I see a head, I will kick it.”, we can have very little hope for industrial peace in this State.

We all remember that it was only by a mere fluke that the Leadership of the Liberal Party and the Deputy Premiership descended on the shoulders of the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha. We do not have to recount further the circumstances in 1957 that brought his party to power. Everybody who follows politics knows that the reason the Deputy Premier is Leader of the Liberal Party today is because the Liberal Party cannot get rid of him. How did he get into that position? Mr. Bruce Pie resigned as Leader of the Queensland People’s Party and Mr. Hiley then assumed Leadership of what became the Liberal Party. Obviously Mr. Hiley took the view that there was no chance of the Liberal Party ever coming to office in this State, and he, too, resigned as Leader of the Liberal Party, which then numbered eight, only twice the present number of the Queensland Labour Party. I think the hon. member for Toowong was approached to accept the Leadership of the Liberal Party, and after it had been offered to, and refused by, seven of the eight members of the Liberal Party there was a unanimous vote in favour of the eighth member, the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, who was the only one prepared to accept what appeared to be the prospect of leading a hopeless party. I appeal to the Premier to find some more harmless place for the Leader of the Liberal Party before he does untold damage.

I wish to deal with the fact that the Minister for Labour and Industry, in the course of the debate the other day, implied that he had some sort of security dossier concerning me. When he was reading out the list of members and suspected members, of the Communist Party, I asked him, because I thought it was quite relevant, in view of the action the Liberal Government in Canberra had taken on Professor Gluckman—“Have you got Professor Gluckman’s name there, too?” The Minister replied, “I may have the hon. member’s name here. Give me time and I will tell the House something about him all right, don’t worry.” It does not concern me very much. I have no recollection of having been spoken to by any policeman, except traffic policemen, so if there is some dossier on me in the hands of the Deputy Premier, apparently it has been compiled, as usual, without giving anybody an opportunity of

questioning it. I am not concerned with what the Deputy Premier said about me, but I am concerned with the Deputy Premier using this Chamber to smear people outside the House who have no opportunity to stand up for themselves. At least I can come in here and defend myself, if necessary, against the Deputy Premier, but people like Mr. Burke, Mr. Gurnett, and Mr. Chard, who have denied that they are Communists, are not able to come into the House to defend their reputations against the character assassination of the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha.

The Government are making a serious mistake if, like the Deputy Premier, they attribute the present industrial unrest to the Communists. We do not underestimate the serious consequences of allowing Communist influence to disrupt industry for its own purpose, but responsible union men, like George Whiteside, the President of the Queensland Central Executive of the Australian Labour Party, have the practical job of dealing with this situation where it has to be dealt with—in the trade unions themselves. What is the use of the Deputy Premier getting up and waving a photograph of a disputes committee, pointing out that there are five A.L.P. members on the committee and smearing them because they are sitting there with four Communists? If Mr. Whiteside and other non-Communist members of the trade union movement, members of the A.L.P., did not sit on the disputes committee, there would be nine Communists on it. Then I suppose the Deputy Premier would be very happy.

Again, the Deputy Premier was reported in the Brisbane "Telegraph" as having told the Liberal Party conference—

"If Australian Labour Party members were sincere in wanting to get away from unity tickets with the Communists, the first thing they should do was to put their own representatives on committees."

When an A.L.P. member does go on a disputes committee on which there are Communists, he complains. On the one hand he tells the Liberal Party convention that the A.L.P. should put representatives on the committees and on the other hand he gets up and waves a photograph around and smears them as being on a unity ticket with Communists, simply because they are trying to exercise their influence in the industrial sphere as they are entitled to and to the advantage of the community, rather than of the trade unions and the Communists.

After all, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Duggan, Mr. Lloyd and I did not put Gerry Dawson or Hanson or any of the others in those posts; they were put there by the members of their unions, and the Deputy Premier is one of those who paraded through the House an enactment which he said was going to get rid of the Communists in the trade union movement—his famous court-controlled-ballots legislation. I do not know whether

any union has taken advantage of it but there might be some attempt currently being made by a section of the building trades workers. Where is the consistency on the part of the Deputy Premier in the debate? We find spokesmen for private enterprise, defenders and champions of private enterprise, such as the Deputy Premier, getting up in the Chamber and telling the trade union movement and the Australian Labour Party how they should run their affairs. I suggest the Deputy Premier should read the recent contribution by the hon. member for Mount Gravatt on restrictive trade practices. If we are going to say the Trades and Labour Council here in Brisbane has anything like the influence on our economy that the controllers of B.H.P. and all the other monopoly interests have, which today are running riot in Australia with the blessing of the Menzies Government and of the Nicklin-Morris Government, we are kidding ourselves absolutely.

Anybody knows that the joint stock company, which has been a feature of our economy for a long time, is the most undemocratic process it is possible to imagine. It might be a very convenient way of channelling savings and investment into a constructive application that the community wants but rank-and-file control of the Trades and Labour Council compares more than well with that in a joint stock company in Australia. There is nothing democratic about the average joint stock company.

Some time ago I was accused, I think by the hon. member for Carnarvon, of lecturing in Fabian economics, whatever that is, at the Labour College. I intend to read some of the notes I gave students of economics at the Labour College about joint stock companies as I think they are very applicable to the debate. Instead of worrying about what the trade union movement is doing, the Deputy Premier would be doing a great service if he inquired into what his own people are doing. We know that, in concept, the joint stock company not only has great value in channelling savings into investment but it also appears democratic. Unfortunately, in practice it is not so. It is possible for a company to be controlled by a strong organised minority which may hold as little as 10 or 20 per cent. of the shares. Everybody knows that that is not only possible but has actually been done in many industries in Australia.

The undemocratic aspect of joint stock companies that I think warrants a complete reappraisal—in fact, we would do well to have a royal commission into it—is that the more the shares are diffused through the shareholders, the less possibility there is of control of the company being exercised to any great extent by the great mass of shareholders. You would realise that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The more shareholders you have with small holdings of, say, 100 or 1,000 shares in a major company, the less likelihood there is of those shareholders, as a

body, being able to control the companies. Propaganda is spread by the Liberal Party claiming that Australia is becoming more democratic because instead of 100,000 shareholders we now have 600,000 shareholders, for example. That means only that the joint stock companies are becoming more undemocratic than ever, because the more shareholders there are with small holdings, the more difficult it is for them really to control the companies. As you would know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from your own business experience, very few shareholders turn up at these meetings. Proxies are sent out to the shareholders, and they are generally not returned.

**Mr. Windsor:** What about the unions?

**Mr. HANLON:** I am only pointing out the analogy and I think the hon. member could pay attention to it instead of joining with the Deputy Premier in smearing the trade-union movement. Proxies are generally not returned, or are given to one of the directors because he is the only person known to the shareholder. Any shareholder who wants to buck such a control is faced with great expense, and even if some issue does bring the shareholders together the result is more often bedlam than progress. As an instance, hon. members will remember what happened during the Butler-Ansett dispute a couple of years ago. The meeting was called and they could not fit all the people into the hangar. It was a complete shambles because for once all the shareholders turned up to vote.

As the shareholder has declined in power, the management has grown in power. Can hon. members opposite deny that? In the past, a person might perhaps go into partnership, but he would actually take an active part in the business. In a dispute such as occurred at the Commonwealth Engineering works at Rocklea, that person would look at it as a man on the spot. What shareholder-control is there in Commonwealth Engineering Ltd.? The man in control would be not only providing the capital for the business but also managing it. But what do we find today? Instead of the owner taking an active part in the business and supplying the capital, we have three different classes of people. We have the shareholders in the company, who provide what might be called the enterprise; the major part of the capital is provided by debenture holders and note holders, who have no say at all in the running of the company; and the management is supplied by a hired manager, who generally has no more than a smattering of the total shares in the company.

Nor can we say that acquisition by the Government will entirely do away with the dangers of power centralised in few hands. There is no doubt in my mind that Government control would destroy many of the worst features of pyramiding monopoly power; but Governments face this same threat, in that the shareholders, or electors in

this case, see their elected representatives losing control over the public service. More and more, as government becomes more complex, we see the public service extending its grip on Governments, just as in the growth of the joint stock company the control by hired management has outstripped the control of the shareholders. We hear talk of trade-union influence and control. It is infinitesimal compared with the influence of that small group of people who, though perhaps holding few shares themselves, are ruining the economic life of the country by their control of these companies. What are we doing about them? Do we find the Deputy Premier giving us details of their practices? Has he a dossier on them? Of course we do not, because he is a victim of them himself. The Government are making a serious mistake if they accept this industrial unrest as being entirely attributable to Communism. We are getting to the stage where those in the higher income bracket—the tall poppies, we might call them—are actually getting wage increases in accordance with speculative land value increases, while workers are refused small increases. Within the next six months substantial increases will be given to Judges, Under Secretaries, and others.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. KNOX (Nundah)** (3.41 p.m.): I wish to be associated with this motion so ably moved by the hon. member for Hinchinbrook and seconded by the hon. member for Bowen. I should like to congratulate both of them on their very fine speeches. I should like to say also that there have been many fine speeches made by new members on both sides of the House, and we can expect to see some very vigorous debating from them in future.

I should like to congratulate Mr. Speaker on his appointment, and to congratulate you, Mr. Taylor, on your appointment as Chairman of Committees. You are both men experienced in your field and I know that we are going to have a very fine Parliament in the coming three years.

**Mr. Duggan:** Would you say that the Chairman of Committees was more experienced than the Speaker?

**Mr. KNOX:** I have been present during all of the speeches, but the Leader of the Opposition was absent when some of his new members spoke. The Leader of the Opposition was anxious to get new blood into his party because it was so weak in debating strength, and now that he has it it is a pity that he was absent during the maiden speeches of six of his new members.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I rise to a point of order. I should like to have it placed on record that the statement by the hon. member for Nundah is completely untrue. With possibly one exception, I heard all of those speeches, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I ask the hon. member to accept the denial of the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. KNOX:** I do so willingly. It was, of course, the Leader of the Opposition who interjected, and I had kept a record of the number of times that he was present and absent.

I now want to get on to bigger aspects of this debate, and I refer particularly to a speech that I made previously in this House concerning the attempted control by a certain group of the A.C.T.U. I said three years ago that there was a move afoot to capture the policy-making body of the A.C.T.U. by the Communist Party through the reorganisation of a number of unions so that the delegate strength from those groups of unions would give the Communist Party the opportunity to have a greater say than their numbers warranted.

Some 12 to 15 months after I made that speech, what I said was going to come about did actually happen. After the big convention of the trade-union movement in Australia, we saw that reorganisation of the A.C.T.U. take place, and the Communist Party did gain a far greater influence in the A.C.T.U. than they had previously. So it is that we find in Australia today these moves by the A.C.T.U. to impose levies to finance visits to and from Red China and Australia by union officials. As has been mentioned already in this debate, the A.C.T.U. is the body affiliated with the World Council of Free Trade Unions, and that body has said on many occasions that no affiliated body may send its delegates to Communist countries or receive delegates from them. Of course the A.C.T.U., in attempting to whitewash itself, is endeavouring to get the support of those unions that are under A.L.P. control by trying to get a per capita levy, which will be paid in a lump sum from each union to the A.C.T.U. to finance these visits. The Leader of the Opposition knows that perfectly well and I am quite sure he is worried about it, and so are other members of the Australian Labour Party.

Not only have the A.C.T.U. been successful in having these delegations going between Communist countries and our own country, they have been successful also in including in those delegations prominent members of the Australian Labour Party. They have the acquiescence of the central executives of the various States, particularly Victoria and Queensland, in sending representatives of the A.L.P. with the A.C.T.U. delegations.

**Mr. Graham:** Was there anything wrong with that?

**Mr. KNOX:** I am going to tell hon. members something about that later on. The hon. member asked, "What is wrong with that?" I wonder what his Leader would say? He is very silent, and I am sure very worried, too.

**Mr. Duggan:** He is not going to bob up like a poppycock and comment on every silly thing you say.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. KNOX:** I want to mention the next move of the Communist Party in regard to trade unions in Queensland and the A.C.T.U.

**Mr. Graham:** You would like to smash the trade-union movement.

**Mr. KNOX:** I have no desire to smash the trade-union movement. I wish to see the unions grow strong and healthy. However, the next move is to form a transport co-ordination committee of all the transport unions, here and in the other States. Hon. members will find that a combined committee will be formed of delegates from the A.C.T.U. and the individual unions.

I will mention some of the unions who have been invited to join this body. There will be the Seamen's Union, the Waterside Workers' Federation, the Ships' Painters and Dockers Union, the A.R.U., the A.E.U., the Blacksmiths' Union, the Boilermakers' Union and the Sheet Metal Workers' Union. Out of that body will be formed four sub-committees, an air sub-committee, a maritime sub-committee, a rail sub-committee and a road sub-committee and, in the same way as the Communists were able to control the A.C.T.U., by having delegates on this body, on a reformed group basis, they will be able, through these sub-committees composed of delegates from Communist-controlled unions and from the A.C.T.U. under Communist influence to control entirely Australia's transport system.

Possibly Mr. Egerton, the prominent member of the A.L.P. and member of the Q.C.E. of that party, who said on television the other night that there were big new moves afoot, might indeed have been referring to this move in regard to the transport unions. The people of Queensland want to know where the A.L.P. stands on this pernicious intrusion of the Communist Party into affairs that were primarily its responsibility years ago.

**Mr. Graham:** You are speaking only on behalf of the Liberal Party.

**Mr. KNOX:** I am speaking on behalf of many other people in the State who are just as concerned as the Leader of the Opposition is about his own people. I have to be extremely accurate in this because the Leader of the Opposition will want to know. The first document I quote is a photostat of the official report on the all-Australian Trade Union Conference held in Melbourne from 20 to 25 June, 1921.

That was the foundation meeting of policy for the Australian Labour Party in those years. On page 9 of the minutes of that meeting we find the objective of the congress, socialisation of industry, and the subject is dealt with in a number of paragraphs. Paragraph 5 refers to the desire by all

nationalised industries to establish an elected, supreme economic council. A considerable amount of debate took place on the matter, and the Federal Executive of the Australian Labour Party approved of the proposal at that date. The Federal Executive had delegates at that congress.

A few months later, on 10 October, 1921, the 9th Commonwealth Conference was held in Brisbane. I have here the minutes of the Australian Labour Party official proceedings. The proposal from the Trade Union Congress was placed before that meeting of the Australian Labour Party. It was vigorously opposed by Mr. Theodore, whom the minutes record as saying, "The supreme economic council would take the place of Parliament." He opposed the inclusion of that plank in the platform.

**Mr. Davies:** Who said that?

**Mr. KNOX:** Mr. Theodore, and he opposed its inclusion in the platform.

**Mr. Donald:** You do not object?

**Mr. KNOX:** I am behind it.

**Mr. Donald:** You certainly are—40 years behind it.

**Mr. KNOX:** I am asked by the Opposition why I am so interested in the matter.

Mr. Theodore went on to say, at page 16 of the minutes—

"The exponents of the proposal were using the example of Russia to follow the control of industries. There would be workers' councils and a supreme economic council which would supersede Parliament.

"The Labour movement was going to be split in twain, if the interpretation given yesterday was reaffirmed by the series of resolutions they were going to deal with, there was no use delegates ignoring the importance of that question."

I skip many years and turn now to the minutes of the A.L.P. conference held in Hobart on 15 March, 1955. That of course was the very famous convention which the delegates from Queensland boycotted, and the Leader of the Opposition was one of those who supported the boycott of the conference.

On eligibility of members of the A.L.P. to associate with Peace Conventions, I refer hon. members to the following passage at page 50 of the official report of proceedings—

"The Executive now declares that it is Communist strategy to use these Conventions to represent the West as aggressive and the exclusive centre of danger to World Peace."

The Executive drew attention to Communist influence in many parts of the world.

The passage continues—

"The Executive again draws attention to the resolution of the 1951 Conference concerning the so-called Peace Conventions organised openly or covertly by the Communist Party."

Yet today there are members of the Australian Labour Party on the Q.C.E. who have attended these Peace Council meetings in recent times, and claim to be proud of their association with these peace movements, which have been declared by the A.L.P. to be Communist-front organisations. No wonder the Leader of the Opposition is worried!

Take now a more recent decision of the Australian Labour Party. I refer to the minutes of the A.L.P. conference held in Canberra on 11 May, the 23rd conference. On page 58 under the heading "Unity Tickets," we find this statement —

"Conference reaffirms previous decisions of the Hobart and Brisbane Conferences in respect to Unity Tickets, and warns members that on no occasion can they allow their names to be associated with members of any other political party on any How-to-Vote ticket.

"Any member breaking this policy must be summoned before the respective State Executive, and, failing a satisfactory explanation, dealt with according to the rules."

Hon. members opposite are very quiet, because they know the next thing I must produce is a unity ticket. The yellow ticket is a unity ticket of A.L.P. and Communist candidates in the A.M.I.E.U. election. They are associated on that how-to-vote ticket. There are a number of both A.L.P. members and Communist members on it. However, a number of members of the A.L.P.—not all of them—objected to being on it and rejected it out of hand. I will come to that in a moment. Those who did not wish to be associated with it produced this big white ticket. It was the Australian Labour Party ticket for the A.M.I.E.U. election which excluded a number of Australian Labour Party members who appeared on the other ticket.

**Mr. Duggan:** That is completely untrue. The Australian Labour Party issued no tickets for the A.M.I.E.U. election.

**Mr. KNOX:** The Leader of the Opposition is playing with words. He knows that when this ticket appeared, those members of the Australian Labour Party in the union who wished to be dissociated from it formed a body to run the other ticket.

**Mr. Mann:** Why don't you be honest about it?

**Mr. KNOX:** I am.

**Mr. Mann:** Don't tell lies about it.

**Mr. KNOX:** I hope that these remarks are heard because the people in this Chamber will realise just how unsympathetic the

Australian Labour Party members of this House are to the rank-and-file members of the Australian Labour Party who are genuinely trying to fight Communism in their unions.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I rise to a point of order. I informed the hon. member for Nundah that the Australian Labour Party, as an official organisation, issued no ticket of any kind for the A.M.I.E.U. election. He accepted that, but he is now trying to switch it around and twist my words. I ask him to accept my statement that the Australian Labour Party did not issue any ticket at any time for that trade-union ballot.

**Mr. KNOX:** I accept the explanation of the Leader of the Opposition. I never said the Opposition issued a unity ticket, or that the Australian Labour Party issued a unity ticket.

**Mr. Mann:** You said it is an Australian Labour Party ticket.

**Mr. KNOX:** I did not say it was an Australian Labour Party ticket. I said that the big white one was an Australian Labour Party ticket.

**Mr. DAVIES:** I rise to a point of order. The hon. member said that some members of the A.L.P. are genuinely opposed to fighting the Communist influence. I object to that statement. All members of the Australian Labour Party are fighting the Communist influence.

**Mr. KNOX:** I am sorry my time is being taken up by members of the Opposition. I make it perfectly clear that I accept the explanation of the Leader of the Opposition on the unity ticket. It was not issued by his party; it was issued by the Communist Party. So there will be absolutely no mistake, the white ticket has on it an Australian Labour Party endorsement; it is authorised by the Australian Labour Party.

**Mr. Mann:** It is not authorised at all.

**Mr. KNOX:** When the yellow ticket was issued the Australian Labour Party members of the union got together and said—I think they would have said this, because they made a Press statement to the effect—that they had been waiting for the Q.C.E. to give some consideration to how they were going to fight Communists in their union, and if they waited any longer it would be too late. So they produced their own ticket.

**Mr. Mann:** Now you are getting somewhere near it.

**Mr. KNOX:** That is right. I did not get the opportunity to say that. This ticket was produced by Australian Labour Party members in the A.M.I.E.U. It did not have the authority of the Q.C.E., nor was it initiated by the Q.C.E.

**A.L.P. Members:** Now we have it!

**Mr. KNOX:** I am glad that hon. members opposite agree with me. A third ticket was sent around the union delegates. Perhaps the hon. member for Brisbane might care to tell me who its author was. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition might care to say.

**Mr. Duggan:** No, I don't know.

**Mr. KNOX:** It is called an anti-Communist ticket, A.M.I.E.U. triennial ballot, 1960, and it says, "How to vote for industrial progress. Avoid political exploitation. Anti-Communist vote."

**Mr. Mann:** How many of them got elected on that ticket; tell us that.

**Mr. KNOX:** I will tell the hon. member in a moment. A feature of these tickets is that, on all three, delegates to the Q.C.E. had to be nominated, and I understand that only members of the A.L.P. can sit on the Q.C.E. On the unity ticket run by the Communist Party, the three A.L.P. members chosen to represent it on the Q.C.E. were Zimitat, Sweet and Edmonds, three well known members of the A.L.P. However, on the ticket run by the A.L.P. for the union—

**Mr. Donald:** The A.L.P. never ran that ticket.

**Mr. KNOX:** The Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Brisbane said it did.

**Mr. Donald:** They denied it. They asked you to withdraw it.

**Mr. KNOX:** On the ticket run by the A.L.P.—

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I rise to a point of order. I do not want to take up the time of the House, but the hon. member for Nundah has more than the average amount of intelligence, and I asked him to accept my assurance that the A.L.P. had not issued any tickets of any kind in regard to trade union ballots. He accepted that and now he says that I accepted that as being an A.L.P. ticket. I did nothing of the kind.

**Mr. KNOX:** Let me make it very clear. I accepted the explanation of the Leader of the Opposition that the authoritative body of the A.L.P. did not issue any ticket, and it did not. The hon. member for Brisbane agreed with me that it did not. This particular ticket was issued by A.L.P. members who belong to the A.M.I.E.U., and hon. members opposite agreed with me on that.

**Mr. Graham:** That is right. Stick to that.

**Mr. KNOX:** The trouble is that hon. members opposite are so unhappy about the situation and so sensitive about it that they think I am saying things I am not saying.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. KNOX:** On this ticket run by A.L.P. members in the A.M.I.E.U., the three delegates to the Q.C.E., who must be members of the A.L.P. to be delegates, are not the three that the unity ticket people, the Communist Party, would sponsor. They are other people, namely, Foat, McArthur and Martin. So we find the A.L.P. in the A.M.I.E.U. sponsoring three delegates to the Q.C.E. who are not the same three delegates as the unity ticket people wish to have representing them on the Q.C.E.

**Mr. Duggan:** Bill Edmonds has been on the Q.C.E. for several years.

**Mr. KNOX:** He also won the ballot.

**Mr. Duggan:** He was not a Com.

**Mr. KNOX:** I did not say he was. I made it perfectly clear that every one of these people was a member of the A.L.P. to the best of my knowledge yet the unity ticket people, the Communist Party, sponsored three and the A.L.P. members sponsored three. Out of the three delegates the two won from the unity ticket, not on this A.L.P. ticket, and one won from the A.L.P. ticket; so the unity boys won again and they now have on the Q.C.E. two of the members from that union, members of the A.L.P. prepared to do what the unity team want them to do.

Let us see what the Communist Party thinks about this. Let us look at the official documents of the Communist Party and see what they say. In the "Communist Review" of January this year, this appears:—

"The communists", writes L. L. Sharkey in the booklet already quoted, 'regard legislation which imposes compulsory arbitration as pernicious and anti-working class'."

In the "Communist Review" of February this year, at page 53, we see—

"In the first three years considerable progress was made in the trade unions and in association with members of the Labour Party."

In the "Communist Review" of May this year, this extract appears—

"The Communist Party has always fought against right wing politics which are a betrayal of the vital interests of the working class. This is why it is necessary for all who have the interests of the working class at heart to criticise and oppose the right trend in the Labour Party."

That is the picture. They, of course, have a vested interest in the destruction of the Labour Party in this State. And what is the Labour Party doing about it? The inroads into the A.L.P. claimed by the Communist Party are becoming ever more evident.

**Mr. Davies:** Do you desire our preservation?

**Mr. KNOX:** I want to see the Labour Party remain strong and effective.

In the "Communist Review" of New Zealand, Mr. Aarons, a prominent Communist in Australia, had this to say and I

want hon. members opposite, particularly the hon. member for Brisbane, to listen carefully—

"Our aim has been, and will more and more be, to win the Left wing Labour Party workers, whether members or supporters, into the Communist Party.

"We are having success in this. In three months in 1959 we recruited 430 new members, and this growth has continued up to the end of last year and the beginning of this year.

"Many of these workers are members of the Labour Party, mainly younger members of the Labour Party, but people who went into the Labour Party in order to fight the Right wing industrial groups and who became disillusioned by the betrayal of the people whom they looked up to and who are turning their backs on the policy of the working class."

That is a claim by the Communist Party. It is not my claim, because I do not know. However, there is some evidence to support the claims of the Communist Party. On November 7 last year members of unions affiliated with the Q.C.E. were entitled to vote in plebiscites, as they are entitled to vote in plebiscites for all Federal and State elections and council elections.

**Mr. Donald:** That is nothing new. They have always been able to vote.

**Mr. KNOX:** Quite so. Who is the person in the affiliated unions who gives the authority for a person to vote in a plebiscite?

**Mr. Windsor:** Gerry Dawson.

**Mr. KNOX:** Exactly. In his Union, a Communist member gives authority to members of the Labour Party to vote in a plebiscite.

**Mr. Hanlon:** He gives him evidence of his membership of the union. He does not give him any right to vote in the plebiscite; he has that right as a member of an affiliated union. The secretary gives him his evidence of membership. Who else would you have to issue the certificates? Would you like to issue them?

**Mr. KNOX:** Why cannot the A.L.P. issue them? Why cannot they find out the names of these people? In several Communist controlled unions that are affiliated with the A.L.P. it is necessary for the Communist secretary of the union to sign the certificate before an A.L.P. member of that union can vote in a plebiscite.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Is it not a fact that it is necessary for the Communist secretary to take the name of the girl in the office? That does not make her a Communist.

**Mr. BAXTER:** I rise to a point of order. I should like to clarify that situation. When we have a plebiscite—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Will the hon. member state his point of order? Does he seek leave to make a personal explanation?

**Mr. BAXTER:** I do not ask leave to make a personal explanation.

**Mr. Morris:** No.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Is it the wish of the House that the hon. member for Norman be allowed to make a personal explanation?

**Mr. MORRIS:** I rise to a point of order. This is completely irregular.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member for Nundah.

**Mr. KNOX:** That is the situation in which we find the A.L.P. at the present time, and how does this collaboration with prominent Communist officials affect our industrial situation? I have here a complete file given to me by a trade unionist, who may also have been a member of the Labour Party and who may now be a member of the Liberal Party. These are the official minutes of meetings in Brisbane of the Trades and Labour Council, and I should like to quote from them.

**Mr. Donald:** You did a lot of snooping.

**Mr. KNOX:** I had something much more interesting to read than did the hon. member for Baroona, who must have gone through "Hansard" after "Hansard" to find his little spicy bits. In the minutes of the meeting of the Trades and Labour Council of 25 July, 1956, at p. 10, this appears—

"That Council expresses its support for the Assembly for Peace and recommends that all unions support the Assembly and arrange for representatives to be present at the Assembly, to be held in Sydney, 8—11 September, and also that Council itself be represented at the Assembly for Peace."

That, of course, was supported by prominent members of the Q.C.E., against the express wish and desire of the Federal conference, which claimed that this particular council was a Communist-front group. In all minutes of the meeting of 4 April, 1956, we see at p. 6 where the disputes committee, composed of Communists and members of the A.L.P., reported the latest information regarding the pastoral dispute. I am reading these passages because all of these minutes were taken when the A.L.P. were the Government of this State and, whilst they were the Government, prominent members of their own Executive were working against them in collaboration with prominent Communists in the Trades and Labour Council Disputes Committee. On p. 6 there is an impassioned plea by the disputes committee to continue this struggle, and on p. 7 of the minutes of the meeting of 29 May, 1957, we see a recommendation by the executive that a leaflet be prepared calling on the workers to return a Labour Government and stating the reasons why the Council considered that that should be done. This states that the drafting of the leaflet is to be in the hands of an executive sub-committee comprised of Comrades Nolan, Hanson, Egerton, and Waters.

On page 9, in the minutes of the meeting of 18 February, 1959, which is getting closer to the present day, we find this disputes committee composed of members of the Communist Party and prominent members of the A.L.P., making a resolution that the Council should endorse the decision arrived at by the disputes committee on 9 February, which was as follows—

"That the Disputes Committee pledge support to the English Electric workers in this dispute and call on all unions to render all possible assistance to them in carrying the dispute to a victorious end."

In the minutes of the meeting of the Trades and Labour Council of 1 April, 1959, the dispute at the English Electric Co. was further discussed and a further resolution was made to keep it going. So it goes on. In relation to the Trades and Labour Council minutes covering the reports of the Disputes Committee, I made some inquiries to find out what was the job of the Disputes Committee. Its true task was not to keep industrial disputes alive, not to keep them going, not to bolster them up when they showed weakness, but to try to solve them. The whole purpose of setting up the committee was to see that industrial disputes never occurred; its whole job was to get conciliation. However, the whole purpose since the Communists have gained control of it and have been able to use as "front men" prominent members of the A.L.P., has been to keep industrial disputes alive.

**Mr. Morris:** And to break down the Industrial Court.

**Mr. KNOX:** Of course; to see that the Industrial Court is destroyed. That is the avowed aim of the Communist Party and that is how they do it. The hon. member for Baroona had reason to be worried when the Minister tabled that photograph the other day, because that is the committee.

**Mr. Hanlon:** That is the only thing he would table. He would not table anything else he was trying to make out he had.

**Mr. KNOX:** If the Communist body observe all the Communist axioms, the hon. member for Baroona is one person in the Opposition who should be worried. I say that because I believe he is a genuine anti-Communist and he should be very worried about the present situation in his own party.

The hon. member for Baroona made reference to a committee that is chaired by the Minister for Labour and Industry. It is known as the State Ministry of Labour Advisory Committee, or "S.M.O.L.A.C." The hon. member referred to it as a secret organisation. The only people who have deprecated "S.M.O.L.A.C." have been the Trades and Labour Council in Queensland.

**Mr. Hanlon:** What about Edgar Williams, secretary of the A.W.U.?

**Mr. KNOX:** I have read Mr. William's statement in the Press.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Didn't he deprecate it?

**Mr. KNOX:** Not one little bit, according to his statement. He simply said he would not serve on it under the chairmanship of the Minister until a certain matter had been dealt with. That was his statement, and, according to the statement he made in the Press, if that matter was dealt with to his satisfaction he would be quite ready to re-join "S.M.O.L.A.C." and sit on the committee with representatives of the other trade unions and employer organisations.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Tell us who they are.

**Mr. KNOX:** The committee has met on a number of occasions and the reason for the apparent secrecy on its decisions is very obvious. These people speak frankly to the Minister on a number of important matters and there is no publication of the statements by delegates because they might be misused by people who would take political advantage of them by taking them out of their context.

**Mr. Morris:** That was a condition agreed to by the Trades and Labour Council.

**Mr. KNOX:** Of course, in the early stages, the Trades and Labour Council helped the Minister considerably to frame the charter, and that was one of the conditions that they insisted upon being in it. Subsequently, however, they withdrew, not on their own motion, but at the direction of the A.C.T.U., which had also withdrawn some months previously from the Federal Ministry of Labour advisory body.

**Mr. Morris:** And expressed regret at having to do it.

**Mr. KNOX:** The State Trades and Labour Council, according to the Minister, who is aware of the correspondence, regretted having to do it. I point it out now because it is another attempt by the Communist-controlled body to sabotage the very useful machinery set up by this Government, under the chairmanship of the Minister, to assist trade-union bodies in their industrial problems.

**Mr. Hanlon:** They sneaked out like a co-respondent in a divorce.

**Mr. KNOX:** In spite of the sneering remarks of the hon. member for Baroona, when his Government were in power they made no attempt whatever to solve these difficult industrial problems through such a committee. While his Government were in office, the principals of his party and the principals of the Q.C.E. were sitting on the Trades and Labour Council's Disputes Committee whose vested interest was to create industrial unrest.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Do you think they should have left industrial disputes to the Communists?

**Mr. KNOX:** I think it is about time the hon. member's party revised its policy.

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

**Mr. KNOX:** I thank the hon. member for Greenslopes and other hon. members for their courtesy in granting me an extension of time. I shall not be very long because the two matters I want to discuss will take only a few minutes, that is, if Opposition members allow me to continue.

To make the story complete there is one further thing I should mention, that is, the influence of the Australian Workers' Union in this State. Owing to the tremendous influence of that union in the industrial field, the Communists have not been as successful as they would like to be; and that is so also because of the disaffiliation of the A.W.U. with the Trades and Labour Council and the branding of that council by the A.W.U. as a Communist-controlled body, at a time when it was affiliated with the A.L.P. The A.W.U. was not used by the Communists to forward their aims because of its disaffiliation with the A.L.P. However, the A.L.P. wishes to get the A.W.U. back in the party fold.

**Mr. Aikens:** They want their £7,000 a year.

**Mr. KNOX:** The A.L.P. may want the A.W.U. money, but I suspect there may be some higher motives, that there is a genuine desire among certain members of the Parliamentary wing of the Australian Labour Party to have the Communist influence removed from the party organisation, and they know the A.W.U. can do it. The A.W.U. has the strength and can give the balance of power over the Left-wing unions. But this desire for unity is being thwarted in all quarters, much to the embarrassment of the Parliamentary wing. The Q.C.E. decided not to recognise facsimile voting, which had been a traditional right of every rank-and-file member of the Australian Workers' Union in plebiscites. There were moves and conferences between the Leader of the Opposition and Vice-President of the Q.C.E. and leaders of the Australian Workers' Union for the purpose of getting the A.W.U. back in the fold, but for some unknown reason the Q.C.E. set its face against piecework, a vital principle affecting the livelihood of A.W.U. workers. The A.W.U. has made it quite clear that it will rejoin the A.L.P. only if that body recognises facsimile voting in plebiscites and does not oppose piecework.

**Mr. Tucker:** Get onto ground you know something about.

**Mr. KNOX:** The hon. member has not been in the Chamber very long. Does he disagree with me?

**Mr. Hanlon:** He does not think you know anything about the union movement or the Labour movement.

**Mr. KNOX:** The most difficult position in this Chamber is that held by the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Donald:** And always has been.

**Mr. KNOX:** He was in the Chamber earlier in my speech, but has now left. He said of hon. members on this side of the House that we were clinging to the warm seats of Government. The hottest seat in this Chamber is that occupied by him. I see a smile on the face of the hon. member for Baroona. He recognises that that is so. It is well known that the Leader of the Opposition had difficulty in regaining leadership of the Party after the last election; it is well known that the Q.C.E. had become dissatisfied with him; it is well known that the Labour Party had been a disorganised rabble in this House for the last three years and that there was a need for some leadership.

**Mr. HANLON:** I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has referred to hon. members on this side of the Chamber as a disorganised rabble. That is personally offensive to me and I ask for a withdrawal.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** The hon. member for Nundah.

**Mr. KNOX:** I accept the explanation of the hon. member.

**Mr. HANLON:** I rise to a point of order. I did not make any explanation at all. I said that the hon. member had referred to hon. members on this side of the Chamber, including me, as a disorganised rabble. That is personally offensive to me and I ask for its withdrawal. I certainly made no explanation.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I remind hon. members that if an offensive remark is made and another hon. member takes objection to it, the hon. member who has made the remark is duty bound to withdraw it.

**Mr. KNOX:** If the remark I made was offensive to the hon. member I have to withdraw it, but a general description of the Opposition in the last three years could be "disorganised." I did not mean to be personally offensive to anybody. In actual practice the Opposition was a disorganised body of people and there was constant criticism by the executive of the Australian Labour Party on the way the Leader of the Opposition handled it. So it is that the Leader of the Opposition finds himself in the hot seat; not the warm seat, but the hot seat. His trusty left-hand man, the hon. member for Brisbane, who has also left the Chamber, has been described as the prime-mover. He accused me of being a log-roller and headhunter. In comparison with the hon. member for Brisbane I would be a first-year apprentice in some of the activities and experiences he has been party to over the years. The Leader of the Opposition is in a difficult position with his own party.

**Mr. Aikens:** That would be a funny one; Johnno as log roller for Duggan.

**Mr. KNOX:** I did not suggest that. I suggested he might be log-rolling for somebody else.

With the present position and the organisational state of the Australian Labour Party, there is a very real danger that the people of the State might believe that "front" men like Mr. Egerton, the President of the Trades and Labour Council and also a prominent A.L.P. man, are indeed spokesmen for the Australian Labour Party. We have to be careful that the people of Queensland have the true picture. As long as the Australian Labour Party organisation is prepared publicly to associate itself with unity tickets, Communists, and people of that ilk, will remain out of office.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. DAVIES** (Maryborough) (4.27 p.m.): There will be no need for any words of mine to assure hon. members of the loyalty of the Australian Labour Party in Opposition, as it had been expressed by our Leader. I endorse everything that has been said concerning His Excellency the Governor and Lady May.

It is rather pitiful to find members of this Parliament engaging in such speeches as we have just heard. As our Leader said recently, when one considers the matters of national importance that could be dealt with by speakers who possess a good deal of intelligence and should devote it to the good of the State, but devote it instead to other matters, it is to be deplored. No-one appreciates more than we do the necessity for a strong Australian Labour Party Government in this State and the Commonwealth. We realise and appreciate to the full the disruption taking place through the action of some Communists in certain places in Australia. I draw the attention of the previous speaker to the fact that his party has control of the Federal Government in both Houses, and they have control of the State Parliament here, but what has been done over the lengthy period that Mr. Menzies has been in control of the Commonwealth to take steps, if such steps were necessary, to control any such influence that may be acting to the detriment and welfare of this country? The Commonwealth Government are in a position to take action. Nothing has been done because they realise the people of Australia will have naught to do with these people in encouraging their activities. That is proved at election time when we find these people losing their deposits. The Commonwealth Government and the Government in Queensland realise and appreciate to the full their great value at election time when they can scream of the dangers of Communism to this country, and indirectly accuse the Labour Party of having their ranks infiltrated by Communists. Through their wild statements over the air and on television, they manage to sway their way many thousands of "swinging" votes.

In the political history of the State there have at all times been men of very extreme views, just as there have been in other countries and in other parts of Australia, but the vast mass of Australian workers are stable, solid, good, loyal and true Australians, who

will have naught to do with violence but who are determined to have a still greater share in the increased production of the country and who will not be led by those who want Australia to adopt foreign ideologies.

We recall that members of the same type of party, representing the same influences in the country, as that of the hon. member for Nundah, right back in the early days of the State's history, accused such men of being pro-Boer, later on of being I.W.W., pro-German, and so on. When the Russian revolution took place, the term "Bolshevist" was very handy and one heard "pro-Bolshevist," "pro-Communist," and so on. One could quite imagine the hon. member for Nundah issuing orders such as were issued in the early '90s when we had Colonel Tom Price (son of that Price who was convicts' gaoler at Norfolk Island) issuing the order, "Fire low and lay 'em out."

If it were not for the strength of the unions today, industrial conditions generally would certainly deteriorate and we should find the element represented by the hon. member for Nundah gaining greater influence and authority in the community with a return of those deplorable conditions.

In the Queensland strike of 1891 the banks controlled the Pastoralists' Union, and the Pastoralists' Union directed the Government, which was only an executive committee of the employers. The Union Committee at Barcardine were gaoled for three years merely for being a union committee. Judge Harding, who tried them, said,

"The police had 24 shots. If I had been there, there would not have been many who boo-hooed twice."

Mr. Lilley interjected and said—

"You can't shoot men for disorderly conduct."

and the Judge replied—

"Very probably the police could have found justification for it."

We know that union members went to gaol on six, ten and fifteen year sentences, and on faked evidence.

Thirty men were sentenced to gaol terms of from 18 months to four years under a copy of the notorious Buckshot Foster's Coercion Act for "Unlawful Assembly."

Five strike leaders at Broken Hill were sentenced to from three months to two years.

Remember the Queensland National Bank scandal. If anybody should have been gaoled it was the prominent people associated with the bank at the time of its collapse, some of whom were rather honoured in the community at the time despite the fact that many thousands of people in the State were financially ruined.

So it is very deplorable to find hon. members failing to take advantage of their full 40 minutes in the debate—a very valuable

40 minutes. What an opportunity it offered members of the Government, particularly backbenchers, who would possibly feel they were freer from party rule, to give vent to some of their feelings about the neglect of the State by the Commonwealth Government. This Government have revealed within their ranks a greater degree of political cowardice and failure to realise their responsibility to the State than ever before. Particularly does that apply to back-benchers and, even more so, to members of the Liberal Party.

I strongly and wholeheartedly endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Baroona condemning the attitude adopted by the Deputy Premier and his willingness to besmirch the characters of people in the community. Admittedly members of Parliament must have certain rights, including the right of free speech, but, when a member of this Assembly is willing to abuse the privilege to the degree the Deputy Premier did, we reach a very sad state of affairs and I repeat that, if it were not for the strength of the industrial movement and the Australian Labour Party in the country and the fear of opposing parties that people would swing strongly in their favour if they went too far, we should have the same set of conditions existing today as existed in the '90s.

Before passing from that subject, let me draw the attention of hon. members opposite, particularly the hon. member for Nundah, to this excerpt from a speech in the House of Representatives in the Federal Parliament on 17 April, 1958—

"There was a time when the present Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, said very clearly that he would not suppress any political party in this country nor try to suppress any idea by legislation. He even went further. In 1945 he told a meeting of students of the Sydney University, 'If I had to choose between fascism and communism—I pray I never shall—I would choose communism.'"

**Mr. Hanlon:** Who said that?

**Mr. DAVIES:** Mr. Menzies, the present Prime Minister of Australia, who during his 11 years in office has shown no inclination to pass any legislation dealing with Communists or expose any Communist activities, although he has under his control more efficient secret police than the Deputy Premier of Queensland has, one might think.

Another member of the Liberal Party, the new member for Kurilpa, in his maiden speech, evidently endeavouring to follow in the footsteps of his leader, was quite willing to besmirch the character of a person outside the House. Some years ago, when speaking in the House of Representatives, Mr. Menzies named certain people as Communists. When a person is branded a Communist, he is viewed by many people with some suspicion, and there are many positions in our society that he has no chance of

occupying. For instance, he has no chance of becoming a Member of Parliament or of being elected to Australian Labour Party organisations. He will have difficulty in gaining selection for any responsible position in any organisation in our community, in fact. If he is a Communist, he must accept the responsibility for his beliefs. But if a man is not a Communist and the smear is made, as it was made here by the Deputy Premier, he is under an unfair handicap. Hon. members know that the man who made the smear has displayed a good deal of physical courage previously, but on this occasion he would not have the courage to make these charges outside Parliament.

I did not interject when the hon. member for Kurilpa was speaking, because it was his maiden speech in the House, but he said, "There are a few who will always be unemployed. I remember that Mr. Les Haylen, an Australian Labour Party member in New South Wales, once said in Parliament that a figure of 2.4 per cent. of unemployed was a very good thing." I do not know who misled the hon. member for Kurilpa, but I wrote to Mr. Haylen immediately and received this reply from him—

"Thank you very much for the information and for your interest in my statements on unemployment.

"I have always been a firm advocate of full employment and have never at any time said it was a good thing for the community to have an unemployed pool of 2½ per cent."

Any intelligent person with a knowledge of political affairs in Australia must know that full employment is part of the Australian Labour Party's policy, just as they know that the supporters of the Government do not advocate it. I have been in businesses in Brisbane and had pointed out to me how hard the girls were working. I have been told, "We cannot get that work from the girls unless we have other girls outside the gate waiting to take their place." Instead of blaming the management for lack of efficiency, they take the easy way out—a file of people outside the gate willing to take the place of the girls inside. That is the only way in which many of these people can get efficiency, and we know that they admit that they must have a pool of unemployed of at least 2 per cent. or 2½ per cent. We know that the Government are perfectly satisfied with that. What they should do is give some attention to management and to recent criticism in the Press, which I shall quote at a later stage, that management spends too much time at conferences at Surfers Paradise frittering time away, when it would be far better to get away from there and concentrate more on the job. I shall quote that passage when we are discussing the Budget as, not expecting such an irresponsible speech as that made by the hon. member for Nundah, I did not come prepared to read it.

To continue with Mr. Haylen's reply—

"During the 1958 elections Menzies quoted something I said from 'Hansard' out of context which referred to 5 per cent. unemployment as a good figure. This was a statement I made in 1945 and referred to the Repatriation Bill and to sick soldiers in their employment and had nothing to do with unemployment."

There is then some criticism of Liberal Members, but I shall repeat only the substance of it. Mr. Haylen says to remind these members of the promise by Mr. Menzies to put value back into the £1. I hope that the hon. member who made that accusation will have sufficient political decency either to produce proof of what he has said or withdraw it and apologise to this Australian Labour Party member in the House of Representatives. He would do better to spend some time in the House querying why Mr. Menzies, who has been in control of the Commonwealth Government for some 11 years, has not been successful in keeping his promise to the people in 1949 to put value back into the £1. I emphasise that the back-benchers, particularly of this Government, have not sufficient political courage to tackle this problem and confront the Commonwealth Government with it.

**Mr. Hughes:** Look at the low unemployment figure in Queensland now.

**Mr. DAVIES:** Here is an hon. member who is satisfied with the situation. He is endeavouring to argue that this State is getting a fair spin from the Commonwealth Government. I suggest that he have a quiet conference with each member of Cabinet and ask him for his personal opinion of the Commonwealth Government. I am sure that he will return from those discussions a little more bashful. He is a new member concerned so far with his own little village; he is not yet looking at things on a State-wide basis.

The Liberal and Country Parties say, "We will deal with it if you will give us and the Commonwealth Government half a chance." One way that hon. members opposite can deal with it is to tell Mr. Menzies that at the next Federal election they will oppose him in every seat. But they are not prepared to do that. They will get on the platform and say what a wonderful job the Commonwealth Government have done, although we have all these indications of the shameful way in which this State is being treated.

At page 29 of the Budget Speech we find this—

"Rail Standardisation—Under the Railway Standardisation (New South Wales and Victoria) Agreement Act of 1958, the Commonwealth has agreed to finance the construction of a standard gauge rail link between Albury and Melbourne, at an estimated cost of £10,726,000. Each State

is to repay 15 per cent. of the cost by instalments over a period of 50 years. Expenditure to 30th June, 1960, totalled £5,769,000 and an amount of £4,750,000 is required in 1960-61 to cover the major portion of the work outstanding."

The main point is that each State will repay 15 per cent. of the cost over 50 years. I ask hon. members to compare that with the manner in which we have been treated on the Mt. Isa railway line. So far, we cannot get any definite information on it because both Governments are heartily ashamed.

**Mr. Windsor:** It is half finished.

**Mr. DAVIES:** If the hon. member studies the recent Federal Budget he will find that £20,000,000 is a mere bagatelle and it should not present any difficulty to the Commonwealth Government to finance that line out of their own resources.

If time permits I intend to mention the timber industry. However, because of the speech hon. members have just heard I may not have time to deal with it.

I next refer to the railway conversion work in South Australia under the Railway Standardisation (South Australia) Agreement Act of 1949. The State of South Australia has to repay three-tenths of the cost of that work in instalments over a period of 50 years. Indeed, £10,000 has been included in the Estimates to enable the preliminary survey work to go ahead. In that case, three-tenths of the cost of the work is to be repaid by the State in instalments over a period of 50 years. The Leigh Creek work was carried out under similar terms, yet the only reference I can find to Mt. Isa in the Budget statement is a provision for advances of £20,000,000 under the Loan Council programme.

I think the Premier said, in reply to a question by the hon. member for Baroona, that the Commonwealth have succeeded in reducing the interest rate from the prevailing rate of 6½ per cent. to 5.44 per cent. I will not concern myself with the period of time, but I have heard that the period of repayment is much shorter than 50 years. I ask hon. members to compare the conditions of the loans that have been granted to the respective States and ask themselves why Queensland has not received treatment comparable with that given to the other States.

While speaking of South Australia I should like to place on record a few pertinent points about the electoral gerrymandering that has gone on for so many years that has helped to keep the political dictator of South Australia in office for so long. I refer to the Premier of that State, who evidently gave some worth-while advice to this Government on the redistribution that took place recently here.

In 1949 in the metropolitan electorates 13 members were elected for 313,000 votes and in the country 26 members for 125,000

votes. The Labour Party secured 62 per cent. of the votes and had elected 13 members. The Opposition obtained 38 per cent. with 26 members, and became the Government. The votes required to elect a member were 24,000-odd in the metropolitan electorates and 7,100 in the country electorates. In 1953, the Labour Party secured 167,000 votes and the Liberal-Country Party 119,000, a Labour majority of 48,000 votes; in 1956, Labour got 129,000 and the Liberal Country Party 100,000, a Labour majority of 29,000; in 1959, Labour got 185,000 and the Liberal-Country Party 136,000, a majority of 49,000 for Labour.

I remember Government members when in Opposition referring to South Australia as an ideal State, and drawing comparisons that in their opinion were detrimental to the A.L.P. administration in Queensland. I am not going to read in detail the figures I have collected, but in respect of education, social services, hospital services, expenditure on aged people, and in every other way, the South Australian Government have spent far less than any other State Government. For instance, on hospitals the expenditure per head in South Australia was 78s., whereas the average for the other six States was 87s. 10d., in child welfare the expenditure by South Australia was 5s. against the average for the other States of 7s. 1d.; on education, the South Australian expenditure was 154s. compared with 184s. in the other States. I give those figures for the information of hon. members opposite who appear to admire the South Australian Government. The hon. member for Baroona dealt with the weaknesses of the case submitted by the hon. member for Ashgrove.

**Mr. Windsor:** What about something for Maryborough?

**Mr. DAVIES:** I am pleased to hear that interjection. I appeal to the Government to undertake further forestry development at Tuan. Hon. members opposite have not given much thought to what has happened in forestry during their term of office. They would benefit greatly if they discussed the matter with the Director of Forests. I am sure they would be gravely disappointed to find out that their Government have failed to maintain the rate of development of the Australian Labour Party Government. I draw the attention of hon. members to the following statement by the Director of Forests—

"It is essential that reforestation work—both plantations and silvicultural treatment of our natural forests—be continued and expanded if the Department is to properly fulfil its function of assuring the timber supplies of Queensland. The work is both productive and profitable.

"However, unless continually increasing funds are made available there is no alternative to decreasing the annual programme of new reforestation work."

The hon. member for Kurilpa should give some thought to those matters.

One Minister after another in answer to questions has been heard to say, "We would do this if we had the funds." We know the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity has had to curtail the activities of his departments. The expenditure of every department has been curtailed. Even the Minister for Education and Migration could spend more money if it was available.

Take the position with hospital services. We have every reason to believe that the granting of extra funds to Queensland by the Commonwealth has been refused because in Queensland there is still a degree of free hospitalisation. We know that pressure has been brought to bear on the Government to give up the free hospital system and so fall in line with the other States, and that they will have to do so if they want to receive consideration from the Commonwealth Government to the same extent as the other States.

**Mr. Hughes** interjected.

**Mr. DAVIES:** We remember the Government's pledges about great development, an increased number of industries, higher productivity and full employment, but we find in nearly every city on the coast that there are fewer factories than in 1957. The hon. member ought to be ashamed of his statement. The disclosure by the Commonwealth Statistician that during the last 12 months Queensland lost 1,702 more migrants than she gained makes poor reading. The disclosure is a warning to the State Government that it has to cope with the problem of attracting more industries, not only to Brisbane but to towns and cities throughout the State. Despite their lack of funds the Government have embarked on an extravagant scheme of street lighting in the metropolitan area. Development is the crying need throughout the length and breadth of Queensland, but the Government have seen fit, despite the present position, to undertake a street-lighting scheme for Brisbane. It is the action of a Queen-Street Government. The hon. member for Merthyr, a tourist back-bencher, emphasised it in a broadcast on Sunday night. He stated he deplored "Queen Street Government." It is quite clear to us what he meant. There is clearly too much Queen Street Government at the present time. There can be only one reason why there are not enough secondary industries in this State. In no way have the pledges of this Government been kept. The Government are neglecting the timber industry as it was neglected by the Moore Government during the three years from 1929 to 1932. It was not until the Labour Government had been in office more than three years that there was a rejuvenation in the timber industry. I take the Tuan forestry industry as an example of what is meant by Mr. Grenning in his report. He says—

"This is a serious matter from the point of view of the State's future timber supply. The best information available would indicate that the annual planting programme

should be increased to 6,000 acres. This will require still further funds each year. As timber is a long-term crop, long distance planning is essential and this can only be carried out efficiently if funds are assured for a period of years and not determined from year to year."

What is the State doing about that? They say they have not the funds. In the Tuan forestry, plantings this year were less than half what they were under the Labour Government. There are just half the men employed. You cannot catch up in the life of a tree. Trees which are going to be cut in the next 40 or 50 years are now young trees or saplings in the forest. It is a long-term plan and it is a valuable asset. If we take the slash pine forest in the Tuan forestry area, this year 326,400 trees were planted, on 480 acres, which is less than half the aim of the Labour Government. The area was opened in 1948. To develop it a little further, the following are the plantings—

Year	Acres	Plantings
1955	102	775,000
1956	105	616,000
1957	73	663,000
1958	75	409,400
1959	64	399,000
1960	55	326,400

The same position exists throughout the State. Already in this area 9,300 acres have been planted with 6,324,000 trees. At present, due to thinnings, there are some 5,000,000 trees growing in the area.

**Mr. Aikens:** What about self-sown trees?

**Mr. DAVIES:** There are no self-sown trees in the Tuan forestry. They have a nursery area, and they are taken away from there for planting. The growing of trees in the nursery is a very important and scientific business. The hon. member is referring to hardwood and cypress areas. I am referring to the Tuan forestries and reforestation areas where the trees are planted from seeds, and planted out into the forestry development.

If we take the State as a whole, in 1954-1955 there were 3,186,200 trees planted, and in 1958-1959 there were 2,741,600 trees planted. In 1954-1955 there were 1,845 men employed, 1,933 men in the next year, and at present, if you exclude the men in jobs other than reforestation, we are down to a total of some 1,400 men.

I do believe the Government could do more to encourage the private people on the land to plant trees and I think that the Government could follow what is done in the United Kingdom and the United States. I suggest the Government should endeavour to develop some scheme, such as placing the responsibility on the farmers to plant certain areas, under certain conditions, to prevent the spread of disease. I believe the Government should develop a more tree-conscious outlook. It is a very important and a very urgent problem and it is one that has been neglected by the Government. The Government claim they cannot help as they have no money for

education and hospitals, but it is a fact that the Government are neglecting forestry development in this State. Recently this season the Maryborough City Council planted 20,000 trees at Teddington and the Bundaberg Harbour Board are planting 13,000. That all helps to make up for the neglect of the Government.

In 1962 we will take out the first merchantable thinnings from the area. There are at least three merchantable thinnings of value over the period of the life of a crop in such an area, say, 50 years. It has been estimated, not by me but by leading Forestry people and timbermen, that over the period, allowing for values somewhat in keeping with what they are now, £2,000 an acre would be a very low return. It could be up to £4,000 an acre over the life of a crop, and 9,300 acres have been made ready to be planted. Taking the value at £4,000 an acre, at the present time Tuan has a solid asset of £37,200,000. Each year's plantings add to that asset.

So one finds it hard to understand why a country such as Australia cannot finance development at the rate that many members of the Cabinet would like to see Queensland developed. Perhaps backbenchers take a more intelligent interest and would be willing to raise their voice. If it is a rebel voice, let it be raised. Occasionally we hear raised in the House of Representatives a rebel voice that gets information for the public that is all to the good.

**Mr. Windsor:** You are getting better as you go along.

**Mr. DAVIES:** I can do without any praise from the hon. member.

If we plant at an irregular rate we must eventually produce less. Say we plant at a certain rate this year and plant one-third less next year—say, 750,000 trees one year and less than 500,000 the next—at the end of the 50-year period the production will be much less than it was the previous year. If the plantings are stable and regular, so will the production be stable and regular. How does that affect matters? Regional sawmills are established to deal with timbers at various stages. The plant, on the first thinnings, would be valued at something like £20,000, on present values, and would want to cut 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 feet a year. If the plantings are not regular, we will not have sound economics in the sawmilling industry.

**Mr. Windsor:** We will have aluminium by then.

**Mr. DAVIES:** Is the hon. member referring to the transactions taking place in the Weipa area? There is a story there, too, that he might find it better to be very quiet about, if all the facts were known about what is happening.

I repeat the point I made. It is very important. It causes a great deal of concern

to timbermen who are interested in the welfare of the State. If we do not have regularity of planting we cannot have regularity of the quantity harvested. If we have 1,000,000 feet harvested this year and only one-third the next year, it must affect the economy of the mill, the people in charge of it and the workers in the industry, as well as others in the community.

So the Government are neglecting their job in the handling of the timbers of the State.

A report was prepared by a timber commission of inquiry. Once again I wonder why country sawmillers were not represented on it, why it had to be a Queen Street commission, and why one member of the commission might have been very antagonistic to country interests. We know that the timber around Brisbane is cutting out. The Treasurer and other Ministers have mentioned the fact. I have here a quotation from a statement made by the Treasurer, Mr. Hiley, on 21 October, 1958. He said—

“A lot of timber will come down from the Maryborough district.”

And Maryborough has the finest hardwood in the State. Its timbers are necessary for construction work in the north-west.

Northern timbers will not stand the stresses and strains that the Maryborough hardwoods will stand. I have seen big pieces of northern timber used in buildings in the North-west that have had to be supported by steel structures in order to take the strain. Timber from Maryborough has to be exported to areas where suitable timbers are not available. This is the most important timber area in Queensland, and my remarks apply particularly to the quality of the timber.

The Government have not made clear what they intend doing about the report of the committee of inquiry. Statements appeared in the Press to the effect that changes had been recommended which would be detrimental to the country sawmillers. Hon. members on this side of the House want to know the conditions under which sawmillers in the metropolitan area are to be permitted to go into areas that the Labour Party kept them out of for years. Here is a chance for the Government to exercise some control. If the workers were employed in the mills at Maryborough, it would assist in the decentralisation of industry, and the Government should not neglect this opportunity of building up the timber industry. There is a tremendous supply available in the Maryborough area, and we on this side of the House want to know what is being done. Some regulations were tabled, but there were very indefinite, and no indication has been given of any amendment to the Act. I think a clear statement should be made, particularly as the Government said before the election that half the sawmills in south-east Queensland would be closed. That statement was made by a leading Cabinet Minister, and the timber interests in the south-east are

concerned because they know that the big city of Brisbane sawmillers, who help finance this Government, will not be involved. It must necessarily hurt the small sawmillers. City interests have been protected throughout the administration of this Government, and so far nothing has been said to contradict the statement that half the mills in Queensland will be closed. There are not enough logs to go round.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. ANDERSON** (Toowoomba East) (5.9 p.m.): I desire to reaffirm my allegiance and loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. In so doing, I am deeply conscious of the honour we have in being members of that great Commonwealth of Nations over which Her Majesty rules. I am equally conscious of the debt of gratitude that we owe to her official representative in this State. We are very fortunate in having a man of his calibre as our Governor.

I should like to extend my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment to your high office, and at the same time to place on record my appreciation of the work of your predecessor, the hon. member for Cunningham, who has attained Cabinet rank.

I also congratulate the hon. member for Clayfield upon his reappointment as Chairman of Committees and upon his good work during the past three years, and the hon. member for Whitsunday upon his appointment as Minister for Public Works and Local Government.

It has been my pleasure, as well as my duty, to make many representations on behalf of people in my electorate during the past three years, and on most occasions my representations have been successful. I commend the Ministers for the work they have done for Queensland, and we are all very proud of the achievements of the Government. This achievement, I believe, reflects the nature of the Government itself, and is to me the highest ideal of democratic government. We are a democratic Government; that has been proved by this side of the House.

In Toowoomba, many monuments of neglect stand as grim reminders of the disregard of the previous Government for the people living beyond the metropolitan area. To seek out one of these, I have to go no farther than our own General Hospital. Happily the Government, through their energetic Minister for Health and Home Affairs, took immediate steps to rectify a situation that should never have been allowed to develop. Next Saturday that building will be opened by the Minister himself. New nurses' quarters have been built, and they will provide the comfort and amenities that the nursing profession so rightly deserves. To be candid, I marvel at the patience and tolerance of the members of that profession attached to this hospital who have for so

long put up with conditions that were, to say the least, of a not very high standard. I have nothing but the highest of praise for them and I appreciate fully the difficulties with which they have had to contend.

The opening of this building will mean that there will be come inducement for trainees to enter the nursing profession. I am sure that it will relieve one of the most pressing problems of Matron Fountain, which is the provision of adequate nursing staff.

On completion of this building, provision has been made for the erection of a new surgical block, which will provide adequately for the demands made upon the hospital. That will not be the complete answer, because it has been neglected for many years. The resident medical officers' quarters are most uninviting, and from time to time the services of additional medical staff are unobtainable because of the conditions under which they have to live.

Another urgent requirement is a residence for the resident medical superintendent. We have been singularly fortunate in having men of outstanding ability, but unfortunately there is no inducement for them to stay in Toowoomba for long periods because of the housing conditions there. I hope that when the Minister is there next Saturday he will take the opportunity to see what further improvements are needed to remove this legacy from the previous regime.

In November this year Toowoomba celebrates its centenary of local government. As part of the celebrations, we are looking forward to the laying of the foundation stone of the proposed maternal and child-welfare centre which is to be part of our civic centre. I hope that it will be sufficiently well advanced for this to take place in conjunction with our centenary celebrations.

Our schools are examples of the Government's awareness of the necessity to provide adequate education facilities, and, in the short time that we have been the Government, we have made great improvements in education. New high schools are being opened in the various suburbs. Our latest acquisition has been the Opportunity School in Ramsay Street, which will fill a long-felt want in our city.

Toowoomba today is a progressive city with a population of over 50,000 people. To give hon. members an idea of the progress taking place, the building department of the Toowoomba City Council issued no less than 1,652 building permits during the past year. We are building more than one house each day of the year. That is good progress, and we are proud of it. With the growth of the city, it is understandable that I make representations for the establishment of certain Government branch offices in Toowoomba. We want decentralisation, and all of those offices have been so far kept in Brisbane.

There are many considerations which have exercised my mind in relation to this growing city, and I propose to make brief reference

to some of them. I believe the establishment of a Stamp Duties Office in Toowoomba is more than justified at the present time, and in this regard I would say that the transactions of hire-purchase companies alone would warrant consideration being given to this matter. There are several companies operating in Toowoomba, including the recognised major companies handling motor vehicle and domestic transactions. In view of this, I believe that such a move would be in keeping with the Government's policy of decentralisation. I could draw a similar comparison in respect of the comparatively recent establishment of a regional directorate of education in Toowoomba.

If a Stamp Duties Office were established there, the Public Curator might be inclined to create a full branch of his department in our city. I feel that such a provision should be examined at the earliest opportunity. At the same time, an examination could be made of the possibility of establishing a branch office of the Registrar of Titles in Toowoomba.

I know that that is quite a different matter and would be a big undertaking, but these difficulties are not insurmountable. At present there are three distinct divisions in this department—northern, central and southern. However, the area round the Darling Downs could be claimed to be developing at a much faster rate than other areas. Consequently, the establishment of a district registry in Toowoomba would be greatly welcomed when it was in full operation; it would eliminate the delays that are now experienced in having plans and other documents examined for registration.

In view of all these things, I am firmly of the opinion that Toowoomba has now attained sufficient importance in this State to warrant examination of the possibility of establishing the Government department branches to which I have referred and I sincerely trust that due consideration will be given to my suggestions at the appropriate time.

Under the guidance of the Department of Labour and Industry, Toowoomba has again received a good measure of benefit, such as traffic lights, which are a boon to our city. We hope the Minister will give us more.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You can have ours, if you like.

**Mr. ANDERSON:** The hon. member can transfer them if he wishes to.

In this department, too, there is evidence that Toowoomba could well do with a local relief assistance branch.

I believe the time has come when the Toowoomba office should set up a duplicate system of the relief assistance branch and, in advocating this measure, I have in mind the volume of work associated with the issue of rail travel concessions to pensioners.

At the present time, the normal procedure is for the applicant to apply to the local member of Parliament for the concession; he in turn makes application to the relief assistance branch in Brisbane, which checks the entitlement and, if found in order, dispatches the requisition forms to the Minister for approval. Next, the Minister forwards the requisition forms to the local member and the final step is for the member to deliver the forms to the applicant. This prolonged process usually takes some days and much of it could be eliminated, saving time and energy not only for the department but for the pensioners, who often find the process too slow.

Again, in the Department of Labour and Industry we find the Government's expressed interest and desire to promote industry in Queensland, and because of this, greater attention is being paid to tourism. In this respect, we are grateful to such bodies as the Queensland Development Association and its kindred associations, such as the Toowoomba Industries Committee, for the prominent part they are playing and for the great voluntary contribution they are making to the overall effort. Currently, the Toowoomba Industries Committee is making representations to the Toowoomba City Council for financial support in the production of a film depicting the various industries already established on the Darling Downs and also the potential that exists for the establishment of new industries.

Whilst the Toowoomba City Council has made an annual grant to this committee, nevertheless I hold a strong opinion that such projects should receive greater encouragement from both the State and Federal Governments.

I desire to draw the Minister's attention to this aspect of publicity and trust that he will give due consideration to my suggestion of a subsidy. I visualise a grant of one-third by the Federal Government, one-third by the State Government and one-third by the local government. I should like to read an extract from the annual report of the Agent-General for Queensland, which discloses a desire for such things—

"The year under review saw a further expansion in the publicity work undertaken by this office. All media, including television, radio and newsreel services, were utilised as opportunity offered.

"With the rise in the standard of living in the United Kingdom it is imperative that our publicity activities should be intensified if Queensland is to obtain its fair share of new settlers and its due proportion of industrial investment from overseas. It has long been acknowledged in the commercial world that 'It pays to advertise'."

The Minister for Labour and Industry has advertised Queensland more than it has ever been advertised before. I congratulate the Minister and the staff of his department.

The following is a further passage from the Annual Report of the Agent-General:—

“Action was taken during the year to construct a small theatrette in the basement of Queensland House, so that appropriate documentary and other films can be shown to prospective migrants and businessmen. This work, which is a credit to the officers concerned, was also undertaken entirely by my own staff. Regular monthly film evenings for potential migrants have now commenced and the initial attendances augur well for future screenings. The success of this form of publicity is dependent, of course, on the availability of sufficient and suitable 16 m.m. colour films of high quality. At present my film holdings do not cover all aspects of Queensland's industries and activities.”

I appeal to all hon. members to get films of their areas so that they can be sent to the Agent-General for use as further favourable publicity for Queensland.

Notwithstanding the many onerous duties of the State Treasurer, it is most refreshing to note the tremendous improvement within the Queensland Housing Commission. As Minister for Housing, the Treasurer has been responsible for very marked improvement generally. The administration has in many respects been streamlined. Applications for State rental homes and for the purchase of homes under the home-ownership programme have received much earlier attention and records show that the housing lag that existed when this Government took office has been greatly overcome. Three years ago there was a waiting list for over 300 Housing Commission homes in Toowoomba alone, but today I am very happy to report that there are less than 50 applicants waiting for houses.

Admittedly, the Queensland Housing Commission may not have provided all the homes. Through the efforts and the encouragement of the Treasurer, co-operative housing societies have had the door opened to them and they in turn have proved a much-needed avenue to overcome the general housing lag.

In view of the rapid development in Toowoomba, I believe the time is opportune for action to ensure that sufficient land will be available for future Housing Commission homes in our city. In this respect and, while I acknowledge the very useful purpose housing settlements are serving, thought should be given to more decentralised planning of future areas. Might I suggest that these areas be much less in size and greater in number than at present. Under such a plan we would see a welcome departure from the present picture of density, and a tendency to individuality in the homes themselves. This in turn would naturally enhance the value of the dwellings and the prospective home buyer would have an added incentive. Many people do not desire to buy a Housing Commission home in a

large settlement, because they find, if they are transferred from the city, that the value of their houses depreciates because of the situation. Land is available in the suburbs of Toowoomba. It could be acquired and utilised to better advantage.

The Commission has a volume of business in Toowoomba that warrants some consideration of the establishment of a district office there. A separate department should be set up, removed from its present location under the control of the C.P.S., Toowoomba. A resident district inspector with authority to make decisions on repairs to rental homes should be available. He would be able to expedite repairs of an urgent nature. Records should be provided so that matters appertaining to the regular payment of rents could be supervised and necessary action taken before some accounts fell badly into arrears. Such a district office could be charged with the responsibility of carrying out a survey to see if the best possible use is being made of our State rental homes. There are instances in Toowoomba of tenants occupying homes with more accommodation than they actually require. With children growing up and getting married, the number accommodated in some of these houses is much fewer than was originally provided for. Better use could be made of these homes.

While the Government view with considerable concern the railway position, nevertheless the Minister for Transport is to be commended on the improvements brought about by him in Toowoomba. I refer to the installation of further boom gates at level crossings in the city, and also to the automatic systems of warning lights which have been erected at the three main level crossings. For many years, various associations in Toowoomba pressed the Government of the day to restore these warning devices, but the appeal fell on deaf ears. Today, we are pleased to acknowledge the tremendous benefit these systems are in Toowoomba, and we thank the Minister for Transport for the urgent attention he gave to this matter. We also thank him for the many improvements he has had carried out at the railway workshops in Toowoomba. Another matter of grave concern to the Minister for Transport is the position of the Railway Department. It must be acknowledged by all hon. members that the Minister has been relentless in his determination in tackling this problem. We must commend the Minister for what he is doing. The Minister has devoted a great deal of his time to ensure that the railways are giving of their best. Notwithstanding his expressed desire to protect the interests of his department, it is of great concern to all of us to find that he has not been given the loyalty that could be expected. The employees of the Railway Department do not appreciate what the Minister is trying to do for them.

**An Opposition Member:** What about road transport?

**Mr. ANDERSON:** Road transport does not come on today, but nevertheless the hon. member will hear about it. While we are on road transport, although 30,000 employees are employed by the Railway Department, there would be at least 50,000 employed on road transport, and they have to be protected just as the railway employees. Another time it will be appropriate to speak about road transport which will play a very important part in the development of Queensland.

At 5.30 p.m., under Standing Order No. 17—

Motion—That the Address in Reply be adopted (Mr. Row)—agreed to.

### SUPPLY

#### CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

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

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

### WAYS AND MEANS

#### CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

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

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.31 p.m.

---