

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 20 OCTOBER 1960

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 20 OCTOBER, 1960

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

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the public accounts of the State for the year 1959-1960.

Ordered to be printed.

QUESTIONS

CONSTITUTION (DECLARATION OF RIGHTS) BILL

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Premier—

"In view of (a) the refusal of the Premier and his Government to agree to the request of the Opposition, supported by the Queensland Labour Party and an Independent Member of this House, to institute a judicial investigation of the grave charges made in this House on October 13 by the Honourable Member for Fassifern, who indicted individuals and groups of individuals as having attempted to intimidate and suborn him during the exercise of his office as a Minister of the Crown, and (b) the Premier's promise, as reported in 'The Courier-Mail' and the 'Telegraph' of February 24, 1960, that a new Bill of Rights would be one of the first measures introduced in the August session of the new Parliament, will he now inform the House whether he proposes to honour his promise and introduce this Bill, the primary aim of which, as he stated in this House on December 9, 1959, was to protect our democratic political institutions?"

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

"The Government's intentions in this regard will be announced at the appropriate time."

MAIN ROADS EMPLOYEES, TOOWOOMBA

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Acting Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

"What was the number of (a) truck owner-drivers and (b) other employees under the control of the supervising overseer, Mr. V. Carroll, at Toowoomba, at May 30, 1960, and at October 15, 1960, and are any dismissals pending or contemplated in the abovenamed categories?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

"As at May 30, 1960—(a) 44; (b) 117. As at October 15, 1960—(a) 34; (b) 114. Dismissals pending or contemplated—(a) 7 in about two weeks; (b) 15-20 in about one month."

MALE UNEMPLOYMENT IN QUEENSLAND

Mr. GILMORE (Tablelands), for Dr. DELAMOTHE (Bowen), asked the Minister for Labour and Industry—

"In view of the interjection by the Honourable Member for Rockhampton North that the unemployment figures supplied by him in answer to my question on October 19 were not the latest, will he indicate the authority from which his figures were compiled?"

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

"The figures quoted by me were as supplied by the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service, Brisbane, in the weekly return furnished to my Department and were received by me on October 13, 1960. Each of my Cabinet colleagues watches employment and unemployment figures very closely because each in his own Department is constantly endeavouring to assist in the problem of seasonal unemployment. The proof that we are all working successfully in this field is demonstrated by the fact that notwithstanding the drought conditions existing and the short beef killing season, figures for male unemployment at September 30, 1960, are 1,620 receiving Unemployment Benefit and 4,624 registered for employment. I have frequently stated that I believe that certain A.L.P. members have a vested interest in unemployment because they appear to try at all times to present comparisons which by using different bases for comparison enable them to build up an imaginative bogey. I deeply deplore this type of cheap political chicanery, but am not at all surprised to note that the Honourable Member for Rockhampton North in his characteristically irresponsible and even psychiatric manner tried to cast doubt on the truth of the figures I presented."

HIGH-LEVEL BRIDGE, BURDEKIN RIVER, MACROSSAN

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

"(1) Is it proposed to build a new high-level railway bridge over the Burdekin River at Macrossan?"

"(2) If so, will the existing bridge be dismantled and sold for scrap or used elsewhere and, if not, to what use will the present bridge be put?"

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

"(1) Yes. Tenders already have been invited for the work."

"(2) The use to which the existing bridge could be put, or the materials contained therein used in other places, is at present under consideration."

GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE,
ELIZABETHAN THEATRE TRUST

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

“(1) Does the Elizabethan Theatre Trust receive any subsidy or any other form of monetary grant or assistance from the State Government?”

“(2) If so, is he aware that the Trust does all its transporting of scenery, effects, &c., by road and not by rail?”

“(3) How does this fit in with the professed desire of the Government to reduce the railway deficit?”

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

“(1, 2 and 3) I refer the Honourable Member to page 14 of the Estimates of the Probable Ways and Means and Expenditure of the Government of Queensland for the year ending June 30, 1961, from which he will observe that a grant of £6,000 is made by the Government to the Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust. This grant is not made for the purpose of meeting transport costs, but is a grant for general purposes and, as such, it is not subject to conditions of the nature implied by the Honourable Member's question. However, I would point out that because of the nature of the scenery, the delicate manner in which it must be handled and the need for quick movement from place to place, permits for travel by road are granted, on application, to touring theatrical bodies.”

INCOME TAX REIMBURSEMENT GRANTS,
1960-1961

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

“What is the tax grant to each State for 1960-1961 expressed in terms of a per capita basis?”

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

“The Financial Assistance Grants for 1960-1961, which are based on population as at July 1, 1960, and average wages paid in 1959-1960, have not yet been finally determined by the Commonwealth Statistician, as required by the States Grants Act, 1959. However, estimates by the Statistician of the grants payable in 1960-1961, expressed on a per capita basis, utilising the projected estimate of mean population for 1960-1961, are—New South Wales, £23 10s. 11d., Victoria £22 19s. 1d.; Queensland, £26 16s. 4d.; South Australia, £32 1s. 6d.; Western Australia, £37 11s. 8d.; Tasmania, £33 15s. 6d.; six States average, £25 19s. 11d.”

CONSTRUCTION WORK, HERBERTON-
WATSONVILLE ROAD

Mr. GILMORE (Tablelands) asked the Acting Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

“In view of the preliminary construction work on the first section of the Herberton to Watsonville Road having been completed, will he give consideration to immediate follow-up work so as to prevent damage in the next wet season and make the road useable to the people of that area?”

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

“The scheme now approaching completion provides only for clearing and grubbing with access tracks for future works, and preliminary drainage as first stage construction on an alignment projected from an investigation survey. Before further works can be done, a working survey is essential to determine the earthworks required and to design the drainage. This survey will be done when a surveyor can be made available, probably at the end of this month. Unfortunately, further funds to the extent required to complete the earthworks and drainage and for the gravelling of the section could not be provided during the current financial year, but it is proposed to allocate funds for further work during 1961-1962.”

TENDER BY MR. G. BOOKER FOR THEODORE
HOSPITAL

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) asked the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—

“(1) As the lowest tender for the construction of the Theodore Hospital was first accepted and then withdrawn, on what grounds was the second lowest tender of G. Booker, Rockhampton, not accepted?”

“(2) Has the deposit on the contract price submitted been refunded to G. Booker, Rockhampton?”

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

“(1) The lowest tender submitted by Mr. E. Rosenblatt was not accepted before its withdrawal. Mr. G. J. Booker's tender was not accepted because as a result of enquiries made it was considered that he would not be able to carry out the work satisfactorily within the time specified. It is prescribed in the Conditions of Tendering of the Department of Public Works that I shall not be bound to accept the lowest or any tender.”

“(2) A cheque in refund of the deposit lodged by Mr. Booker with his tender was posted to him yesterday.”

NEW RAILWAY STATION AND GOODS SHED,
MT. ISA

Mr. INCH (Burke) asked the Minister for Transport—

“(1) Is he aware of the fact that due to the congestion of goods and shortage of space in the railway goods shed at Mt. Isa, 17 wagons of goods were waiting to be unloaded on October 10, and that in consequence of this shortage of space and the piling up of these wagons of goods the general public and business people of this town continue to suffer undue delay in the delivery of their goods?”

“(2) Is he also aware of the fact that there is only one toilet at the goods shed to serve the needs of the staff, general carriers and transport drivers and that a section of this toilet is partly exposed to the public gaze?”

“(3) Is he prepared to recommend the construction of a toilet block of sufficient size to cope with present-day and future requirements?”

“(4) In view of the deplorable state of the railway station and goods shed at Mt. Isa which are no longer adequate to meet the requirements of the travelling public and business people, and having regard to the heavy increase in population and the rapid expansion of this district over the past decade together with the phenomenal increase in revenue received by the Department through this station and goods shed, will he recommend the immediate construction of a new railway station, high-level platform and goods shed at Mt. Isa?”

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

“(1, 2, 3, 4) Strong representations have been made to me over a period, much longer than the Honourable Member has been in this House, requesting improved station and goods shed facilities at Mt. Isa. In August last I made a personal inspection of the facilities and whole-heartedly agree that the conditions which have apparently existed there over many years are an indictment on previous Governments. Immediately on my return to Brisbane, I discussed this matter with the Consultants of the complete Mt. Isa Rail Project and the Honourable Member can be assured that within the term of this Government a new railway station and goods shed—in keeping with the importance which the Railway Department is playing in the development of Mt. Isa—will be built.”

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS, WINDING ENGINE
DRIVERS

Mr. INCH (Burke) asked the Acting Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

“(1) Has any instruction been issued to Mines Inspectors to the effect that authority

forms for the two-yearly medical examinations of winding engine drivers should be made out to the Government Medical Officer despite the fact that the Mines Act does not specify that these examinations are to be conducted by the Government Medical Officer?”

“(2) If such an instruction has been issued, why has it been issued?”

“(3) As the Act only provides for the necessary certificate to be issued by a medical practitioner, will he withdraw this instruction and thereby restore the right to the examinee to have the examination carried out by a medical practitioner of his own choice?”

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

“(1) Yes.”

“(2) The Mines Regulation Acts and the Coal Mining Acts provide that holders of Winding Licenses are required to have their medical certificates renewed every two years or at such time or times as the owner, manager, or inspector may require.

As a measure of assistance to the Mining Industry and to facilitate the regular renewal of such certificates, the Department has for many years met the whole cost of renewal examinations by having such examinations included in the duties of Government Medical Officers. No cost is then incurred by the Winding License holder. Generally this arrangement has proved eminently satisfactory to all concerned.”

“(3) If the license holder is prepared to make the necessary arrangements and meet the whole cost of the medical examination, the Department will offer no objection to his tendering a certificate from another medical practitioner.”

RAILWAY FREIGHTS ON FERTILISERS

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough), for **Mr. BURROWS** (Port Curtis), asked the Minister for Transport—

“(1) In respect of the recent increase in freight rates, is it true that the freight rates on fertilisers have in fact been increased by approximately forty-three per centum as a result of these rates being first re-classified and then subjected to a general increase of twenty per centum?”

“(2) In view of the extreme difficulties primary industries are at present suffering, will he reconsider these rates?”

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

“The percentage increase in manure rates varies according to the distance of haulage. The increase to the old ‘M’ class represented:—36.5 per cent for 100 miles, 20.1 per cent. for 200 miles, 31.4 per cent. for 400 miles, and, as stated, the ‘M’ class was increased by 20 per cent. Manure

rates have always been very low and, in fact, most uneconomical to the Railway Department. Whilst it is realised that the increase will mean some revision in the marketing of the product, it must be appreciated by all that it is unfair to expect the Railways to carry the commodity at a loss. Too long has the Railway Department collected odium in relation to certain losses, when, in fact, the Department has by uneconomical freight rates been actually subsidising and keeping alive many industries. It might be of interest to note that fertiliser can be hauled by road tax free under the "State Transport Facilities Acts" but, because of the low return, I know of very few short or long distances hauliers who include such product in their loading."

PARK LANDS, METROPOLITAN SUBDIVISIONS

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough), for **Mr. NEWTON** (Belmont), asked the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—

"(1) Is he aware that the City of Brisbane Act states that five per centum of all land subdivided must be set aside for parks and recreational use, but that such land being set aside by subdividers, including Government Housing Commission projects, is of the roughest nature and would cost huge sums of money to convert?"

"(2) Would he give some assurance that in future subdivisions the full intention of the Act will be honoured and that suitable land is set aside for parks and recreational use?"

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

"(1) The City of Brisbane Acts do not contain the provision mentioned. Chapter 8 of the Council's Ordinances vests certain powers relating to subdivision of land in the Council Registration Board."

"(2) I have no power to direct the Council or the Council Registration Board in such matters."

DECLARATION OF DROUGHT-STRICKEN AREAS, LOGAN ELECTORATE

Mr. HARRISON (Logan), without notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

"In view of the continuing drought conditions existing in my electorate, would the Minister give consideration to declaring drought-stricken the areas from Kuraby to Pimpama, and from Bethania to Beau-desert?"

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

"Steps are being taken to declare drought-stricken the areas referred to by the hon. member and a rebate of 50 per cent. off the rail freight on fodder for starving stock consigned to stock-owners will be allowed as from Thursday, 27 October."

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT— RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 19 October (see p. 818) on Mr. Hiley's motion—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1960-1961, a sum not exceeding £1,365 to defray the salary of Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor."

Mr. DIPLOCK (Aubigny) (11.25 a.m.): I am confident that the facts and figures quoted by me yesterday will convince the hon. member for Condamine that the accommodation at the school he mentioned, Barakula, was both adequate and ample. This accommodation would only be a reflection of the previous Labour Government's sympathetic attitude towards the wants of country children. I understand that the hon. member is to go to the area very shortly to open the new school. I make the very respectful suggestion to him that, when he goes, he invites the hon. member for Roma, who said that the school had to be renewed, to accompany him. If he does that both hon. members will know that what I have said is correct.

Mr. Aikens: He will claim that you did nothing and he did the lot.

Mr. DIPLOCK: At least he will know how to get there.

The fact that religious instruction is included in the curriculum in primary schools is sufficient evidence that it has been regarded as a necessary and vital part of a child's education.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The conversation between hon. members is getting too loud. I can hardly hear the hon. member for Aubigny.

Mr. DIPLOCK: Whether a child receives that instruction according to the teachings of the Anglican church, the Roman Catholic church, the Methodist church, the Presbyterian church, or any other church, is no business of mine; it is no concern of mine, nor would I say that it is the concern of the State. But it is my concern, the concern of every hon. member of the Committee, and the concern of the State that every child should receive instruction in the fundamental principles of Christianity.

Sufficient religious instruction has not been given in schools in the past, but that has not been the fault of either the teachers or the ministers who visit the schools. Bible-reading, which is included in the school syllabus, has been uninteresting. Without adequate explanation from the teacher the average child has not been able to understand it. Time is allowed in school timetables to permit the visits of ministers of religion, but because of the

shortage of staff and other commitments ministers have not been able to make regular visits. Bible-reading taken by teachers has not assisted in any way. In many instances the internal organisation of schools has been disturbed because of periods during which some children are receiving religious instruction while others are not. If we believe that religious instruction is a vital part of education, in so believing we are only in line with the authorities in England, Scotland and Ulster. If we believe that religious instruction is vital in the education of the child, we should take steps either to teach it efficiently or delete it from the curriculum. Under present conditions we could be doing more harm than good.

Mr. Ramsden: How would we be doing more harm?

Mr. DIPLOCK: Because it is taught inefficiently and anything that is taught inefficiently could do more harm than good.

Mr. Ramsden: It is taught by the teacher.

Mr. DIPLOCK: The teacher has very little to do with it. As I said early in my speech, no blame can be laid at the feet of the teacher.

Mr. Coburn: In effect, there is no teaching at all.

Mr. DIPLOCK: That is quite true. All the teacher does is supervise the class in the reading of these books which are, unfortunately, unattractive and uninteresting. I should say that in 99 per cent. of cases, particularly in the junior classes, they are not understood by the children.

Mr. Ramsden: Your remarks would apply principally to country schools?

Mr. DIPLOCK: No, they apply to all schools. I have not taught only in country schools; I have taught in city schools and I feel that the disorganisation that is experienced in the country schools is also experienced in city schools. I am not laying any charge on this Government for the conditions that exist. This position has existed for as long as I can remember.

Mr. Ramsden: I am not suggesting that you were.

Mr. DIPLOCK: My suggestion is that we either do it properly and efficiently, or not at all.

Mr. Coburn: In Bible-reading, if there were interpretation there would be varying interpretations according to the different teachers?

Mr. DIPLOCK: I should think there would be. I suggest that the Government give consideration to setting up a committee to consider presenting the Bible stories to the children, particularly in the junior grades, in a much more attractive and interesting manner than at present and in simple

language. The committee could comprise teachers and clergymen and a scheme could be worked out that would eliminate the disorganisation that now occurs in schools. I feel that teachers on the opposite side of the Chamber will agree with everything I have said.

Mr. Windsor: Do you think it would help if tests in religion were provided?

Mr. Aikens: They never help anybody.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I would not suggest any tests.

Mr. Windsor: Perhaps I should have said "examinations".

Mr. DIPLOCK: As matters stand at present I should say that there would not be a 5 per cent. pass, and even that might be an over-estimation if Bible-reading were tested. May I stress the point that neither the department nor the Government nor anybody else can lay any blame at the feet of the teacher or the minister of religion. The different churches are short of staff just as the department is. Some scheme will have to be evolved by which all parties interested in this important and vital subject will co-operate and work out some means of teaching it efficiently in State schools. I compliment the Government on increasing the number of transport services in the country, but I have an observation to make and I have good reason for making it. The idea of the Labour Government in introducing these transport services was to provide every possible facility to enable the country child to receive education. That being so, more or less every application, during my term as Minister, was treated on its merits, and very often transport services were granted when there were only nine or 10 applicants. I know the regulation says an average of nine must be maintained, and that because of that regulation some applications have been refused because 11 or 12 children have not been involved. Departmental records will show that very often not only during my term as Minister but also during the terms of office of previous Ministers applications received favourable consideration when the number was nine only, because it was thought that if we treated the applicants a little generously they would do everything possible to ensure that the average was maintained.

I was rather amazed to read an article in the "Telegraph" yesterday under the inch-letter caption, "Remove Unworthy Men from the Police Force." attributed to the Minister for Labour and Industry. It read—

"Unworthy members were few, but they harmed every member of the service."

"In such a large force it could be expected there would be some who were not worthy of their position."

I do not think such a statement is in the best interests of the Police Force. If the

Minister acknowledges the fact that there are unworthy members in the Force, his job is to get rid of them, not to advertise to the public that they are there and are harming other members of the Force.

I did not take part in the debate on the Police Acts Amendment Bill because I could not conscientiously do so inasmuch as I had no evidence that would enable me to take an honest interest or part in it. Other hon. members claimed to have some such evidence, but it has been my experience over a long time and in many parts of the State that not one policeman with whom I have come in contact has done anything of a dishonest or unworthy nature. If captions such as the one I have referred to are to be featured in the Press, the people of Queensland will begin to look in every nook and corner for the policeman who is not worthy of the office he occupies.

The police in the area I represent carry out their duties without fear or favour, and therefore we have very little lawlessness in the district. After a long experience with youths, I do not agree with the featuring of bodgies in newspapers almost as film stars, nor do I agree that we should use kid gloves in dealing with them. They understand only one language and that is hard language.

Mr. Aikens: A good kick in the pants.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I compliment the policeman who is prepared to take a firm stand in dealing with them.

Mr. Aikens: The present Minister for Justice would take action against the policeman because he did not use kid gloves.

Mr. DIPLOCK: Well, that may be his way of dealing with the position. From my experience that is not the right way, because in Dalby, and probably in other country towns, we have no vandalism. We have no large gangs causing the peace to be disturbed because the police keep a firm hand over them, and that is the only treatment they understand.

When the population of Brisbane is considered, the number of louts—youths who call themselves bodgies and are referred to as bodgies—is not very great. If the police are allowed to take a firm hand they will stamp them out.

I come now to the transport police. Certain transport drivers have come to me and asked me to present their case. They have said that certain irregularities were being practised by the police. When I said to them, "Who was the policeman concerned? Who were the people who were prepared to bribe the police?" they ran for cover. It is a very easy matter for anyone to defame a policeman, or someone else, if he has not to stand up and prove what he says.

Mr. Bennett: Do you disagree with the hon. member for Bundaberg?

Mr. DIPLOCK: No. I disagree neither with him nor with the hon. member for South Brisbane. I am speaking from my experience. As a thinking citizen the hon. member would not expect me to agree with him, or disagree with him, other than in the light of my experience. That would be the fair way, would it not? That would be the British way of doing it, and that is what I have done. I do not disagree with the hon. member; he has spoken according to his experience and I am speaking only from mine.

I notice with pleasure the increase of £1,783,065 in the Vote for the Department of Health and Home Affairs. I think the increase is very necessary. I appeal to the Minister to use some of that money to provide either a new section or considerable improvements at the maternity block of the Dalby Hospital. The Minister opened there a wonderful block that was provided by the Labour Government. I am assured by many women who have been confined in the maternity block that if they were ever again in the same position they would certainly travel farther afield. Large sums of money are spent to make our migrants welcome—and I think we should make them comfortable—but a modern maternity block is just as essential to the people of Dalby as making migrants welcome to our shores.

Mr. Aikens: What do you think of the suggestion by the metropolitan, city-slicker members that they should have ermine-covered couches in their rooms?

Mr. DIPLOCK: I would be agreeable even to that if they provided them in the maternity block at Dalby.

I stressed yesterday that although I am not doubting that the figures quoted are correct, I doubt that they are a true indication of the unemployment problem.

I said previously, and I reiterate, that the Government should consider allowing country abattoirs to function as they did some time ago and let country-killed beef, provided it is killed under Government supervision, be supplied to the city. I appeal to the members of the Country Party to support me in this matter because it affects the man on the land more than anybody else. It was referred to frequently in the election campaign, and many responsible Country Party candidates and members assured the people they would give consideration to it.

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin) (11.45 a.m.): Many and varied have been the contributions of hon. members to the debate on the Financial Statement presented by the Treasurer to the Committee on 29 September last. Except for about two speakers, it has been crystal clear that there has been a disposition to avoid discussion on the actual Budget and to discuss matters that have little or no reference to it. Members of the Opposition have described the Budget as an

employers' Budget, as an anti-working-class Budget, as a timid Budget, as a cautious Budget, and as a stay-put Budget; but none of them has endeavoured to justify the name he has applied to it or to prove to the satisfaction of hon. members and of the public of Queensland that it is appropriate.

Mr. Thackeray: It is clear now why there is Liberal opposition to the Country Party.

Mr. COBURN: When we get a little silence from the hon. member for Rockhampton North—

Mr. Aikens: How can we ever expect to get that?

Mr. COBURN: He does not even know that the Budget has been presented.

Mr. Thackeray: I will have something to say on the Budget, never fear.

Mr. Aikens: He would not know the difference between "Budget" and "Bridget."

Mr. COBURN: To apply a name to anything is the simplest matter in the world but to justify its application and support it with evidence is much more difficult. Not only have those speakers who applied names to the Budget failed to prove that they are appropriate; they have not even attempted to do so. They have simply applied the name and then dismissed the matter from further consideration. It would be the easiest thing in the world to call a black cat "Snowy," a white cat "Darky," or a man 6 feet 6 inches tall "Stumpy." But to expect anybody but the most stupid to accept the designation as truly descriptive of the thing named is to expect credulity that is not to be found in intelligent people.

No argument was advanced to prove that the Budget was an employers' Budget—I should have liked to hear some argument attempting to prove it—nor has argument been advanced to prove that it was an anti-working-class man's Budget or a timid Budget. I am sure that all of us would have been pleased to learn why the hon. member who applied the name did so, and to discover if he had cogent reasons for applying it. In each case, however, he simply said, "You accept the name I apply as a suitable one because I say it is," without giving any proof whatever in support of it. The implication was, "Do not question my wisdom in applying it; accept it blindly."

One would have expected an analysis of the Budget and the presentation of arguments to show unmistakably that it was what the speakers called it; but such a procedure was conspicuous by its absence. There is no assistance to be gained from an attitude such as that, and I am sure the Treasurer drew nothing from it.

The salient point of the discussion so far has been the failure of hon. members to either condemn or praise the Financial Statement. I must qualify that remark by saying

that the hon. member for Gympie, the hon. member for Carnarvon and the hon. member for Fassifern did protest strongly against what they consider is an inadequate allocation for further development of irrigation projects. Apart from that, there was no criticism of the Financial Statement that I heard or read.

The criticism generally was of the refusal of the Commonwealth Government to assist Queensland financially to a greater degree than it has, and I think it could be truthfully said that every hon. member, including the Treasurer, agrees with that view. It is rightly claimed that other States, notably South Australia and Western Australia, and to a lesser degree, Victoria, Tasmania, and New South Wales, have received much more favourable treatment than Queensland from the Commonwealth Government, by way of special financial grants in addition to those made under the Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement. The Commonwealth's financial contribution to the Snowy Mountains Scheme and the Albury to Melbourne uniform gauge railway line are not matched by any similar grants to Queensland. Although forceful and consistent representations were made to the Commonwealth Government for monetary aid in the construction of the Burdekin dam, the Collinsville-Mt. Isa railway line, and roads into the Channel Country, they have all been unsuccessful.

This is not a reflection on the State Treasurer, nor on his Financial Statement. If it could be proved that the State Treasurer had not forcibly and consistently tried to obtain these special grants from the Commonwealth Government, criticism of him would be fully justified. But nobody has criticised him in that way, nor has anybody shown that he has been remiss in his duty as Treasurer and not done all he could to get these grants for Queensland. Queensland has received the full amount to which it is entitled under the Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement. Any extra grants are solely the result of a decision that must be made by the Commonwealth Government. If these grants to which we believe we are justifiably entitled fail to materialise, then our criticism, trenchant though we desire to make it, must be of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Aikens: And our own Federal members.

Mr. COBURN: And of our own Federal members, although, of course, some of them have tried unsuccessfully to obtain what we in this Chamber advocate should be given to us.

In discussing the Financial Statement presented to Parliament by the Treasurer, we must first clearly understand that the Treasurer has at his disposal a limited, specified amount of money that he must allocate to the various State departments for services and for the implementation of developmental projects for the advancement

and wellbeing of Queensland. He is not a conjurer who can take millions of pounds out of the air to supplement existing funds. He can deal only with the funds at his disposal. Because of the adoption by the Commonwealth and the States of uniform taxation—up to this stage of the Budget debate I have not heard anybody oppose that principle—most of the State's revenue is obtained from the Commonwealth, and is comprised of Commonwealth* Financial Assistance Grant, allocation of loans approved by the Loan Council, and the Commonwealth Aid Roads Grant.

Mr. Hilton: Don't you know that there has been a High Court decision on it?

Mr. COBURN: The hon. member never opposed it.

Mr. Hilton: Don't you know that there has been a High Court decision on it?

Mr. COBURN: If there has been any attempt to alter the system of uniform taxation it has been done so quietly that nobody knows about it.

In addition to this source of revenue the State has a restricted field in which it has imposed taxes and duties, the most substantial amount received from these sources being from probate and succession duties, stamp duties and land tax. There are still unexploited fields in which the Treasurer could impose taxation, but nobody during the debate has been bold enough to suggest that he should expand the fields of taxation. Nobody has shown whence additional revenue is obtainable, except from the Commonwealth Government, and as all efforts to obtain it from them have failed we must accept the fact that the estimated amount available to the Treasurer for allocation is £109,923,450. In view of the Commonwealth's adamant refusal to grant the State any more, the only way to increase the amount is by additional State taxation. Apparently no critic of the Budget will approve of that being done.

Mr. Hilton: Do you think Queensland should be a participator under the Grants Commission?

Mr. COBURN: I do, but both the Treasurer and the Premier did their best to get the Commonwealth to grant that concession to us, and they failed. My criticism is not of the two who tried to have it done but of those who refused to do it.

Mr. Hilton: They withdrew their application.

Mr. COBURN: There was no alternative. It is no use banging your head up against a brick wall when you realise there is no chance of getting anything done.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. COBURN: " 'Orrible 'Orrace," as my friend from Townsville South calls him, is coming in. It would be better if he kept out of this for a while.

Honourable Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. COBURN: Therefore the Treasurer's task was to allocate the amount at his disposal equitably to the various departments in the best interests of Queensland for essential services and development. Little criticism has been levelled at this allocation, with the exception of three hon. members who expressed deep concern at the small amount allocated for the development of irrigation projects. I must admit that I share their concern. But to enable this to be done from where is the Treasurer to obtain the necessary finance?

Mr. Lloyd: Why are you making excuses for him?

Mr. COBURN: I am not making any excuses. I am making a logical and sensible analysis of the Budget as it is, and that is more than the hon. member did.

Mr. Lloyd: Your obligation to your electors is to be critical.

Mr. COBURN: My obligation is not to be critical; my obligation is to be sensible. That is what I mean to be. I do not want to be critical of things that I think are right. I am critical only of things that are wrong. Before I finish my speech I shall offer some criticism of what I consider to be wrong in the Budget. I have not finished yet. If the hon. member knew the old adage he would know that it is wise to "Praise a fine day at night." Should the Treasurer take money from the amount allocated to the Department of Education? They say, "No, no, no, don't take it from there!" Should he reduce expenditure on services indispensable to a civilised community such as State schools, on which more than two-thirds of the allocation is spent? Should it come from the Queensland University, technical education, practical education in State schools, the Teachers' College, the Gatton Agricultural High School and College, endowment fees and allowances for secondary education, schools for the blind and the deaf, adult education, the museum, the art gallery, the Queensland Conservatorium of Music or the Library Board of Queensland? Do they suggest we should take it from any of those services?

Mr. Aikens: They could get more money by reducing Parliamentarian's salaries, but they won't suggest that.

Mr. COBURN: Not only do they not put that suggestion forward, they do not put any suggestion forward. They give advice on what should be done but no suggestions as to how it should be done. Is anybody so lacking in appreciation of the value of education as to suggest that the allocation to the Department of Education should be reduced?

Could it be suggested, then, that less money be made available to the Department of Health and Home Affairs, thus making it necessary to curtail the services rendered by public hospitals on which almost two-thirds of the allocation to the Department of Health and Home Affairs is expended? Had that been done it would probably have meant the overthrow of our free hospitalisation scheme.

Mr. Thackeray: Who are "we"?

Mr. COBURN: We, the Parliament, the hon. member among them.

Is it suggested it should come from the Department of Native Affairs, from the Maternal and Child Welfare Centre, the Fire Brigades, the Mental Hygiene Department or the State Children Department? Hon. members of the Opposition will not agree that money should be taken from those services, yet they want more money to come from somewhere. They do not tell the Treasurer or his officers where it is to come from. Would they suggest a reduction in the grant to churches and charitable institutions for the establishment of homes for the aged and infirm or the training centres for crippled and sub-normal children? Would they advocate that, as a means of obtaining the extra money that would be required to provide the proposed extra services desired by some hon. members? No-one has told us where it should come from, because no-one knows.

The Treasurer has experienced officers in his department and it is only after a searching scrutiny of the money available and the work to be done that the available funds have been allocated in the manner set out in the Budget and in a way that will bring the greatest benefit to the State.

After listening to and reading what has been said during this debate I cannot find any suggestions for an alternative Budget. That can be constructed only as acceptance and approval of it.

Mr. Davies: Did you read the Premier's statement in Townsville?

Mr. COBURN: I am dealing with what was said here, not what was said in Townsville.

Some moneys expended by the Government, as we all realise, are recoverable, while some are not; some give a return, and some do not. In respect of others there are substantial losses, notably in the railways and the State enterprises such as coal mines and coke works. But as those instrumentalities play an important part in Queensland's development we accept these losses without criticism so long as we are assured that the enterprises are conducted efficiently and in the public interest. If they are not so conducted it is the duty of every member of this Chamber to point out in what respect

they are not being conducted efficiently and in the public interest. The Treasurer has stated very clearly in his Financial Statement that it has been his and his officers' constant endeavour to see two desirable features in the loan programme, first, the element of recoverability, and, second, that of return. The great advantage of placing loan money where it is readily recoverable or where it will give a return is too obvious to need stressing. There are many services—mainly in the fields of education, health, scientific research, development and provision of public buildings—from which the money is not recoverable and from which no monetary return is obtained. But such services are of such inestimable value to the State that to neglect them would be criminal, and so the Treasurer, although he would like—as anybody would—to invest money which could be recovered or which would give a return, is obliged in the interests of the State to spend a reasonable proportion of it in those avenues that I have just enumerated.

When one studies the allocations of expenditure from £29.4 million of loan funds available to the Treasurer for the current financial year, which show that expenditure with full recoverability and return is £8.9 million, that expenditure with partial recoverability and/or return is £2.3 million and that expenditure that produces neither direct return nor recoverability is £18.2 million, one is forced to the conclusion that the allocations have been judicious, although there is still the hope, which all this analysis and deep consideration does not dispel, that more could have been allocated for major irrigation works.

I am convinced that in the final analysis the chief factor in the retardation of the development of our industries, both primary and secondary, will be the inadequacy of water supplies. I have been a consistent advocate in this Chamber for the damming of the Burdekin River at The Falls. I have urged the Premier and all members of his Government to do their utmost to induce the Commonwealth Government to make funds available for the implementation of this great national scheme. I have a very firm conviction that the State has an unanswerable case for the participation by the Commonwealth in expenditure on our great developmental projects. At Clare, Millaroo and Dalbeg—all within my electorate in the Ayr district—£6,000,000 has been expended in settling tobacco-growers on the land. Little if any of this expenditure is recoverable by the State, and the return from it will barely cover expenses incurred in providing services. Admittedly the Commonwealth Government did assist at Clare which is a soldier settlement. On the Mareeba-Dimbulah project approximately £20,000,000 was spent, little if any of which is recoverable and from which the return to the State Treasury will be almost negligible. The Commonwealth Government on the contrary, will be the principal beneficiary from

the completion of these and similar schemes, and the return that will flow to the Commonwealth Treasury will be substantial.

Mr. Aikens: Through taxation.

Mr. COBURN: Through taxation, of course.

Mr. Hilton: And excise.

Mr. COBURN: Income tax will be levied and collected on the growers' and workers' incomes; excise duty will be imposed on the tobacco sold; sales tax on goods will be collected and pay-roll tax will further swell the amount considerably. The return to the State for its expenditure of approximately £26,000,000 on these two projects will be inconsiderable, while the return to the Commonwealth that contributed nothing directly to the expenditure on the developmental work will be substantial.

This arrangement reminds me of the story of the two fellows who decided to purchase a cow. After the purchase it was agreed that each should own half the cow. To one of them—the duller one, I should think—was given the front half of the animal and as his allocation contained the head it was his obligation to feed the cow. To the other fellow—the wiser one, I should think—was given the back half, and as that portion contained the organs that supplied the milk, he claimed all the milk. One was responsible for the expenditure on the feed and the other collected the money from the sale of the milk. It will be admitted that this arrangement is analogous to the financial arrangement between the States and the Commonwealth on the expenditure on developmental projects. It gives us an unanswerable argument for a greater participation by the Commonwealth in developmental schemes of both State and national importance.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. COBURN: The difference between the hon. member and me is that I have thought, and he has not.

The anomalous situation created in terms of the Savings Bank Amalgamation Agreement whereby Queensland will receive so much less from moneys raised by the Commonwealth on behalf of the States as is equivalent to the amount that Queensland is successful in raising loans from the Commonwealth Savings Bank in terms of the agreement must be corrected at the earliest opportunity—which, I regret to say, will not be until 1965—either by terms in a new agreement that will place Queensland on an equal footing with other States that have established a State savings bank, or by establishing a Queensland State Savings Bank. I prefer the latter course.

The investment of surplus funds in the short-term money market "at call" as cash, has obviously been undertaken in a very business-like manner by the Treasurer and the

Treasurer officers—I have heard no criticism of it from anybody—with considerable profit to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and for such skilful handling of funds, which otherwise would have lain dormant and consequently have been unproductive, I highly commend those responsible. During the last financial year short-term investments earned £93,569, which can be regarded only as a very handsome contribution to the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

The increase by £601,657 in the total amount expended on subsidies on loans to local bodies indicates quite clearly that the local authorities are spending more money on works that are subsidizable, and are thus at least keeping up their level of employment. They may not necessarily be undertaking more work because the same amount of work now involves a greater expenditure than previously. Like the State Government, the local authorities are required to pay increased wages and salaries following the granting of "margins" and the readjustment of the basic wage by quarterly adjustments, and also to pay more for the materials they purchase for use in the works they undertake. If the subsidies to local authorities are reduced—and this warning has been given by the Treasurer—it will mean that each local authority will have to increase its present rate or reduce the amount of work undertaken and thereby bring about unemployment. Neither of these alternatives is desirable. On the contrary, because of the application of a new formula of financial assistance, grants under the States Grants Act of 1959 to replace the formula for tax reimbursement grants previously in operation, there is a tenable argument for an increase in the percentage rate of subsidy to local authorities on present subsidizable expenditure on works. It should be increased rather than decreased.

Mr. Aikens: Where will they get the money?

Mr. COBURN: My friend asks where the money will come from. Under the new States Grants Act, we are allowed an extra amount because of the increase in the average Commonwealth basic wage. As it is granted to the State, it should be passed on to the local authorities. We get the increase not only for increased population but also for the increased average weekly wage. In addition, we are allowed a small margin of one-tenth.

Mr. Hilton: Where is that money being allocated at the present time?

Mr. Aikens: Mostly to Brisbane.

Mr. Hilton: I am asking the hon. member.

Mr. COBURN: Which grant does the hon. member mean?

Mr. Hilton: You are referring to the extra allocations under the new financial formula. Where is that money being allocated now?

Mr. COBURN: It has been allocated since 1959.

Mr. Hilton: But where?

Mr. COBURN: I will deal with that fully in a minute.

Mr. Hilton: But, on your argument a while ago, which services are benefiting from it?

Mr. COBURN: That will depend on the next Budget. The money is included in the £109,000,000 that has already been allocated. What the Treasurer does with what he gets for the next financial year is his business; if it is not satisfactory to us, then it is for us to criticise.

Mr. Lloyd: The Commonwealth Government got it this year.

Mr. COBURN: I will deal with that aspect but let me deal with it in my own way. The Commonwealth will increase appreciably the grant to the States next financial year to compensate for the increased costs due to margins and basic wage quarterly adjustments. It is reasonable to expect that the State will similarly compensate the local authorities. I do not desire at the moment to digress on that, as the hon. member for Kedron is trying to get me to do. At present I am dealing with the attitude of the Treasurer towards local authorities and I want to confine myself to that subject. I will deal with the matter of new grants at a later stage in my speech.

If the State, by decreasing the percentage rate of subsidy payable, forces the local authorities to increase rates, that is a veiled way of increasing taxation with the criticism for it being levelled at the local authorities, because they were the ones who directly increased the rate though virtually they had no alternative when the State reduced the rates of subsidy.

I was pleased to hear the Treasurer say that no change in the rates of subsidy to local authorities is envisaged before 30 June, 1961, for I am convinced that by then, because of the new formula applicable under the States Grants Act of 1959—which I shall discuss in detail when I deal with the effect of margins on the economy and the budgeting position—the State will have more than ample revenue to meet all its requirements and continue to pay the present rate of subsidy, and even a slightly increased rate to local authorities. If the Treasurer reduces the subsidy to local authorities, he will have to give a good deal of explanation to the Committee to justify his action.

Mr. Hanlon: He admits he cannot do what Labour Governments did in the past, if he is easing it off.

Mr. COBURN: I would not agree with him on it because he has no justification for a reduction consequent on the treatment he has been given by the Federal Government under

the States Grants Act. In his Financial Statement the Treasurer left no doubt about the tremendous impact of the railways on the economy of Queensland. The cash deficit last year was £2,637,217 and interest on the reduced capital invested in railways was £3,159,984, making a total loss of £6,597,201. The policy adopted in an endeavour to prevent a recurrence of last year's railway deficit is to increase fares and freights and to close certain lines where losses have been substantial. Increased freights will mean increased cost of living, an increased cost of living will lead to higher quarterly adjustments, and higher quarterly adjustments will result in a higher pay-out in wages and salaries by the Government, thus taking from the Treasury much of what it gains from freight increases. Thus the situation created becomes a vicious circle. It would be interesting to know whether the Treasurer or his Treasury officers have undertaken research to enable them to ascertain fairly accurately the net benefit that will accrue to the Treasury from the increases in freights and fares when increased wages and salaries due to increased costs of living, in turn due solely to increased freight rates, are taken into consideration. Our whole system of re-adjusting wages and salaries depends entirely on the "C" Series Index used by the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration. Because of that, anything that contributes to an increase in the cost of living contributes to an increase in the average wage and salary, and consequently puts a much greater burden on all State departments in their payrolls. I suggest that it would be wise for the Treasurer to establish a research branch within his department to study the net results of actions such as these to ascertain whether their application is justified. I am informed that an increase of 1s. in the basic wage means an extra expenditure of £50,000 a year by the Education Department alone, so the increase in the State payroll as a corollary to the increase in the basic wage directly traceable to increased freights could exceed the amount collected by the Railway Department as a direct result of the additional freights. I think the Treasurer owes it to Parliament to tell hon. members what the estimated net results of the increase in railway freights will be in the revenue of the State.

One cannot find much reasonable argument to support the continued operation of railway lines that are losing money as heavily as the Treasurer has told us they are losing it.

Mr. Aikens: Except that it might be in the public interest to keep them open.

Mr. COBURN: I shall deal with that aspect. The people in the areas served by the lines that it is now proposed to close are in some measure responsible for the position that has arisen. It is obvious that they have not supported the railway services as well as they might have. We are informed

by the Treasurer that the revenue in the best instance of the announced closure of some branch lines is only 18.6 per cent. of the related costs, and in the worst instance only 12 per cent. What private operator would continue, or even be expected to continue, a service from which he was receiving in the best instance £18 12s. for every £100 he expended and in the worst instance £12 for every £100 he expended?

Mr. Aikens: The private operator is not required to develop the State.

Mr. COBURN: That aspect can be taken into consideration when we can show clearly that alternative methods of transport would substitute the service given by the Railway Department without any harm being done to those people in the areas affected by the closure. Alternative transport can be provided in those areas, and my castigation of the Government is not because of their announced intention to close these heavily losing lines, but because they did not arrange for alternative transport in the areas before announcing their intention to close the lines. If they had had everything arranged, and had been able to say to the people affected by the closure, "We will close your railway line because it has been consistently losing heavily, but we have arranged for alternative transport for both passengers and goods that will meet your requirements on terms not much less favourable than those given by the railways." If this had been done I am sure there would not have been anywhere near such strong opposition to the closure of the lines as has been experienced.

Further, the railway employees on the branch lines to be closed should have been assured that their services would be retained and that transfers to other busier and more profitable sections would be effected. The Treasurer declares that the Government regard the railway system as a necessary feature of the State's economy. He does not take the view that all its services or lines must pay their way. To me, that is a common-sense attitude to adopt towards a service that has played, and will continue to play, a most important role in the development of the State. During droughts the railways carry at half ordinary freights food for starving stock in areas declared drought areas. This generous concession, with which I am heartily in accord, must have meant a substantial loss in revenue to the railways. In addition, the railways carry at concession freights materials used in the establishment of new industries, as in the case of Mt. Isa Mines. I understand that the loss of revenue is borne entirely by the Railway Department.

Where concessions are granted in cases in which the whole State, and not only one particular department, is concerned, I am of the opinion that the loss directly due to concessions granted should be borne by the whole State, and debited to Consolidated

Revenue. A Railway Concession Special Fund should be established from Consolidated Revenue, from which the Railway Department could be reimbursed for freights lost because of the application of the concessional rates. That would enable us to have a true picture of the financial result of the railway's operations, which could be clearly disclosed in the Railway Department's profit and loss statement.

A study of the Public Debt of Queensland will dispel any inclination to complacency, particularly in respect to the greatly-accelerated rate at which it is now increasing annually. Whereas 20 years ago the increase was at the rate of from £1,000,000 to £2,000,000 annually, the figures from 1950 onwards have ranged from £16,000,000 to £21,000,000 a year, the greatest increase being in the 1952-1953 financial year when the increase reached the astronomical figure of £21,152,857. For the three years from 1953 to 1956 the increase in the public debt was £48,544,236, an average rate of £16,181,412 per annum. For the three years from 1957 to 1960 the total increase in the public debt was £53,104,430, an average rate of £17,701,476. In the three years prior to 1957 the average of the annual increase in the public debt per head of population was £8 9s. 11d. but in the three years since 1957 it has been £9 6s. 2d.

This contrasts with the position in the Commonwealth sphere where, by using revenue in many cases instead of loan funds for capital works, a substantial decrease in the public debt has been effected. As the cost of servicing the State's public debt has averaged 11.21 per cent. of the revenue for the last 10 years, it indicates to us very forcefully what a tremendous drag it exercises on the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

It is realised that loan moneys must be spent in the development of the State and to ensure that we shall have full employment. If the money has been spent so that assets have been created that are an offset to the increase in the debt, then we have little to worry about. We could probably get a great deal more assistance from the Commonwealth Government than we are at present with the redemption of our public debt. The Treasurer claims that the Budget is dominated by the impact of margins and no-one can dispute that statement.

While the granting of margins would have greatly increased expenditure by the State on wages, salaries and, in many cases, the goods and materials purchased, the Commonwealth will greatly increase its revenue by collecting extra income tax on those increased wages and salaries, increased total sales tax on more highly priced materials, substantially increased pay-roll taxes and total extra excise duties.

To answer the query by the hon. member for Carnarvon about the granting of these extra amounts in accordance with the States Grants Act, it is estimated that increased

wages, salaries and charges will cost the State an additional £4,000,000 this year and it is conservatively estimated that at least £1,000,000 of this will be returned to the Commonwealth Government in the form of one kind of taxation or another. As the wages and salaries bill of private employers is many times that of the State it is not difficult to estimate what a tremendous sum, due entirely to increased wages, salaries and costs, will be channelled back into the Commonwealth Treasury through the medium of taxation.

It is the old story of one owning the front half of the cow and the other the back half; but in this instance the owner of the back half does at least give the owner of the front half a portion—small though it may be—of the product of the cow.

Mr. Hilton: There is a year's lag.

Mr. COBURN: There is an explanation of that year's lag, too.

Mr. Lloyd: An explanation of it?

Mr. COBURN: A cure of it, if the hon. member likes, or a suggested cure. Whether or not it will be effective is a different matter but I will put it forward. I cannot see any sense in coming into this Chamber and destructively criticising. If hon. members cannot be constructive in their criticism they are not helping themselves or anyone else. Under the newly-adopted formula of financial assistance under the States Grants Act of 1959, which I am sure a good many hon. members do not fully understand, the amount payable to a State by the Commonwealth is obtained in this manner: the per capita grant of the previous year is multiplied by the ratio of the average wage for this year to the average wage of last year, multiplied by 1.1, multiplied by the population for that year. That is a great improvement on the old method of per capita payment, because it does take into consideration the greater costs the State has to bear in the increased wages and salaries bill, and I should say that, if we get that ratio—or as many times the per capita payment as that ratio is—we are being compensated to a very large extent for the extra burden of pay-outs we are responsible for, and in addition to that—for some reason not known to me—another margin of one-tenth is allowed, because of the multiple of 1.1 that is used in computing the amount of money.

Mr. Lloyd: What they call the "betterment factor."

Mr. COBURN: Anyhow, it is to our benefit and because it is to our benefit it is not something we are going to criticise or ask to have withdrawn. That is the method used, but, before we can know what that ratio is, the year for which it is to be granted must have passed, as you cannot get the ratio of two things before one has been completed.

From this new formula it can be seen that provision is made by the Commonwealth to compensate the States for increased costs resulting from increases in wages and salaries. This increased financial assistance grant is not paid to the State until the year following that in which the wage and salaries increases occurred. That was the objection of the hon. member for Carnarvon to it, and it would be difficult to avoid the lag unless some scheme could be devised by the Commonwealth Government to pay a provisional grant to the States, as is done in the case of provisional taxation, and an adjustment could be made at the end of the financial year when the exact amount that should have been granted is known. I do not know whether that suggestion has ever been placed before the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Lloyd: They merged the two grants, the State grant and the additional grant, in this new formula. The two of them were merged.

Mr. COBURN: No.

Mr. Lloyd: They did.

Mr. COBURN: They did not do anything of the kind. They made an attempt, and a very serious and generous attempt, too, to meet the extra expenditure of the State through increases in wages and salaries by multiplying the per capita payment of the previous year by the ratio of this year's average wage to the average wage of last year. That was not merged with anything.

Mr. Hilton: Prior to that there was also a special grant given which did not have a year's lag associated with it.

Mr. COBURN: Yes, but there was no obligation to give that, and the amount was something that had to be decided by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Hilton: And the States.

Mr. COBURN: In this matter there is no decision attached to it. It is a formula and, whatever the answer when the formula is applied, the Commonwealth Government have to give that amount to the State, and the amount is not given as a privilege but as a right.

Mr. Lloyd: That is what makes the new formula so disastrous.

Mr. COBURN: Does the hon. member not think it is much better?

Mr. Lloyd: No.

Mr. COBURN: Would he like to revert to the old one?

Mr. Lloyd: It would be better.

Mr. COBURN: I cannot agree that it would be better. That lag presents a difficulty and some attempt should be made by our representatives at the Loan Council to try to overcome it by a provisional grant to this

State, the readjustment to be made in exactly the same way as provisional taxation is levied and the adjustment made when the right time comes.

Mr. Walsh: There is always a lag in the formula. What are you talking about?

Mr. COBURN: It is the lag we are trying to overcome. The hon. member is not being very helpful about it. He does not even know what I am talking about.

Mr. Walsh: I know what you are talking about. You are talking about the lag.

Mr. COBURN: The hon. member is talking about the lag, and he does not even know what the lag is about. He does not know whether we are talking about the old formula or the new. We know there is a lag and that it adversely affects budgeting procedure in the year in which we have to bear the extra wage costs. Nobody has suggested how that lag can be overcome. The hon. member says that there is a lag. He asks me what I am talking about, but he has not suggested how we are to overcome the lag. I am making a suggestion and, if the hon. member does not approve of it, it is his duty to indicate a better way.

Mr. Lloyd interjected.

Mr. COBURN: What would the hon. member have done about it? Would he have refused to accept the new formula?

Mr. Lloyd: I think every State Government is realising that the new formula is not a very satisfactory one.

Mr. COBURN: I should like the hon. member for Kedron to work out what Queensland would have got under the old formula when we had to depend on the Federal Government to give us a grant gratuitously, and compare it with what we will get under the new formula. If he can prove from his calculations that we are worse off now, then we should revert to the old system. My reckoning is that now we have a better system, one that meets the situation, because we are not dependent upon any gratuitous act by the Commonwealth Government. It is in accordance with the formula that has been accepted by the States and the Commonwealth and embodied in the States Grants Act of 1959.

Though the "margins" seriously and adversely affect this year's Budgeting, unless there are similar steep increases in wages and salaries next financial year the State's finances for 1961-1962 should be tremendously improved, which will allow for the provision of services and the implementation of developmental projects on a greatly expanded scale. The Treasurer will benefit next year by the lag, although this year he may be seriously affected by it because he has to meet the extra expenditure now, not next year.

Three items mentioned in the Budget that directly affect many of the constituents of the Burdekin electorate, which I have the honour to represent, are—

(a) The writing-off of debts totalling £405,975 under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme in the Burdekin River area;

(b) The recent price adjustment in sugar and the announcement of a 7½-per cent. increase in mill peaks; and

(c) The setting up of a University college to be followed later by the establishment of a University at Townsville.

All these things were welcomed and deeply appreciated by everybody in the electorate, more particularly by those who were directly concerned. A searching inquiry was made into the position of the settlers in the soldier settlement at Clare. As a result of the report that was tabled it was decided that, because certain reasons for the failure of many of the settlers could be laid at the feet of the Government, in fairness to the settlers their debts to the Agricultural Bank should be written off. I have had cause to make representations on behalf of one settler in the area for a loan from the Agricultural Bank. The Agricultural Bank refused to lend the money on the ground that it would be unwise for them to do so in the circumstances. When I made inquiries, I was told that the settler was regarded as being a very industrious and efficient farmer but that the land he was farming was so poor that he could not possibly be expected to make a success of it. That was only one instance; there were many others. Men were put on land that the department itself agrees they could not possibly make a success of, no matter how efficient they were.

Mr. Pizzey: When was he put there?

Mr. COBURN: He was among the first group of settlers who went onto the land.

(Time expired.)

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (12.46 p.m.): The hon. member for Burdekin complained that members of the Opposition did not make a critical survey of the Financial Statement. I assure the Committee that all five members of the A.L.P. Opposition who have spoken in this debate have spoken to the Budget and have made valuable contributions.

I realise the Treasurer's difficulty in attempting to present a balanced Budget this year, but the Budget he presented indicates his cold, calculating, ruthless attitude to the future development of Queensland. It is obvious that the State's expenditure on public works has become a matter of cold mathematics, stemming from the belief that there must be an immediate return of all capital expenditure.

Mr. Hiley: That is rot. Why don't you read the Budget?

Mr. LLOYD: That is what the Treasurer said.

Mr. Hiley: I said nothing of the sort. Sit down and read it.

Mr. LLOYD: I will quote the Treasurer's words.

Mr. Hiley: Quote the whole of them, not just half, as is your usual form.

Mr. LLOYD: I will read it for the information of the hon. gentleman if he wishes me to. He said—

"It has been our constant endeavour to seek two desirable features in our Loan Programmes. First, we examine the element of recoverability and, second, that of return. Recoverability offsets our Sinking Fund obligations"

etcetera, and he went on—

"But these factors, whilst desirable, cannot be allowed to enslave."

I will concede that to him.

Mr. Hiley: Go on, read the rest of it.

Mr. LLOYD: At the same time, it is not just a question of having that element of recoverability in the expenditure; there is also the question of future development. Take, for example, railway expenditure, which, according to the Financial Statement, is to be reduced. The hon. member for Burdekin seems to be of the opinion that we should dismiss most of the railwaymen and practically close down all railway works.

Mr. Coburn: I said nothing of the kind. I said provision should be made for their transfer, if necessary. You would say anything.

Mr. LLOYD: The reduced allocation for railway expenditure indicates what the Government have decided to do about railway works. Firstly, the quadruplication scheme in Brisbane has been completely discontinued.

Mr. Hiley: You seriously suggest that it has been completely discontinued?

Mr. LLOYD: Temporarily discontinued.

Mr. Hiley: I wish you would read the Financial Statement.

Mr. LLOYD: All right, the work has been slowed down.

Mr. Hiley: Ah, now, now! More this year than last!

Mr. LLOYD: A rather important point in this connection is that, in the recent increasing of railway freights, I do not believe serious consideration was given to the different sections, or the sectionalising, of railway revenue and expenditure. For instance, the Central Division showed a profit while almost the whole of the loss was made in the

Southern Division. The position should be carefully examined to find out exactly why losses were sustained in the Southern Division.

In the report of the Commissioner for Railways for the year ended 30 June, 1959, the losses in the Southern Division are set out. In 1954-1955 the loss was £853,806, and it increased to £3,427,000 in 1958-1959. That is a considerable increase in working losses, and it would cover virtually all the working losses in the Railway Department. There can be only one reason for that, and I submit a suggestion for the Government's consideration. Adequate extension of the quadruplication scheme in the metropolitan area would overcome to a great extent the slow movement of goods traffic to and from Brisbane, particularly during peak hours.

Mr. Pizzey: Do you know that, or are you only guessing?

Mr. LLOYD: It is not a guess. I think it has been accepted for some years that one of the main reasons for losses in the Southern Division is the slow movement of goods traffic in the metropolitan area. I think that would be substantiated by reports of the Commissioner for Railways in recent years. If we can overcome that slow movement of traffic, we will improve efficiency and go a long way towards removing the losses in the Southern Division. The Northern and Central Divisions have shown profits, and the Southern Division should be able to show a profit, too.

I think primary producers have reason to complain about the movement of produce from their farms, and I think the Treasurer is aware that many of them are worried about being costed out of the market. There are some grains, for instance, on which the return to the primary producer is so low that it does little more than cover the cost of production. If the revenue of the Railway Department is to be built up year after year by increasing the cost of production, I do not believe that is in the best interests of Queensland. I do not think that this savage increase in railway freights and fares is logical. If you force primary producers out of production by over-pricing railway cartage, there will be no goods for the railways to carry. Already producers in some areas have found alternative means of transport.

If the Central Division is making a profit, one examines the reasons for that just as one examines the reasons for losses in other divisions. If it is found that a commodity produced in that area is being carted wholly by the Railway Department and is a very lucrative source of revenue, one should not attempt to cost it out of production. That is all part of the system that has been in operation for many years. The railways are there not only to show a profit but also to enable development to take place in the various areas of the State. It is only because of our railway system that industries have

been established in many areas. Losses sustained by the railways must be borne by the people in the interests of the development of the State.

Mr. Walsh: Compared with other departmental expenditure, the railways are the bog of this Budget.

Mr. LLOYD: That is the excuse given by the Treasurer for the deficits that have been shown.

Mr. Walsh: They are not paying much more in wages than was paid by the former Government.

Mr. LLOYD: The Government must accept that movement in expenditure is their sole responsibility. They were the Government who decontrolled prices and rents, and allowed the spiral of inflation to settle on Queensland's economy. They unsettled the economy to the stage where the total payment of wages and salaries is a big factor. The Treasurer has endeavoured to make the operations of the Railway Department the reason for the deficit, but the very attempt to rectify that position by the introduction of savage freight increases will certainly reduce the volume of traffic through the department and probably eventually reduce revenue.

The hon. member for Burdekin mentioned a number of points of some interest, particularly Commonwealth-State finances, but he ignored the fact that over the past few years from time to time the Treasurer and the Premier have claimed that they have had additional finance from the Commonwealth Government. In other words, he congratulated the Treasurer—

Mr. Coburn: I said that if you thought there was anything amiss you had the right to point it out.

Mr. LLOYD: I am doing that. When agreement was reached on a new taxation formula the Premier said that the star of federation was in the ascendancy, that it was the saving of federation as far as the States were concerned, but there have been many alterations in the opinions of those two hon. gentlemen since. I suppose there were other State Premiers who thought that the new formula might operate very satisfactorily. The merging of the State grant and the additional grant formula might have been an undesirable feature to some, but nobody at that time imagined that the margins would become the factor they have in the last 12 months. The effect of the sudden increase in wages and salaries throughout Australia has been to make it virtually impossible for many State Governments to balance their budgets. Originally the Treasurer said that the formula was a very good one, but to indicate the alteration of opinion I quote from an article

that appeared in "The Sunday-Mail" on 26 June, 1960. "Harold Cox's Canberra Comment" reads—

"Canberra.—State Premiers who attended the Loan Council conference last week, now sadly fear that once again they are the suckers.

"Twelve months ago they thought they had made a good deal for themselves.

"At that time they accepted the Commonwealth Government's offer of a six-year agreement to fix income tax reimbursement by formula.

"Now they think that Mr. McEwen, who then deputised for Mr. Menzies and the Treasurer (Mr. Holt) really pulled off a good deal for the Commonwealth."

I think the Treasurer is now realising the truth of that statement. He is finding that instead of being able to go ahead in the six-year period of the agreement the Government have been put into a position very similar to that of the basic-wage earner or the average wage earner who has to wait three months for the cost-of-living adjustment.

Mr. Coburn: That could be overcome by a provisional grant.

Mr. LLOYD: They merged the provisional grant with the State grant under the six-year formula. I agree that there should still be a provisional grant. I do not want to be interpreted as meaning that I am advocating that money should be taken from education and hospitals and transferred to some other Vote. I intend to make as clear as possible a number of facts, one of which in particular will make clear my attitude towards budgeting. I should like to quote, for the benefit of the Treasurer and the hon. member for Townsville South what I said on deficit budgeting as reported in "Hansard" on October 14, 1958, at page 623. I was referring at the time to the deficit of £1,500,000 for that year, and I said—

"While men are unemployed we must do our best to spend as much money as we can—even more than we can afford on some occasions."

I said that because I realise that we are limited in our budgeting by the amount of money we receive from the Commonwealth Government. But much depends on the Government themselves in the amount actually received through tax reimbursements and grants and by way of loan moneys from the Loan Council.

My point on this occasion is that this, at any rate, is one year in which we are unable to carry out the normal works and services of government in the interests of the people of Queensland. That is apparent from the substantial reductions in many of the Votes in the Estimates.

Mr. Davies: The previous speaker said we had plenty of money.

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member for Burdekin was apparently offering excuses for the Treasurer and the Government, although he is an Independent. He was talking politically as an Independent member of the Government parties.

I wish to refer for a few moments to the statement that I was making on capital-expenditure reduction in the Railway Department. That is one case in point and I think it is very important that we should examine it. The Treasurer is emerging as the Leader of the Government. That was borne out the other day when he gave the full Government case as it related to the hon. member for Fassifern.

One apparent fact in railway finance is that the rest of Queensland is being asked to pay high charges, particularly on agricultural produce, to subsidise tremendous losses in the Southern Division. When I referred to the subject previously I did not mention in confirmation of that fact that whilst the working loss in the Railway Department last year was in the neighbourhood of £2.6 million, the working loss in the Southern Division—or, more correctly, in the Brisbane section comprising the area from Brisbane to Gympie and Helidon and the South Coast line—was £2.2 million. At that time the loss sustained by the whole of the Railway Department was less than that figure. In actual fact, railway losses within the Brisbane area and its close proximity were equal to the full losses sustained by the Railway Department. There must be some very important reason for that. If it is the difficulty experienced in moving traffic in and out of Brisbane, through insufficient railway lines, we should, if we are not to perpetuate railway losses, cure it by building other lines so that traffic can flow freely in and out of the city. Quadruplication may not be very important to Brisbane, but it is vitally important to the whole of Queensland. If by the expenditure of £1,000,000 or £2,000,000 we could overcome hold-ups in the flow of goods traffic in and out of Brisbane, we would be doing something of great advantage not only for the moment but also for the future. If railway losses could be cut substantially, additional funds would be available for other works and services.

Mr. Pizzey: Do you really think that is the reason for the losses?

Mr. LLOYD: I have read a number of departmental reports that confirm my statement, and I am prepared to accept the word of past Commissioners for Railways.

Great prominence was given to that feature in post-war years, and it was advanced as one of the reasons why Labour Governments of the past should embark on a scheme of quadruplication. The Government should consider the aspect I have mentioned. The rest of Queensland should not be asked to subsidise the tremendous losses that occur in the southern sector. If the facts were pointed

out to them, they would realise the importance of this work and the need to undertake it. I know sufficient money may not be readily available at the moment, but I draw attention to the statements of the Premier and the Treasurer immediately after the Government assumed office. They said that, instead of adopting the crude and rude attitude of Labour Premiers in the past, they would adopt a gentlemanly and aristocratic approach to the Commonwealth Government and so secure additional funds for Queensland. They have failed to do so. The Financial Statement is tantamount to an admission that the funds available to the Government are insufficient for even the normal works and services required by the people.

I realise that additional educational facilities must be provided, but the same situation exists in all of the other States. In answer to my question yesterday morning the Minister said that in 1947 there were 129,970 primary school students and 4,748 State secondary school students in Queensland. By 1957 those numbers had grown to 198,857 and 15,444, respectively. That was the first year of this Government's administration. For 1960, three years later, the figures are startling. They are 210,512 and 28,507, respectively. But as I have said, the situation is not peculiar to Queensland; it exists throughout Australia. State Governments generally are obliged to allocate additional money for school facilities. I agree entirely that increased expenditure is called for, but where is the additional money the Government were going to get by a gentlemanly approach to the Commonwealth Government? We did not get it. The Government failed in that respect.

Not more than two years ago under the new formula Queensland's allocation of Commonwealth aid for roads was reduced by £1,500,000, over a period of five years—a disastrous state of affairs—while States such as Victoria were able to secure additional grants under the same formula. A somewhat similar set of circumstances arose in respect of tax reimbursements. I suppose the Treasurer and Premier, with most of the other Premiers of Australia, thought that the new formula was a really good one and that they would be able to balance their budgets, or almost balance them, with the increased allocations. It was never thought that marginal increases would come about, and it is now found that while the Commonwealth Government are getting somewhere in the neighbourhood of an additional £30,000,000 yearly through increased income tax, pay-roll tax, and all the other incidental forms of revenue that they receive as a result of high wages, and so on, the States are unable to get enough to pay their wages bills and carry out normal works and services.

The hon. member for Burdekin said something I could not follow. I thought he was praising the new formula, and before the luncheon adjournment I tried to show that there is considerable doubt—and I believe

the Treasurer himself has some considerable doubt—whether the new formula will cover all circumstances. Whilst we have reserved the right in exceptional circumstances to make application to the Commonwealth Government for additional finance—"exceptional" circumstances being circumstances that are confined to this State, and maybe we will be able to get additional finance because of the present exceptional drought conditions—payments for salaries and wages, and other factors that are common throughout the Commonwealth, are not exceptional circumstances. Some approach could be made to the Commonwealth Government for the re-introduction of the additional-grants system that operated before the "escalation" clause of the new formula was introduced. Whereas in the past Labour Governments in this State were able to maintain a fairly high level of works and services for the people, they were at the same time enabled to secure additional grants from the Commonwealth Government because of exceptional circumstances.

I cannot make a statement on the real reason behind the method of obtaining these additional grants from the Commonwealth, but from an analysis over the years it seems that during those years when inflation took control the additional grants were much higher than in the years when there was reasonable stability in the economy. In 1950-1951, the additional grant was £2,000,000, and in 1951-1952 the special grant rose to £5,005,542. During that time the basic wage in this State increased by £3 or £4 a week and there was tremendous inflation. The real inflationary spiral was from 1950 to 1952, and the additional special grants made available to the States by the Commonwealth Government were higher than they had been when there was reasonable stability. In 1955-1956 it was only £2,123,117. They were smaller amounts and then they increased. As the inflationary spiral again took over and the momentum became greater, the special grant to Queensland was so much greater.

This year, when we have a large extra bill because of the marginal increases—the Treasurer said it amounted to £4,000,000—a special grant should be made available by the Commonwealth Government. It would appear that these special grants were made available by the Commonwealth Government from surplus revenue resulting from underestimated revenue collections.

The new formula may be satisfactory in so far as it gives the States a greater allocation of finance, but it does not cover the circumstances where the Government, like the basic-wage earners, are running behind continually-increasing costs. The Treasurer and the Government are 12 months behind, and the State has to bear the cost. Greater consideration should have been given to these matters. I do not know whether the Premier or the Treasurer were not sufficiently experienced in the workings of the Premiers' Conference or the Loan Council meetings,

but we have reached the stage where we cannot afford to carry out all the State's normal services.

The Treasurer has taken from the Trust and Special Funds £6.4 million to finance overdrafts in the Consolidated Revenue account. These days there seems to be an unholy rush to destroy the special funds we built up over the years, even to the extent of taking away some forms of revenue, and transferring the funds to the Loan Fund Account. It may be building up our net loan expenditure but it is being done at the expense of moneys previously put into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. One that I recall concerns forestry and lumbering, which some years ago amounted to more than £1,000,000. It has been transferred to the Loan Fund Account to build up net loan expenditure.

We have heard of attempts not only by the Treasurer, but also by Sir Arthur Fadden on one occasion, to blame previous Labour Governments for the shortage of loan moneys in Queensland, but the claims cannot be substantiated. From time to time, in reply to questions asked about the continual reduction of the Commonwealth's loan allocation to Queensland for housing—this year some £300,000—the Treasurer says it is because of the failure of previous Governments to get sufficient loan moneys from the Commonwealth.

Sir Arthur Fadden was reported in "The Courier-Mail" of 11 June, 1958 as having said at a meeting of the Loan Council—

"Queensland's lower share per head of loan raisings was a matter for the State Government to have out with the other States.

"The Commonwealth Government could not be blamed for Queensland's plight inherited from a previous State Government.

"The distribution of State works and housing programmes was a matter for State Governments themselves."

That was an attempt to blame previous Labour Governments for the situation that has developed whereby Queensland's loan allocations are so much less than those of the other States. It is not correct to say that they were responsible.

The Treasurer tried to ridicule me when I suggested to him that, during the war years, it was impossible for Queensland to spend very much money on capital works. He said the war was on in the other States, too. But Queensland was a garrison State of the Commonwealth, and much of its capital works expenditure was carried out by the Commonwealth.

Mr. Coburn: During one of those years the State's debt was reduced by £1,000,000.

Mr. LLOYD: That would be correct. That is not net loan expenditure, of course. The

reason was that Queensland was a garrison State of the Commonwealth. Naturally we built up considerable reserves.

Mr. Hanlon: It was good business to let the Commonwealth do the work.

Mr. LLOYD: My word it was! The Labour Governments of that period are to be congratulated on the work they did. Everybody in Queensland will admit that the railways, and railway men, did a wonderful job of work in the national interest.

Mr. Davies: The hon. member for Condamine does not appreciate that.

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member for Condamine believes only in roads and that is the policy that is being adopted following the campaigning by hon. members opposite.

Naturally, in the post-war years we had to use most of the reserves that had been built up. The Labour Government used them as far as possible, but why should they be blamed for the present low level of loan expenditure in Queensland? It is the responsibility of the present Government to go out, as Sir Arthur Fadden said, and fight it out with the other States to get a reasonable allocation—to get sufficient money to enable all these works and services to be carried out. The Government should not sit back and say, "We cannot help it. The previous Labour Governments put us in this situation." That is not enough. The people of Queensland will not be satisfied with that. They expect the Government, if necessary, to adopt the crude and rude attitude and tactics of former Premiers and Treasurers of the State before the Premiers' Conferences and Loan Council meetings and to fight bitterly and hard for anything we can be given to enable us to carry out much-needed works. There has been a net loss in population in Queensland during the past few years. Migration into Queensland is falling below the level of migration into other States, and this is the only State in the Commonwealth in which there has been a net loss in population. Why is that? Is it not because insufficient industries are being established in Queensland to absorb the available labour? Is it not because the other States are expanding much more rapidly than we are? It is obvious that the financial agreement established in 1927 has failed to provide an adequate and equitable distribution of the moneys available to the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Houghton: What do you say is the reason why local authorities have always filled their loans in the last couple of years?

Mr. LLOYD: I am coming to the question of local authority loan raising, which was also mentioned by the hon. member for Burdekin. Let us examine the net loan indebtedness of all authorities in Queensland and the other States.

Mr. Coburn: There is an argument for increasing the subsidies.

Mr. LLOYD: There is, and there is quite a sound argument for the continuance of the subsidies in Queensland. The latest figures that I was able to obtain from the Commonwealth Year Book were those for 1956-1957. I think they are very important in this argument, and they show that the indebtedness per head of population in all States is as follows:—

—	State	Local Authority	Semi-Governmental	Total
	£	£	£	£
New South Wales ..	205	19	55.8	279.8
Victoria ..	180.2	11.2	121.9	313.3
Queensland	192.8	47.4	38.4	278.6
South Australia	314.9	3.6	26	344.5

Local authority indebtedness per head of population in Western Australia was £10.1 and in Tasmania £25.5. The comparative figures show that local authority indebtedness was £47.4 per head of population in Queensland and that the State nearest to that was Tasmania with £25.5; in South Australia it was no more than £3.6. Of course, other States have a different method of distributing finance. In South Australia, for instance, the State accepts full responsibility for the supply of electricity and water, whereas in Queensland many of our responsibilities are handed over to local authorities.

Mr. Hanlon: To encourage decentralisation.

Mr. LLOYD: Yes. It is an excellent way of doing it, I think. A more equitable distribution of expenditure can be achieved. In Victoria the semi-governmental expenditure is £121.9 per head of population; apparently local authorities are doing a great proportion of the work in that State. The system of subsidy was instituted in Queensland because of the transference of the responsibility from the Government to local authorities, and I believe that this is a very good argument for the continuance of the system. I think the Treasurer should make investigations, and where the ratepayers of local authorities are meeting the interest bill on our indebtedness the subsidy system should be continued. I do not think it is a move in the right direction for the Treasurer to suggest that the State no longer can afford these high subsidy payments which amounted to £5,000,000 or £6,000,000 last year.

Mr. Coburn: Unless he can give us some evidence to justify it.

Mr. LLOYD: Where the local authorities, instead of the State Government, are handling most of the work and meeting the interest bill, some relief should be afforded. The only relief we have had in the past has been that we have been able to make advances to local authorities under the loan-subsidy system to finance a great deal of their work. If that is discontinued a great deal of the work at present being undertaken

by local authorities will slip back. In a State like Queensland with an expanding economy it is undesirable that all the work being done by local authorities should be reduced.

I mentioned that in my opinion the financial agreement had failed to maintain movement with the expanding of Australia's economy. When the financial agreement was first framed in 1927 apparently it was quite a sound scheme. It has operated satisfactorily in many respects. It has prevented competition between State Governments and the Commonwealth Government on the overseas loan market, thus preventing the forcing up of interest rates on loan moneys raised. At the same time, the original formula provided that in the event of the State Government's disagreeing with the allocations, the Commonwealth Government should take one-fifth of the total sum available and the remainder should be distributed among the States in accordance with their net loan expenditures in the previous five years.

The Treasurer is trying to build up Queensland's net loan expenditure, which may have the effect in the future of increasing Queensland's allocation by the Loan Council. But since the financial agreement has been in operation I do not think the States have ever agreed to accept the terms of one-fifth to the Commonwealth and the distribution of the remainder among themselves. At the present time it would be impossible for the Loan Council to make those arrangements. In the last 11 years £2,000,000,000 have been paid out of revenue to the Loan Consolidated Investment Reserve, and utilised in lending money to the State Governments. This year the Commonwealth Government have an estimated expenditure on capital works and services of £140,000,000, whereas the States' allocation is no more than £230,000,000. If there were £370,000,000 to be allocated, under the formula the Commonwealth would receive no more than about £80,000,000, yet they are going to spend £140,000,000.

Mr. Hiley: Out of revenue, not loan.

Mr. LLOYD: That is exactly the point I shall make. Going back the same way if we do not accept the distribution offered to the States on the formula, what will happen? The Commonwealth Government will say, "We can raise only £100,000,000—split that up among you." They would not allocate the amount that they have set aside in the Loan Consolidated Investment Reserve.

Mr. Hiley: I think they have committed themselves to make that available to support the loan market. You have to know how much cake you have before you start to cut the slices.

Mr. LLOYD: The expenditure in the Federal Budget on capital works and services this year has been £140,000,000.

Mr. Hiley: Every new military camp, every new post office, every expansion of Commonwealth railways, and so on, is paid for currently by the taxpayers; not one penny of it is borrowed.

Mr. LLOYD: We realise that. It is interesting to compare the actual amount of revenue, which is being contributed by the taxpayers, spent on Commonwealth capital works and services with that spent on State works and services. It makes very interesting reading. For instance, in the 11 years from 1949 to 1960, for Commonwealth works and services £1,360,000,000 has come from revenue. For State works the amount of £600,000,000 has come from the same source. The sum of £2,000,000,000 has been contributed by the taxpayers in the present generation towards the improvement and development of the country, a development that will be enjoyed by future generations. In other words, the taxpayers today are paying for the development of the country 10, 20 and 30 years ahead.

It is also interesting to note that the Commonwealth public debt has fallen during the same period by £264,000,000, while that of the States has increased by £1,500,000,000. The most important factor is that over the same period the interest bill of the States has increased by £72,000,000 and more than half that money has been contributed by the taxpayers of Australia. That is an important factor. It has been mentioned from time to time in this Chamber but it is worth while continuing to mention it.

It is time that the States and the Commonwealth got together on the financial agreement and decided what is to be done. At the present time tax reimbursements are made more or less on the formula of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. That Commission, in analysing the requirements of the claimant States during the 12-monthly period, goes through the Budgets of the individual States—the non-claimant States in particular—dissects them, and estimates what is the normal amount required to provide, per head of the population, for normal works and services in each State. It decides the normal amount that could be collected by each Government from State tax and then studies the budgetary position of each State. I believe it is upon that basis that we have been receiving money from the Commonwealth in past years. I do not think there has ever been any attempt to analyse the position of each State on the basis of its developmental requirements and on the money that may be expended over a period of years on irrigation and water supply schemes, the damming of headwaters for flood-prevention purposes, soil and water conservation, or transport facilities to enable ready access of goods to markets. Those matters have

never been examined to ascertain exactly how much should be allocated over and above the amount allocated for the normal expenditure on works and services such as hospitals, housing, education and the usual irrigation work.

I maintain that this other developmental factor, over and above those normal services, has never been taken into consideration at Commonwealth-State level with any degree of satisfaction to the States. For instance, no doubt in Queensland and Western Australia there would be a greater need for developmental works than in some of the other States but that factor has never been considered. If it is impossible for the States to get together and work together on a national basis, it is essential that some other tribunal or body be constituted to accept the responsibility for weighing these matters on a completely non-parochial and national basis. It has never been done and until it is attempted the position will not improve. We will continue the fight with the Commonwealth Government and the other States to get a greater share of the allocations. This matter should be looked into from the viewpoint of Australia as a whole. At the moment we are considering it as Queenslanders, and the people over the border are considering it as New South Welshmen. If the problem is to be resolved some body composed of other than the political heads of the States should tackle it. It would be sufficient if, under the present financial arrangement, the Commonwealth Government were to say to the States, "There is your allocation for the purpose of constructing schools and hospitals, and providing health services and all the other normal works and services," and then give authority to another body, such as the reconstituted Interstate Commission, to deal with development in the interests of Australia as a whole. It could investigate, say, the Mt. Isa railway line and the Burdekin River Authority and decide that those projects were desirable from a national viewpoint.

Mr. Coburn: We would have to depend on them to do that.

Mr. LLOYD: That is so. I am pointing out that the problem has never been tackled in this way. Allocations to the States are determined according to normal works and services, but no consideration has been given to any State's potential for development, that is, development in the national interests. We should realise that Australia is an integrated economy. If the Commonwealth Government had to undertake developmental work, the State Governments would then be simply administrators for the purpose of providing normal works and services.

Mr. Coburn: And lose our sovereignty.

Mr. LLOYD: Those who speak of the sovereignty of the State amuse me, particularly as we have lost so much already. Consider our frustration in standing before this

Committee knowing only too well that the only real attack we can direct on the Government's budget is that they have failed to secure from the Commonwealth Government sufficient money to provide our normal works and services. The interjection of the hon. member for Burdekin would lead me to believe that his attitude is "I am a Queenslander." We must be Australian in outlook if we are to hold this country and withstand outside challenges.

Mr. Smith: And withstand the Communists.

Mr. LLOYD: Withstand challenges irrespective of the particular "ism" or the source of the challenge. We must be Australian in outlook and not think as Queenslanders, New South Welshmen or South Australians. We have already abrogated most of our sovereignty under the Financial Agreement and uniform taxation.

I listened attentively yesterday to the speech of the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt. It was a very thoughtful contribution. It indicated to me that the hon. member was very concerned about the Commonwealth Constitution as it stands at present. He is the great champion of Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, but I think he is now in doubt about the wisdom of the section. He said we had to be Australian in outlook if we were going to develop the country in the interests of Australia as a whole. Countries such as Germany and Japan have rehabilitated their economy. Germany, for instance, now refuses to borrow externally—in fact, it is the largest lender to the International Bank. Why can Australia not attain such a position? Is it because of constitutional difficulties? I think so. The Constitution in its present form has failed in its original purpose, that is, development of the nation.

If it is necessary in the interests of national development that State Governments should become no more than administrators for the Commonwealth Government, I am afraid that will have to be the position, otherwise we can never develop this country. At the moment, representatives of the six States go to the Premiers' conference and Loan Council meetings but if Queensland wants a greater share, we find that New South Wales, for instance, will make a bargain with another State to make sure that Queensland does not get the additional money. That is what is happening. Six Premiers from six States, supposedly with full sovereignty, go to the Loan Council meeting and bicker about how much they are going to get. They say, "We demand this; our development is more necessary than that of Queensland or Western Australia." We will get nowhere until that system has been completely altered. The only way in which it can be altered is by all the State Premiers getting together and discussing the problem in a sensible way.

In 1942 the late John Curtin, when Prime Minister of Australia, did something substantial in this direction. He called a meeting in Canberra of the Premiers and the Leaders of the Opposition from all States. The present Queensland Premier was there. He voted in favour of the Curtin plan for an amendment of the Australian Constitution, but when it went to the people, the Liberal Party, under the leadership of Mr. Menzies, placed doubts in the public mind and the referendum was defeated. It was a specific provision towards post-war development and indicated that at that time the Premiers and the Leaders of the Opposition Parties in Australia realised that something had to be done. The decisions reached on the financial arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States were virtually unanimous, but they were later rejected. State Premiers and Leaders of the Opposition representative of all political parties were present. They discussed this very vexed problem on a non-partisan basis, and I believe something will have to be done in the near future to convene a similar meeting. We cannot continue as we have in the past. We cannot afford to be placed in the position of not being able to get the necessary money to build all the schools that are required and provide all the hospitals and health services that are needed. That will happen unless something is done quickly.

We in Australia are finding that our educational system is failing completely to match modern-day requirements of industry and the overseas trend in science and technology. Other countries have a higher standard of education than we have. We will not attain that standard until the responsibility for it is accepted by someone—and the responsibility must rest squarely on the Commonwealth Government.

I shall refer to some figures on education and give the number of graduates in 1955 in science and engineering per million—

Country	No. per million
U.S.A.	281
Russia	450
Great Britain	162
Canada	143
Australia	79

The amount spent on education in Australia is the lowest in the world.

A Government Member: What?

Mr. LLOYD: Practically the lowest in the world. I mean that statement in a general sense; the lowest of the major nations of the world, if we may place Australia in that category. The figures are far higher in other countries.

We have had very few inquiries into education; only two, I think, including the Murray Committee of a few years ago. University education is becoming a very grave problem for all State Governments. We must expand our educational system if industry is to get

graduates trained in modern science and technology. We cannot get them on the present basis. The first thing that should be done is for the Commonwealth to accept full responsibility for University expenditure. That would be a start and would enable more money to be set aside by the State Governments for primary and secondary education. As at last year the Commonwealth Government's contribution to the Queensland University was about £400,000, whereas the State Government's total expenditure on the new Queensland University was £3,000,000 to £4,000,000.

Mr. Hiley: On University education?

Mr. LLOYD: Yes. I am giving those figures from memory and they may not be accurate. However, I have the report of the Auditor-General here and I note that on page 146 he sets out a list and says—

“The following statement sets out particulars of capital works involved since 1 July, 1935, and the sources of the relative funds.”

And the total is shown as £4,727,851. Then he sets out that £4,248,351 was provided by the State Government and only £479,500 provided by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Hiley: Those are surely cumulative figures?

Mr. LLOYD: Yes, but they indicate the high cost of university education to the State, and doubtless it is similarly high in the other States.

An Honourable Member: It will get a lot bigger, too.

Mr. LLOYD: Yes, it will, over the years, and eventually more universities will be required. It is a matter we can discuss non-politically because the task will have to be faced by whatever government are in power in the State.

(Time expired.)

Mr. SMITH (Windsor) (3.2 p.m.): I was very glad to hear the previous speaker say that he and his colleagues would keep us immune and safe from the evils of those with whom they so readily associate. We hope that the time they are spending in the company of those people so undesirable to our ideals and ideas will be time well spent in keeping them from setting their sights on our shores. But I should prefer to think that we will look after Queensland in our own way—the really fair and decent way—and continue in our Australian way of life without any assistance from what has been done in the Oriental countries, a system that apparently is so near and dear to some of our opponents.

Mr. Bennett: The old catch-cry!

Mr. SMITH: It is significant that no sooner does the hon. member for South Brisbane come into the Chamber than he

again demonstrates his desire to speak rather than to listen. Last night I told him that if he would be content to listen more and speak less he would be a darned sight more use to the Assembly.

Mr. Bennett: It would do you good to do some listening for a change.

Mr. SMITH: You cannot account for some people. The other night when I did not speak the hon. member for South Brisbane said I was skulking on the back benches and now that I am on my feet he says I speak too much.

Mr. Bennett: You sleep too much, not speak too much.

Mr. SMITH: Today I propose to deal with the growth of Queensland because I think the Budget debate is the one most fitted to the discussion of that topic. I intend to make certain comments on the Town Plan that the Brisbane City Council is preparing and on certain governmental and public buildings in Brisbane that are no doubt due for removal or repair or reconstruction. The whole idea behind my remarks will be to suggest that the State should have a plan co-extensive with the Town Plan so that we might say of any particular part of the inner city, "That spot is marked out for the future State Government Insurance Office building," and that some other spot is marked out as the site of some other building. I have purposely mentioned the State Government Insurance Office building because it is already on the drawing board to be put on a particular site. I intend to suggest that we do not proceed with that plan, that we should adopt the scheme that I will outline.

Mr. Davies: Where would you put it—in the Domain?

Mr. SMITH: No. I would put the hon. member at one end of the Domain but I would put the building somewhere else more suitable.

Perhaps the people who walk along George Street do not realise that all the ground on the western side, with the exception of the Bellevue Hotel, is Government land. From Queen Street to this Chamber, with the exception of the Bellevue Hotel, the land is owned by the State, but I do not think that anyone walking down George Street with his eyes open would say that all the buildings on the land are of a high architectural standard. They may have been say, half a century ago or nearly a century ago. The Treasury Building, the Executive Building, and the Government Printing Office would no doubt get a place. They would not get first prize, but they might get a place. The Government are now spending money on Harris Court and the Government garage, and at some time they will probably put money into Binna Burra. The only thing that I would like to see put into it is the blade of a bulldozer.

The design of that building might have been suitable for the purpose for which it was used; but the design is quite useless today and any money spent on it now would be money wasted. I advanced that idea in 1959, Volume 225 of "Hansard" at page 1332, when the District Court building was being constructed. I then advanced the suggestion to the Committee that the money could have been much better spent in building a complete new court house.

Mr. Bennett: Of course it could have been, and to allow Adelaide Street to go through to the river.

Mr. SMITH: The money that went into the District Court building produced quite comfortable courts. However, I am not concerned with the subject from the point of view of a practitioner going into the courts but from the point of view of getting the money spent and getting a pound's worth of value for each pound spent. I suggest that any money spent in rebuilding these old buildings is not money well spent.

Throughout Brisbane there are buildings and land owned by the Government that are scheduled at some later stage for the development of Government buildings. Next year, when the Commonwealth Government completes its new taxation building, we shall have thrown back into our laps the old building known as the Taxation Building on the corner of Elizabeth and George Streets. Mr. Taylor, it is over 35 years since I made my first broadcast in that building, which is probably longer ago than most people in this Chamber made a broadcast.

Mr. Bennett: What did you broadcast?

Mr. SMITH: At that time I was disseminating equally sensible remarks. In addition to the Taxation Building, we have vacant land in George Street alongside the Chest Clinic, and in Mary Street we have the dilapidated old buildings that are used for the inspection of machinery on the site formerly occupied by the Queensland Hotel. I understand that site was resumed originally for the purpose of building a new Government Printing Office. I do not know whether that is so, but to put a Government Printing Office in that part of the city would seem to me to be rather a waste of a good site in Mary Street. It is not far from the inner part of the city. It is not necessary to have the Government Printing Office in the inner city today. With teletypes and electronic machinery it is possible to have the machinery well removed from the compositors. For example, the compositors could work at Parliament House and the printing could be done outside. There is no reason why we should have a building suitable for carrying heavy machinery on that site. A printing office must be designed with a large slab floor, possibly two, and you cannot have a multi-storeyed building without increasing the costs beyond commonsense limits.

On this matter of sensible utilisation, we find, too, that alongside the Chest Clinic in George Street is a vacant piece of Crown land that is used for parking Government cars. No doubt this piece of land would be very useful for the parking of Government cars, but we should not use valuable land in George Street to park vehicles. Of course, we park cars in the grounds of Parliament House, but that is a different matter; we should have parking facilities here.

There are other blocks of land in Edward Street. There is also the piece of ground bought by the Main Roads Department, and referred to by the hon. member for Brisbane in a question the other day. It was resumed at a cost of £88,000. The proposal is to remove the Main Roads Department from its present site and build a multi-storey State Government Insurance Office on it. There are more State Government buildings around Anzac Square, a scattering of Government Departments, all getting further and further away from the centre of the executive Government. My idea is that we should be doing our utmost to have all Government departments within the measured mile, and we should be doing the sensible thing by planning for it now. We cannot build them now, because we have not got the money, but we should be planning for it. We should be able to say, "All of George Street from the Treasury Building to Parliament House is to be developed for the siting of Government departments. We are not necessarily going to use the same blocks as we have today." We should do it as they have done in America with the United Nations building. We should build narrow, long and tall buildings, leaving spaces between them for light, air and beautification. Then anybody who wishes to conduct Government business may be able to do it all in George Street.

Mr. Davies: Would you take over both sides?

Mr. SMITH: If the Botanical Gardens are to remain, I suggest we take a strip of land opposite the Gardens and so make the area a thing of beauty in Brisbane. Brisbane is the capital of the State, but unless the capital is beautified we cannot expect to attract the tourist trade that the State deserves. It is also the idea of people who have seen other buildings and other land beautification schemes in other cities. An article appeared in the "Sunday Mail" of 16 October written by Mr. Keith Dunstan, a well-known journalist in Queensland some years ago. He now writes again under the heading of "The Tourist Capital".

An Honourable Member: The Gold Coast.

Mr. SMITH: Not the Gold Coast. It means Queensland, and it means Brisbane as the capital. Mr. Dunstan states—

"Brisbane has far greater natural advantages than most of the great cities of Europe, an unequalled climate plus a

superb combination of hills and a great winding river. What Brisbane needs to go ahead is a great local sense of civic pride and the men who are prepared to cut the red tape."

I took a little personal satisfaction from what he said in his final column when he criticised the Government for what they had been doing over the years. He said—

"Another example is what they did to the Police Court building in George Street. Now there was a quaint old building, probably unsuited to such a highly-rated area. Yet they didn't pull it down. All they did was put a false front on it and call it the District Court."

"The Courier-Mail" is a paper with a great amount of balance, judging by the articles that it publishes. It is prepared to regard Brisbane as the tourist capital, a city with a big potential, one worthy of a plan to develop it as a city of beauty, and a help to the tourist trade.

It published a leading article on 15 October, in which it referred to the State's growth and the report of the Co-ordinator General, Sir James Holt. It said—

"The resources are here and the will to succeed is here. It is true that seasons have been unkind and many people are experiencing the worry and hardship of drought.

"They deserve sympathy and practical help. But generally the State, because of water conservation and other improvements, is standing up better to drought than ever in the past.

"The big thing . . ."
and this is the important part—

" . . . is to keep a sense of proportion and not to over-emphasise isolated reverses at home."

The isolated reverses that we are going through will pass. When they do, it is then that I want to have in being a plan to develop our city and our governmental centre. There is no doubt that the day will come when this city has its ring-roads and loop-roads. There is nothing more certain than that. The other day I had to appear for a client of mine, resisting a council refusal to the erection of his building. That refusal was made because it had planned to build a ring-road through his land. It has already developed the plan—I do not think there is any secret about it—which will greatly improve the area embracing the Spring Hill district.

Mr. Mann: It won't come to fruition in your time.

Mr. SMITH: Does the hon. member for Brisbane not wish it to come to fruition? Perhaps he would like to retain the slums around there.

Mr. Davies: Tell us where the slums are.

Mr. SMITH: If the hon. member wants to obstruct the plan he must want to keep the slums. If he wants to see the plan come to fruition, he should lend his support to it.

Mr. Mann: Where are you going to get the money from to finance it?

Mr. SMITH: As I said, we have not the money at the moment, but the plan for these ring-roads is being drawn up by the city council, and I am sure that there will be major roads in this part of the city. I think it is unlikely that the Brisbane River area ringing the domain and up to Victoria Bridge will be in great demand for intensive development, for which it is not suited. The A.B.C. has tennis courts—not in very good repair, either—on its land and there are a couple of foundry buildings on the Albert Street corner.

Mr. Mann: The A.B.C. want to sell that property, if you are interested.

Mr. SMITH: Perhaps we may be able to do something about it.

Mr. Davies: What about the Queensland Club?

Mr. SMITH: That is probably the only decent building in the whole block. The buildings are mostly single-storey warehouses, so it is obvious that the land in question is of no great use for industrial development. If the Government want to extend they have the opportunity in this area.

I again refer to "The Courier-Mail" of Tuesday, 11 October, in which appears a statement under big head lines that Parliament House is bursting at the seams. The article reads—

"Few Queenslanders realise that their State Parliament, which has been meeting in George Street since 1868, is bursting at the seams.

"Though there are 92 rooms in the building, space is so scarce that up to four members share a room to conduct their parliamentary activities.

"A peep into its history will tell us why. The building was erected when membership of the First Legislative Assembly was 26 from 16 electorates."

Mr. Mann: Do you think that writer knew what he was writing about?

Mr. SMITH: I think he knew what he was writing about.

Mr. Mann: There are 16 of us in one room and he says "four." There is one error.

Mr. SMITH: It could be that the position of the Opposition is worse because they are the fat, lazy politicians referred to by the hon. member the other day. A look at those on this side of the Chamber, including me, will show that such people are hard to find over here.

Mr. Mann: That is because you spend two hours a day here and the rest in the courts defending someone.

Mr. SMITH: That is not so.

Mr. Mann: You are a part-time politician.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member for South Brisbane is holding down not only his professional practice, but also the position of municipal leader of the Labour Party, a position he has held for a number of years. In addition he is now a member of Parliament. The same could be said of the hon. member for Sandgate. How can the hon. member for Brisbane talk about people who are holding down more than one job when one of his own colleagues is holding down three jobs?

Mr. Mann: Look at a lot of your fat friends and see what they hold down.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would be pleased if the hon. member for Windsor will continue with his speech.

Mr. SMITH: The newspaper article continues—

"Although Parliament House rises to a height of 103 feet to the top of the curved mansard roof over the Libraries, space within it is getting increasingly small in relation to expansion of membership."

It points out that Parliament House was built for an era that is past.

Mr. Mann: The reporter would not know what he was writing about. He must have been drunk when he wrote it.

Mr. SMITH: I am not suggesting that we do anything with Parliament House. I am suggesting a plan, and ultimately under the plan this building will disappear as Parliament House.

Mr. Davies: Are you going to have a dictatorship?

Mr. SMITH: This building will disappear. The House of Commons was bombed out and rebuilt, but that did not bring about a dictatorship. Hon. members opposite cannot understand anything even as simple as my suggestion.

Mr. Mann: How you could win Windsor after that argument has me beaten.

Mr. SMITH: And my opponent beaten, too. This building houses the highest form of Government, that is, the Legislative Assembly, and it is totally unsuitable for the purpose. The three sides of Government are the Executive, the judiciary and the administrative. Hon. members have only to look around to see how the Executive is housed. The members of the judiciary are housed in the Supreme Court, another building constructed when there were fewer judges than we have today and when litigants apparently did not mind walking up stairs. Today we have motor-car accidents and some litigants

have not the use of limbs. Some may be bed ridden. They have to be carried into court on stretchers and carried up the stairs. Hon. members opposite criticise my suggestion that we should have a court that will provide such persons with a degree of comfort. Those are the people on whose behalf I speak, not those who sit in judgment, or barristers who argue the cases. Litigants are entitled to have their cases heard speedily and efficiently in suitable surroundings and with the utmost comfort. I do not mean that the surroundings should be luxurious, but they should be comfortable. They should not be forced to wait around in a cold quadrangle where very few seats are provided. That has been the position for years. There are some seats, but they are few in number. When those are taken, other persons have to stand in the quadrangle. Some litigants are aged and they are entitled to some comfort.

Mr. Davies: Why have you not done something? You have been four years as the Government.

Mr. SMITH: Hon. members opposite were in office much longer and they did very much less. The work done since this Government took office is a credit to them and I am not in any way criticising the Government for what they have not done.

Mr. Bromley: A moment ago you said there had been a lot more accidents lately.

Mr. SMITH: I am speaking of the period since the inception of the motor-car. When the Supreme Court was built there were no motor-cars and few push-bikes. People walked or used horses. There were a few carts, but today there are trams and motor-cars and pedestrians are knocked over by trams and motor-cars. People are being hurt in motor-car collisions. These matters were not envisaged when the buildings were erected. If we could only inculcate in hon. members on the opposite benches a sense of reality and an appreciation of the buildings we might get somewhere.

I have dealt with the legislative building and the Supreme Court. I come now to the administrative building. The Treasury Building, no doubt, is a masterpiece of architecture and construction in its own right, but the quadrangle has been filled up with what can only be called an excrescence. It is built inside the quadrangle, which formed part of the previous structure. That can be done today because of air-conditioning. We could fill in all the quadrangles—those in the Government Printing Office, the Executive Building and the Lands Office—because the buildings can now be ventilated with air-conditioning and lit with fluorescent lights. All these buildings—the administrative centre, the Executive Building, the Lands Office and the Government Printing Office—are using uneconomically the land on which they stand. Unless some plan is drawn up for the use of the quadrangles it is not economical, and when they are used it is

not good architectural design. If we had a narrow building rising a multitude of storeys we could accommodate more efficiently and effectively a far greater number of public servants on a much smaller piece of ground. I am not presenting any brief for the public servants. The public servant is simply a person who has to work for the good of the public.

I suggest that the Government sell all the higgledy-piggledy bits of land they hold throughout Brisbane, and the Taxation Building, if the public good can be enhanced by selling them, and concentrate on developing a strip. I suggest selling the Taxation Building because in a building of that kind with high ceilings and out-moded windows, with poor ventilation and light, if it is desired to turn it into a useful building it has to be rewired for lighting and the ventilation system has to be altered. The Taxation Building has ceilings 11 feet 6 inches to 12 feet high. In two floors of that building there could be three today, and the present six floors could be replaced by nine in a new building of the same size. With the new techniques in use today and better partitions, there would be much more room. The public servants could be accommodated conveniently and close to the seat of government. That is what we need. We do not want more spread than we have already, with the Railway Department, the State Government Insurance Office, the Titles Office, and other departments, next to Anzac Square. That is as far as we can allow Government departments to get from the seat of government.

We should aim at an administrative centre. I hope that the river that flows so proudly may become a tourist attraction and become visible once more from a road along this side.

Mr. Hanlon: Does the hon. member say that what he has mentioned is the reason why more people are leaving the State than are coming into it?

Mr. SMITH: They are leaving the State probably because of the antics of the associates of the interjector, such as those at Eagle Farm aerodrome last Saturday. Those things make people leave.

Having got to the position that we shall develop a city centre and sell off all the higgledy-piggledy buildings, we will then start to do what I recommend, which is the common-sense thing, and plan for uniform buildings of a number of storeys on the sites I have referred to. It is not impossible.

Let me remind the Committee of some of the changes about to take place. Some resumptions have been made already, one of land near the Chest Clinic for the development of the Chest Clinic. But we have a huge chest hospital at Chermerside. It seems rather pointless to have such a hospital at Chermerside, admittedly under Commonwealth control, and a Chest Clinic in George Street.

I have not studied it but it would seem to me that to erect a building specifically for the Chest Clinic on that piece of land would be a waste of the site. No Chest Clinic could possibly need 11 storeys. Why even the hospital at Chermside does not rise as high as that. The future building in George Street must be envisaged to be very small and I suggest the land could be put to better use. Preferably, sell it.

Mr. Graham: Don't you think the Chest Clinic being central, gives all the people a reasonable chance of attending it?

Mr. SMITH: I suppose the hon. member would argue that having the Chest Clinic in George Street makes it ever so much easier for the people of Thargomindah to attend than the hospital at Chermside.

The Museum is a building of cultural importance that is fast outliving its usefulness. Built years ago it is now outmoded and useless.

Just over Victoria Bridge the old Bayards' Building is used by the Agricultural Bank.

What was once Smellie's building in Edward Street became the Industrial High School, and at the end of this year it will cease to be used for that purpose.

One section of the old Port Office is used by the Department of Labour and Industry. Goodness me, the Minister for Labour and Industry has his office up in the Treasury Building in George Street, and there is this branch office in Edward Street.

Mr. Sherrington: He is always overseas.

Mr. SMITH: No, he is here. If the hon. member for Salisbury had been in the Chamber he would have seen him.

Mr. Sherrington: He is here quite often.

Mr. SMITH: The Minister is here today. It is not much good the hon. member's interjecting immediately he enters the Chamber. He lets us know that he is present but it is much better to look around first and learn what is going on.

The Trocadero, bought by the Railway Department when it intended to build a railway bridge to connect the inter-State railway station with Roma Street station—

Mr. Aikens: What has happened to that project?

Mr. SMITH: I don't know, but I suggest that the Trocadero is a building that could be put to some other use. If the Railways still have it, let them sell it. If others need it, let them use it. It is just another building that shows there is no scheme of planned development of government offices.

In my scheme the Minister for Education would be in a separate building. He would need a building—one housing the administrative offices of all educational activities—and a very fine building it would be, because the educational status of Queensland is very high,

not as the hon. member for Kedron suggested it was. The building would house the Minister for Education and his staff, the teaching staff and indeed everything connected with the administration of education in the State.

Similarly the Lands Department building would house everything connected with the administration of public lands. The same would go for each of the other Ministers. Perhaps two could be put in one building; I do not mind that.

Mr. Aikens: In other words, you want about another £15,000,000 to be spent in Brisbane?

Mr. SMITH: I want to see the city developed as the capital of a very fine State.

Mr. Aikens: And bag-and-bark humpies for the North.

Mr. SMITH: If there are one or two people fitted to live in humpies of that sort, let us build them for them. As the ramifications of the Education Department spread out into the far north, everybody will benefit from more efficient organisation. It is efficiency for the State that matters, and my plan seeks to provide the utmost efficiency.

It also provides the means of enabling anyone who comes from an outside centre, to conduct his local authority or semi-governmental business in the one building. No country hon. member will deny that that will be a great convenience to shire councils, shire council chairmen and shire clerks.

However, I was dealing with some of the buildings in the city. In George Street, Harris Court is being remodelled at very high cost. What can remodelling do compared with what can be done by razing the building and constructing a new one from scratch suited to the purpose and incorporating the most modern planned layouts in accordance with the latest time and motion studies?

Mr. Aikens: Money no object for Brisbane!

Mr. SMITH: People might say that, but people are saying it about Canberra, too. A lake project has been approved there and people are growling about it. But Canberra is a model of what I am suggesting, because it has a plan and a developmental authority that says, "You will build houses there. You will build factories there. You will put this building here, and the projected Parliament House will be there." In 1927 Parliament was opened in Canberra in a provisional building, and they said, "Parliament House will be built here." Today they are commencing to scrape the ground for the foundations of that building—33 years later.

Mr. Davies: Your Minister for Education is starved for funds.

Mr. SMITH: I notice that we have not heard one word in this Chamber in criticism of the spending of money on building the

United Nations Building in New York. There are some buildings that must be built, and there are some beautification schemes that people have thrust upon them. That is what happened in England. The bombing in England was probably a great blessing in disguise, and I think that is recognised by people the world over.

Mr. Aikens: The sooner we hold Parliament up in one of the igloos at Stuart, the more work we will get done.

Mr. SMITH: I hope that when Parliament sits in an igloo at Stuart the hon. member for Townsville South is down here seeing one of the departmental officers about some information that he wants.

If we want this State to develop, we must plan for the future. I should say that today the Public Service in Queensland are utilising over 200 per cent. more floor space than they did 30 years ago, and it is probably nearer 300 per cent. So as each decade passes there is an increase of 100 per cent. in the floor space required, and if we, as the legislators of today and the planners for tomorrow, are to do the right thing, we will plan a balanced development of Government buildings. If we wish to increase the number of tourists coming to Brisbane, we must make the city more attractive. The Gold Coast, the North Coast, and other parts of the State are important, too, but Brisbane must be made attractive. The buildings that I envisage are not lavish or lush; I am suggesting that they should be designed for efficiency; but let them be of such a style and size that we can incorporate in them the latest building techniques and the greatest number of labour-saving devices.

Look at what we put up with here and the working conditions of people round Parliament House. Take the librarians. They have their library on this floor, on the next floor, and over in a detached building. "Hansard" has one section here and records in another place. Unfortunately, very few hon. members opposite are prepared to admit that we can achieve much by taking bold steps and big steps.

I am prepared to concede that the previous Government did one sound and common-sense thing, and if the interjectors will still their wagging tongues for a moment I shall tell them what it was. I refer to the re-organisation of the departments in the building in Anzac Square. It took a long time to build, and I am not suggesting that we should put up structures that take as long as that to build, but departments were accommodated on one floor instead of on five floors. Take the Housing Commission. People who wanted a house—and these are the people who the Opposition say they want to help—had to go from one floor to another. For instance, a mother with her 3 or 4 children might go in and make inquiries about a house to rent when the previous Government did not have a house

to rent available and there was no house that she could buy. The Government re-organised the department—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SMITH: This is one thing that I am giving hon. members opposite credit for. If they interrupt me, they will not hear the only credit they are going to get in my speech. I give the previous Government credit for putting one department on the one floor, as far as possible, so that if you saw in the building directory that the department was on one floor, when you got out of the lift at that floor, even though you might have to walk through partitions and go around corners, you found what you wanted.

In the Legislative Assembly we are doing the direct opposite by not concentrating the parliamentary library in one area. All the authorities and references that I have, show what they are doing in overseas cities, which, like us are short of money, but unlike us they are full of foresight and are prepared to plan and spend now, because next year it will be dearer and in 10 years' time prohibitive.

Mr. Davies: Are you not prepared to spend?

Mr. SMITH: I trust that my scheme will get some recognition.

I commend to the Department of Public Works the scheme which is now coming so much to the forefront in building—I refer to modular co-ordination. That might seem to be a rather meaningless combination of words but it simply means that you construct your buildings in such a way that certain components, which are prefabricated, can be used in all the buildings that you erect. At present bricks are made to a standard size. The brickworks at Darra, Newmarket, Beenleigh and Southport make bricks of a standard size. We have this standardisation in bricks; we have it to a certain extent in timber, but in no other part of the building trade. In Queensland we have the tendency towards the craft process. The builder commences the building at the ground, works up to the roof, and then goes away. People today are paying for a motor car almost as much, in some cases, as they would pay for a house. Not one motor car today is built by the craft process but by process workers. One man puts a part of the chassis together, another man with a gun regulated at a certain tension tightens a certain set of nuts. Before he does that another man has put a certain number of bolts through a certain number of holes. Thus it goes on in this factory line production method until the final article is produced and it stands on its four tyres. It is mass production but it is efficient. Today the cost of building has far and away outstripped the increase in the price of the components of building, purely and simply because the carpenter who puts the weatherboards on the studs

is also putting the hinges on the door. With a modular co-ordination system components of a standard size would be used in all buildings. There might be two or three standard sizes—there might be multiples of them—but by the adoption of standard sizes, joinery works and other component manufacturers, such as the makers of steel window frames would all be working to standard patterns.

Mr. Davies: It sounds like a machine age.

Mr. SMITH: It is a machine age—and we are living in it. If the hon. member cannot realise that he has had his time—he is out of date.

Mr. Davies: I am talking about the monotony associated with it. Does that appeal to your soul?

Mr. SMITH: I am speaking specifically of Government buildings. I do not care if it is monotonous. I want efficiency. The monotony will not affect the workers inside.

Present-day veneers and plywoods are far stronger than the solid pieces of timber that used to be hewn out of trees in years gone by. Huge pieces of timber would be used for architraves, etc. Those large pieces of timber are not as strong as the laminated structures of today, which are lighter and smaller and are produced at greater speed. You cannot even get the timber today for some of those slabs, and you do not want it because better methods are now in vogue.

If this Government were to take a stand and encourage mass production in building it would not be doing anything new, because it is a fact that we did mass produce once. We see evidence of that in the older parts of the city around Petrie Terrace and Spring Hill, with terraces of apartments—a terrace here, a door there and a window here; then the next one the terrace, door and window. We will have to return to that today in modern building and with modern materials.

Mr. Davies: What about the University?

Mr. SMITH: That is a particular example of the co-ordination about which I was speaking. My suggestion is that we should endeavour to incorporate it into the whole of the building trade in this State and throughout Australia. We have a standard brick; let us have other standards as well.

I want to get away from the conditions where a man says, "I want a house in which I want such-and-such a man's windows, such-and-such firm's this, and such-and-such a firm's that." Let us plan it the way a motor-car is planned, with a set standard of tyres and a set strength of battery. With a car, if you are replacing the tyres, tyres of such a size are there and if you are replacing the battery the battery of the required strength is there.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. SMITH: It is distressing when talking about something in this Chamber to hear the hon. member—I do not want to call him 'Orrible 'Orrie—interject and show clearly that he does not understand what is being said.

Mr. Davies: I could interject with a rhyme.

Mr. SMITH: It could not be worse than his present interjections, so let us have the rhymes.

I am talking about certain disabilities existing in the building trade today, and I am submitting that we should go in for a large building programme on a certain designated site. I suggest it be done in the same manner in which the council is planning the city. Let us plan our Government departments and bring them all together, if hon. members like it that way, with the Executive Building the pride of them all. Let the new Parliament House, which one day we must build, be the crowning piece of that collection of buildings. We will need a new Parliament House; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. Thackeray: The Bellevue Hotel is ramshackle on modern standards.

Mr. SMITH: Would the hon. member agree that we should resume the Bellevue Hotel and make it an attractive street right through?

Mr. Thackeray: If you have the money, go ahead with these grandiose schemes.

Mr. SMITH: Here we have an hon. member from out-of-town showing a great deal of sense. He is not like another hon. member from Townsville South who continually wants something. I am glad to see the hon. member for Rockhampton North showing such sense.

We should rationalise our building projects. We should not go any further with the proposal to construct a new Main Roads Department building. Instead, we should consider seriously utilising the best part of the land between here and the Supreme Court. We own most of it. If that is not enough for our plans, let us consider the block fronting the Botanic Gardens. We know from the hon. member for Brisbane that the A.B.C. wants to sell a piece of land that would be ideal for some Government departments. Let us put up these buildings, using modular co-ordination.

To give some point to my statements about ability to cut down costs, I propose to incorporate an address given by the Government Architect in his private capacity. It proves that the objective I have been espousing—that is, cutting down the costs—is apparently not impossible. I do not know the views of the Government or the architects on planning, but I will

incorporate the article by the Government Architect, Mr. E. J. A. Weller, in my speech for the purpose of setting out what can be done with modular co-ordination to cut down building costs and increase building efficiency. If such ideas are adopted by the trade, the new Government buildings that I have suggested are not out of the question; they will become one of the centres of beauty in the city, and the improvement in the beauty of the city will enhance the attractiveness of the State and improve the prosperity of the people. I commend to the Government that this is the time for us to plan our future Government buildings development, and to lay down a hard-and-fast rule and earmark land for the purpose before it becomes too dear to resume.

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (3.51 p.m.): The procedure adopted in a Budget debate is a particularly good one. Hon. members have an opportunity to discuss the Budget and also many other subjects that they could not deal with on other occasions.

I have made a brief study of the Financial Statement. From beginning to end it is an uninspiring document from the viewpoint of assistance for the people of Queensland, particularly those in the capital city. It fails to give relief to those who most need it—family units—in the form of housing and other facilities. I was disappointed in the Financial Statement in that no strong appeal is made to the Federal Government to accept their responsibilities to the State. I know that is the theme of many speeches by hon. members and people outside, and to a certain extent it is a hackneyed one, but nevertheless it bears repetition. At every opportunity we should hit hard at the Federal Government because of their neglect of Queensland. The Financial Statement, instead of being critical of the Federal Government and the fact that they are not doing the right thing for Queensland, tended to a defence of the Federal authorities in the matter of their responsibilities to Queensland. One hon. member touched on something of great importance, that is, the need for a major project in Queensland along the lines of the Snowy River scheme. Unless development of that magnitude is undertaken in the North, we will never have full development of the State.

Mr. Pizzey: Don't you call the Mt. Isa railway project a major undertaking?

Mr. DEAN: Yes, but not of the magnitude of the Snowy River scheme, and we have waited a long time for the rebuilding of the Mt. Isa line.

The Commonwealth Government certainly discriminate against Queensland. I was very disappointed to hear the Treasurer's frank statement that if the relationship between the Commonwealth and Queensland does not improve, local authorities will be in a very bad way in the future through curtailment

of Government subsidies. My colleagues here, from local authorities, must feel as I do because over the years when a subsidy reduction has taken place we have always felt that it has been of great concern to the country and the local authority, and those responsible for it.

Another portion of the Budget did not give any encouragement to the development of secondary industries in this State. That is very serious. Some people may try to create the impression that there has been an improvement, and in some cases they may claim that in different parts of the city and the State secondary industry has grown; nevertheless it should be encouraged to grow, and it should have grown to a far greater extent. I feel that the Budget is a disappointment, and it will be a great disappointment if some way is not found in the future to overcome this great weakness. If we look at it realistically we will see that in our financial problems the chickens have come home to roost. If hon. members would turn their minds back to 1945, which is not so long ago, they would see, with a little research into the legislation of the late J. B. Chifley, that he foresaw the present financial trouble when he introduced the Commonwealth Bank Bills of 1945. After a little research I have taken certain extracts from Banking Bills to amplify my remarks. The Bills he brought forward were for the post-war period. We are certainly out of the post-war period now, but immediately after the war the measures that were brought in were intended to ensure that financial stringency such as we are suffering now would not occur.

I shall refer to Regulation 9 of the National Security Regulations. It is quite clear that it was a war-time measure and I need not go into it, but if it worked then for the economy of the country, why can't it work now? The credit regulations worked so well during the war years that we were able to wage a war and bring about a successful conclusion for the democracies.

Regulation 9 of the National Security Regulations allowed a special accountancy procedure to operate—it operated very well indeed—and at the end of February, 1945, the balance in that special account was £230,000,000. It proved to be a very simple, elastic, and effective instrument of credit control. It is considered by many knowledgeable people that if that control had continued in operation, instead of being repealed by the present Government, we would be in a better position than we are in at the moment. If the special credit control that I refer to had been continued it would have helped many people, particularly those on fixed incomes. With the cost-of-living problems people on fixed incomes are in dire circumstances. They are affected more than anybody else by inflation.

It was not the purpose of the Commonwealth Bank Bill of 1945 to interfere with domestic arrangements between the banks and their clients. It laid down only general principles, such as the control of rates of interest, advances and deposits, and rates of discount. We need that control more than ever today, when money is being channelled into wrong avenues such as hire purchase.

The Bills were framed in such a manner that the general purpose of the Commonwealth Bank was to make the greatest practical contribution to the stability of the currency, the maintenance of full employment and the economic welfare of the community. They were among the most important features of everyday life. All will agree that that is an essential function today. The party to which I have the honour to belong, the Australian Labour Party, has always been firmly convinced of the soundness of the measures introduced by the late Mr. J. B. Chifley in the post-war years. It has always believed in keeping the control of credit firmly in the hands of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia. The system of having the Commonwealth Bank act as a central authority for banking control worked well during the war. Today that control has been split in many ways and it is not now with the Commonwealth Government but is vested in many private interests and private banking concerns. The economic crisis of today is a retribution for the crime of not keeping on the statute book of legislation that would have mitigated or to some extent controlled the evils we are suffering from.

Another feature of the Bill was that it allowed the Commonwealth Bank to compete with the trading banks and other financial institutions. The relationship today is lopsided because private banks have complete preference over the Commonwealth Bank in the trading activities of the State. I have had personal experience of that. People have told me that they have approached the Commonwealth Bank for financial assistance to build homes only to be told that the bank could not lend the money. One Commonwealth Bank manager was frank enough to say, "I have the money but I cannot lend it to you. If you go down the road to a private bank I think you will be looked after." His advice was sound, his prediction correct; the private bank advanced the money. The competition that exists between the Commonwealth Bank and the trading banks is very unfair.

The Bill also laid it down that general banking should be carried on by a separate division and no business could be refused just because it would be taken from another bank. That bears out my previous statements. Today, if the Commonwealth Bank conflicts with another bank, the private bank is given preference.

The few observations I have made on the Budget are all that I intend to make at this stage because I am not yet well versed in State financial matters; I merely feel the impact of them in the same way as the average man outside does. I realise that budgets are designed in a certain way and that one has to be very expert to analyse them closely.

However, as we are permitted to use the time allowed us in this debate to speak on almost any subject, I should like to clear the air a little about the Greater Brisbane scheme. I know that, sooner or later this Session, Parliament will pass a Bill to amend the City of Brisbane Acts but I know, too, that there will be a certain amount of rush and bustle with legislation before long because progress in the Chamber has been slow so far. One naturally concludes that Bills will be rushed through at such a speed that hon. members will not have an opportunity to express themselves fully on them. Many people are not familiar with the Greater Brisbane scheme.

Mr. Houghton: What do you want—more money for the Banyo roads?

Mr. DEAN: I will touch on that subject later. I can assure the Committee that in this debate I will take full advantage of the opportunity to give full expression to my feelings. Let me bring hon. members up to date on the Greater Brisbane scheme, and enlighten them, if they have not already been enlightened, on the great help it has been to the city. With many others, I believe we would not have the city we have today had it not been for the inauguration of the Greater Brisbane scheme. It was brought in in 1925, and those of us who remember the conditions that prevailed prior to that time, particularly in outlying areas, know only too well how much improvement has taken place. The various shire councils and local authorities were very sincere in their efforts, but, as they were frustrated by the many different ideas and methods of administration, the conditions were chaotic.

Greater Brisbane came into being following the passing by Parliament of the City of Brisbane Act on 30 October, 1924. Now we have the ward system where previously there were 19 different councils consisting of 205 aldermen and a number of joint boards, apart from the tramway and electricity undertakings. It is obvious, therefore, that it was a very big amalgamation, and in some ways it was an experiment. I believe, as do many others, that the experiment has been successful, because today Brisbane can take its place with any city in the Commonwealth. Prior to the amalgamation, there was a great deal of conflict between contiguous local authorities, and it was obvious that some action had to be taken to make Brisbane a city of which we could be proud.

Under the Greater Brisbane scheme, certain boards were abolished—the Metropolitan Electricity Board, Three Mile Scrub and Bridge Board, and the Wattlebrae Hospital Board. The Brisbane Tramway Trust was abolished on 1 January, 1926, and the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Board on 1 April, 1928.

In many ways it was economical for us to have this amalgamation of the various wards and shires, because it gave us a community of interest and an incentive to make something of the city of Brisbane. Under the old system, 205 aldermen in 19 shires were paid £72,344 a year. The figure in the current budget of the Brisbane City Council for aldermen's salaries is £47,250. Aldermen receive no out-of-pocket expenses and no mileage allowance for running a motor car, and I feel that it must be realised that the present method of administering the affairs of the city is very economical.

It is interesting to note that one-third of the State's population is in the Greater Brisbane area and that the City Council's budget is bigger than the budget of some Australian States. We have also absorbed the additional responsibilities of administering the tramways, the electricity undertakings, and the Water Sewerage Board. The introduction of the Greater Brisbane Scheme has saved the people of Brisbane many thousands of pounds over the years. Another fallacy that should be aired is contained in the argument that we hear from time to time that representation on the Brisbane City Council should be confined to retired gentlemen of the city who can sit in the Council without any remuneration. That argument presupposes that the representation shall be restricted to men and women in the community financially able and prepared to give their time gratis. That would not be good for the city. It would be contrary to the present-day concept of democracy that we should restrict the administration of a democratic department to one section of the community.

Another contentious matter is that Party politics should be kept out of Council activities. The supporters of that argument should refer to the records of local government in the Old Country. Research has revealed to me that the London County Council, since its inception in 1889, has clearly defined a Party division between its members. It has always had that clear Party division between local authority representatives. From the beginning of the Greater Brisbane scheme many of the inner wards naturally have benefited to a greater extent than the outside wards. But I venture to say that outside areas, such as the one I represent, and places like Wynnum and Manly, have benefited to a far greater extent than they would have done had they been left to their own resources. I have a good knowledge of the conditions in my area prior to the Greater Brisbane amalgamation under the City of Brisbane Act. I know how far Sandgate was in debt in 1925. The Sandgate

people owed £33,000, including a £22,000 electricity debt. They had a debit balance in the bank of over £10,000. I know, even if the newer residents do not, that in Sandgate and similar areas, many of the old residents are very thankful for the Act of Parliament that brought about the amalgamation of the various local Councils.

Mr. Davies: You are entitled to speak on their behalf too.

Mr. DEAN: Yes, and I am.

Mr. Melloy: Did it mean increased rates?

Mr. DEAN: Only a small increase. Since the Greater Brisbane Council took over the increase has not been alarming over the years.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. DEAN: I read the story the other day of the part the Opposition played in the City of Brisbane Act.

The responsibilities of councils outside Greater Brisbane are not the responsibilities of the Brisbane City Council. Council colleagues of mine in many parts of the State have responsibilities too, but not to the same extent as we have in the Brisbane City Council. We have the responsibilities of a capital city. We give assistance to various charities; we give a lot of relief to many organisations. We grant subsidies just as the Government do, but on a far wider scale. The amounts may be smaller but we assist many associations. I am in complete agreement with the help we give to church organisations in Brisbane. No church property within the Greater Brisbane area is subject to rates. All church properties are exempt.

Mr. Houghton: Does that include water rates?

Mr. DEAN: No. Church organisation relief was introduced in 1936 and the council decided to give consideration to the various religious organisations. In 1936 the relief given to churches amounted to £155,000. Hon. members can gauge for themselves the assistance that the council has given since then. I point that out to show the responsibility that has been accepted by the council and the increased expenditure it has incurred. That is one reason for the continual appeals by the Council for assistance for increased subsidy.

Many of the outside areas could be developed at a faster rate than at present and brought to a very high standard if we could get more money. We feel aggrieved that we cannot get money to develop them. The Sandgate area could be turned into an admirable tourist resort, as I said the other day. It could be developed to attract a far greater number of tourists than at present.

Mr. Davies: It is a charming little seaside resort.

Mr. DEAN: It is indeed. It would be one of the most charming in Queensland if we had the money necessary to bring it to the standard it deserves. However, as time goes on, I feel sure that money will be made available.

I urge the Government also to consider special grants to areas in which schools are adjacent to dusty roads. I know this is a big problem, and a costly one, but over the years it would pay handsomely in the improved health of the school children. Roads should be sealed for a radius of two miles around each school area. I am sure that would have the effect of reducing sickness and absenteeism among school children.

Whilst dealing with council activities I think I should refer to an incident that occurred in my electorate last night, if to do nothing more than impress on hon. members that council administration and finance loom large in the public mind at present, so far as Labour Party representatives are concerned. Much discussion has taken place in this Chamber recently on pressure groups. Such groups are particularly active in the local-authority sphere, and "The Courier-Mail" this morning made mention of a typical example—a mass meeting in the Banyo area, convened by the Banyo Progress Association. I would say that 99 per cent. of the people at that meeting were new residents of the area. The older residents would have more sense and would realise the cause of the shortcomings complained of.

The intimidatory tactics used in this case are typical of those used on virtually all aldermanic representatives. I have been informed by different people in the district that the progress association is engaged in certain other activities of which district progress is the least important. Any person can join these associations, walking in and out at will. Progress associations are very democratic institutions, but some people use them to intimidate their elected representatives so as to get favours or improvements in their districts. I refer to that matter in passing only to prove that members of Parliament and aldermen in addition to attending to the everyday requirements of their constituents have to stave off personal and abusive attacks.

Some of the passages in the newspaper article are amusing. One of those at a meeting said that only seven of the 49 roads in the Banyo area had been reconstructed and sealed. I wish the percentage in the Sandgate ward as a whole was as high. I do not think the work done in this area of 19½ square miles is a bad effort. It is significant that such attacks are directed at representatives just prior to an election. The one I have referred to is no exception to the rule, as the next Council election will occur in 1961.

Mr. Dewar: Are you talking about Banyo?

Mr. DEAN: Yes.

As I said earlier, I intend to discuss a variety of subjects. I turn from local authority affairs to a matter affecting hon. members personally. I have been in Parliament only a short time, but I have discussed the matter with some of my colleagues. Hon. members on both sides of the House should have an opportunity to travel throughout the State. The practice is adopted to a great extent in the Federal sphere; Federal members visit New Guinea and other Commonwealth territories. I commend the practice.

Mr. Davies: They are sent out to find the Prime Minister.

Mr. DEAN: Whatever the purpose, I commend the policy. Travel throughout the State would broaden the outlook of hon. members. They would return with a knowledge of the electorates of other hon. members and the problems of other areas.

I was horrified at some of the comments of the hon. member for Windsor about Government-owned properties. He should exercise some discretion. He should not urge that we get rid of certain valuable properties or that we should use them for other than their present purposes. We should resist the destruction of good buildings throughout the city and we should hesitate before we take action to chase industries out of the city. The city should have in it a variety of interests and secondary industries should be encouraged. I know a lot has been said on planning and the ring-growth system and many other aspects of the city's development, but I do not altogether agree with him when he advocates taking portion of the Botanic Gardens, or a portion of George Street, or erecting more public buildings. I would rather see the establishment of more secondary industries and the decentralisation of Government than see more public buildings going up. If the time should come when the Government commence to dispose of Government buildings in the city I hope they will do the right thing by the Brisbane City Council. That applies not only to the State Government, but to the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Hughes: Do you agree that the State should sell its unoccupied lands in the city area so that the council will benefit by the rates from them?

Mr. DEAN: That is the point. If they are going to use the land the council should be reimbursed for the loss of revenue over the years. I have made a rough check—it was very difficult to get the actual figures—and, if all the Government-owned buildings, both State and Commonwealth, in the city of Brisbane paid the full general rate to the Brisbane City Council, the council would gain over one penny in the £1. I could not get the exact figure as it was not available to me, but it would be over a penny in the £1. That would be a great help to the city council.

If the hon. member's suggestion is ever taken seriously and the Government decide to dispose of these buildings, I hope the city council will be reimbursed for the rates it has lost over the years. A good deal of money is needed to run the city. Some people may dislike Brisbane, but we must realise that the capital city is the shop-window of the State. It is the window that the people look through when they first come to Queensland before moving farther afield.

A very disappointing thing occurred some years ago in the Botanic Gardens when the orchestral shell was constructed. It was a joint effort, and I admit that criticism could be levelled at the council representatives on the advisory committee. It is a tragedy that £15,000 was spent on its construction. It has never served the purpose it was intended for because the elements play great havoc with anyone using it and it is almost untenable for concerts or any type of dancing display at a certain time in the afternoon. It is a pity that more advice was not sought before it was built. Some advice was sought from the University people, but somebody must have made a mistake when the shell was sited. It is virtually a dead loss for the purpose for which it was intended. Some day the Government and the council will have to get together and cut the losses on the shell and either remove it or build another one. A good one is sadly needed. Another shell could be built in Albert Park or somewhere on the Terrace, where it could be fully utilised.

Another thing that helped to develop the city and gave it standing and prestige in the eyes of the world as a capital city was the establishment of the Queensland Conservatorium of Music. For many years various organisations and representatives met and put up very strong agitation for the establishment of a Conservatorium of Music in Brisbane. I am very happy to say that it is playing its part fully in the cultural development of the State and giving to students locally opportunities for musical training so that they do not have to leave the State for it, as they did in years gone by. I am very glad that it was established when it was most needed because over the years people were very downhearted and despaired of ever having a Conservatorium in Queensland.

Mr. Newton: It was established by the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. DEAN: Yes, by our own Government, and many men and women played a very important part in setting it up. As time goes on and it increases in status and acquires an atmosphere like those in the older countries of the world, it will be known in other lands as a place to send students to gain very valuable knowledge.

Another subject that is very close to me is the importance of establishing a public forum in Brisbane. I mentioned it in my maiden speech, and, if we persist in our

advocacy, something will be done about restoring the Domain as a place for people to express themselves freely. We cannot practise the principles and tenets of democracy if we have not such a place for the average citizen.

Mr. Hughes: Only ratbags get up on the soapbox at the Domain and places like that; nobody else is interested.

Mr. DEAN: The hon. member for Kurilpa is quite wrong. There may appear to be a lack of interest but that is only because the amenity is not there. It is the inherent right of every man to express himself freely and at length on any subject, but Brisbane's citizens are deprived of that birthright.

Mr. Hughes: Only Aikens and Mann and their kind go in for that sort of thing.

Mr. DEAN: Unfortunately, people are not given the opportunity in Brisbane. In this Parliament we can express ourselves, but others do not have the same scope and freedom as we do to speak to our heart's content, in a place like a public Domain. Rights like freedom of speech cannot be suppressed for very long. That has been demonstrated in other countries. Suppress something and it will break out elsewhere. It is far better to let people air their grievances. Let them expound their pet schemes and their ideas for the betterment of the State and the country. If we call ourselves true democrats and pride ourselves on practising democracy, we must set aside a place for the average person to express himself in public.

I am pleased to note the development of the North Coast beach areas that has taken place over a period, particularly in the last 12 months. I do not wish to say anything derogatory of the Gold Coast, or the South Coast—I respect the hon. member who represents that area—but in the past there has been too much concentration on it and too much interest shown in it to the detriment of the North Coast, especially with surfing beaches and bathing facilities. I have spent my whole life in this State, and nothing distresses me more than to go to the North Coast and see the great potentialities that have been neglected there for the sake of developing a sand area, which, in my opinion, is all the South Coast is. Although I like driving and I go down there, I do not like its artificial atmosphere. Outside of my own home, I get my greatest contentment and relaxation on the North Coast.

Mr. Hughes: This Government have opened up the North to tourists.

Mr. DEAN: I am speaking now as a Queenslander. I hope also that the development of Bribie Island will not be left solely to private enterprise. I hope it will be developed on sensible and sound lines and that speculators will not be allowed to use it to their own advantage, as they have been in some areas on the South Coast. I know Bribie

Island, and I should not like it to be left to the speculators and the money-makers. As an example, land in the Brighton area, which is in my electorate, has been sold to Asians who have never seen it; they have bought it as an investment. Some of the best land in Brisbane is now lying idle and cannot be built on. It is no good to Queensland or Australia. In my opinion, Bribie Island could become one of the leading playgrounds on the coast, a place where people could relax with every degree of comfort.

Mr. Hughes: You must agree that this Government are doing a great deal for tourism on the North Coast.

Mr. Adair: Go right up north.

Mr. DEAN: Before going to the Far North, I think we should develop the areas nearer to the city. We should work north gradually and develop the State progressively, not jump all over the place like a grasshopper. It is no good spending £1,000 in one area and then £1,000 in another area; the development must be orderly. Money spent on developing the North Coast surfing beaches would benefit the State as a whole.

Mr. GILMORE (Tablelands) (4.40 p.m.): I take this opportunity to congratulate the Treasurer on his clear and concise approach in bringing home the details of the State's financial position to the Committee, and the people of the State, in simple language that leaves nothing to the imagination.

The Opposition have had very little but praise for the Budget; to a marked degree there has been a tendency to avoid discussing it. Even the Leader of the Opposition said that it was one of frankness, but then he went onto his pet subject and defended the Australian Labour Party.

One of the best speeches we have heard so far was delivered by the Leader of the Queensland Labour Party, the hon. member for Carnarvon. He, at least, gave us food for thought in his approach. This morning we heard one of the most analytical speeches that it would be possible to present. I refer to the speech made by the hon. member for Burdekin.

I shall confine my comments to two very important points. The Treasurer's first point of major importance in the Financial Statement was his reference to local-authority subsidies. I should very much regret to see any reduction in the Government's support for local Authorities. If any body of citizens is to be congratulated for serving the State in a civil capacity it is the local authority. Local authorities have done an excellent job, one that we can all be proud of. If we do not continue granting subsidies, which have proved so beneficial to the various districts, some other form of assistance must take the place of that scheme. It would be very difficult to get any board or any other instrumentality to operate as

efficiently, as cheaply, or as enthusiastically as shire councils in Queensland do. They are rendering a wonderful service. The subsidies that are required to keep them going now are but a fraction of what it would cost to do the same job by any other method.

I think the Treasurer put it very well in his Financial Statement when he referred to the desirability of a high rate of recoverability, but that this should not be allowed to enslave. It proves that he is extremely conscious of how the State's finances must be husbanded to return the utmost benefit for all available loan moneys. This State, large as it is and crying out for development, demands men of rather wide vision. We must think big. It is going to cost tremendous sums of money but it is our duty to continue to endeavour to supply the working tools for the people to develop this State. Therefore, our irrigation projects are of vital importance to us and I will endeavour to point out the great economic advantage to Queensland, and to Australia—more particularly to the Commonwealth Government—of what is known as the Tinaroo Dam scheme—the Mareeba-Dimbulah irrigation scheme.

Those who conceived that scheme in the beginning were bold and courageous, and they did a mighty job in the development of Queensland. But they did one thing wrong in planning the allotted areas for farms because they had no personal knowledge of the requirements. They believed they could build a dam and that was all that was in it. At that stage the Burdekin scheme was on the verge of collapse, and it did collapse because of the Labour Party's mismanagement. We had to save the soldiers who were put there by the Labour Party and relieve them of the responsibility for repayment. That was because of insufficient knowledge on the part of the scheme's planners. The areas they allotted were too small.

I said in this Chamber before—and it is worth repetition—that the Tinaroo dam scheme would have fallen had this Government not come to office. They enlarged the areas and salvaged the whole scheme.

Mr. Davies: You had the same advisers as we had.

Mr. GILMORE: No.

Mr. Adair: How many fell in the Morgan settlement?

Mr. GILMORE: I think it was the Forgan Smith Government who wronged those men. Labour wronged them there and they had to walk off it.

Mr. Adair: It had nothing to do with the Government at all.

Mr. GILMORE: The Tinaroo Dam was opened in September, 1959, a little over 12 months ago. That was the first time that water was taken across the Great Divide

in North Queensland and it was impossible to gain any appreciable increased production from the stored water in a seasonal crop that commenced in September. I should like, however, to give hon. members the figures for the first year. There were 5,886 acres of tobacco planted and the weight of leaf produced was just over 5,000,000 lb., the farm return being £3,147,418.

Mr. Armstrong: What year was that?

Mr. GILMORE: The year just ended.

Mr. Armstrong: Very good.

Mr. GILMORE: That is the first year. I believe that, in making the case for Federal aid for products such as that, these points must always be presented on a firm, sound, and actuarial basis, if I may put it that way. The farm return, and I stress the word "farm," was £3,147,418, but the Commonwealth Government received in excise duty just on £7.7 million. This is the first year of operations. Less than £15,000,000 has been expended on the scheme, although it is a £20,000,000 scheme. The Commonwealth return from excise, I repeat, was £7.7 million.

Mr. Hiley: On the analogy of the hon. member for Burdekin, they are getting more than half the cow.

Mr. GILMORE: They are getting the lot, but that is not the whole picture.

As the scheme gains momentum—and it is not really under way yet; far from it—the return will be much greater. This year's plantings amount to 8,500 acres, approximately 50 per cent. above those of last year. Assuming the season is similar, the yield of tobacco will be 7,500,000 lb. the farm return will be just under £5,000,000 and excise will amount to £11.6 million. I am presenting this information as a case for Federal aid for this great project.

The dam has a capacity of some 68,000 irrigable acres, of which some 50,000 acres are suitable for tobacco, or are tobacco soil. On a three-year rotation just over 16,000 acres a year would be under tobacco alone. Assuming that we have normal seasons, the return from a £20,000,000 scheme will be £10,000,000 a year from tobacco alone, and excise will amount to £23,000,000. If that is not a good business proposition, I should like to hear of a better one. I have spoken only of tobacco, but the land will grow cotton. Over and above the 16,000 acres used each year for tobacco, 50,000 acres will be available for cattle-fattening and the production of maize, sorghum and cotton. I refer particularly to cotton, because excellent cotton is grown in the area. I believe that in those facts we have a clear-cut case for Commonwealth aid.

It could be argued that the Commonwealth Government would get their excise in any case—that they would get it from

imported tobacco—but if that argument is accepted in respect of tobacco it could be argued that we could import sugar at 3.2 cents. a lb. and that we should therefore close down the sugar industry and so save money. Could we dare to close the industry merely to get cheaper sugar? Could we dare to hamstring the tobacco industry merely because the Commonwealth Government can get excise from other sources?

Mr. Hiley: The illustration does not apply only to tobacco. It could be applied to Australian motor-cars, television sets, refrigerators and everything else.

Mr. GILMORE: That is right.

I believe we have an excellent case both for Commonwealth assistance and for an increase in the allocation for irrigation.

The tobacco industry in Australia is hastening towards self-sufficiency. If we in Queensland do not expand the other States will leave us far behind.

Mr. GILMORE: From time to time in this Chamber we have heard of references on finance to the Federal Government. I agree wholeheartedly that we have not received comparable assistance for our projects. I say that as a former Federal member, but that does not mean that we can be other than dignified and correct in our bargaining. Let us keep to the high level that the Treasurer and the Premier have always maintained when dealing with the Federal Government.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. GILMORE: I have heard references to the Rt. Hon. John McEwen. I do not want anybody to misunderstand me on this. I have worked with him and I am proud to say that I have. The people of Australia do not know, and can never appreciate, how much they owe him. I can well recall when the appreciation of our currency was being discussed. It would have cost every primary producer who was exporting 25 per cent. John McEwen, with the rest of the Country Party, opposed it.

Mr. Duggan: I do not think you need to be particularly proud of your stand on that matter. I think you did a great disservice.

Mr. GILMORE: The hon. member would think that because he wants cheap goods. He would not have had a Holden car; he would have had cheap galvanised iron. If hon. members want cheap things they get them.

Mr. Duggan interjected.

Mr. GILMORE: New Zealand had to get £10,000,000 to keep going. It is well known that this country depends heavily on wool. When the Korean war broke out it was suggested from America that we peg our wool price at 24d. a lb. and John McEwen went to Washington as fast as he could. That was to be Australia's contribution to the world organisation. I am very glad my friend has come in because I am sure that he did

not know these facts, and that he was goaded by irresponsible people into saying what he said.

Mr. Duggan: Are you attacking the hon. member for Gregory now?

Mr. Rae: I think he might be.

Mr. GILMORE: Had the price for wool been pegged at 24d. a lb. there would have been no necessity for an aerodrome at Windorah. There would have been very few people in the West and nobody representing Gregory in this Chamber. It would have been a closed and desolate area.

I turn now to the beef industry. It is not generally known that John McEwen was responsible for the 15-year meat agreement with Great Britain. Before that agreement was made the grazier was on the "bone"; he could not afford anything. Now he is referred to as the wealthy grazier. He is referred to in this Chamber as the grazier who will not sell his beef in Queensland but takes it to a better market in New South Wales. The hon. member for Brisbane said that the wealthy grazier does that, and then he said, "Do you blame the dock-workers for not working for £15 a week when they can get £18 a week?" The same argument applies to both classes of people. Today the graziers can afford to live in houses worthy of those who live in the outback, and they can increase the quality of their herds. The workers are better paid than ever. All this is the result of the 15-year meat agreement.

When Argentina was unable to meet its obligations to the American market, the escape clause was invoked by which second-grade beef could be exported from Australia, and we enjoyed greater prosperity than ever.

We can all remember, a few short years ago, the disastrous and unhappy experience of war with Japan and the hatreds engendered; but today Japan is accepted as a customer who purchases large quantities of our wool, and our sugar, and some of our minerals.

Mr. Adair: Why should they be?

Mr. GILMORE: They are our customers. John McEwen made that possible and he protected every one of our industries.

The people in the dried-fruit industry were starving; they could not sell their fruit, until John McEwen negotiated an agreement with the United Kingdom.

The percentage system has been largely responsible for the expansion of the tobacco industry and that is entirely the work of the Rt. Hon. John McEwen.

Mr. Duggan: What did he do for Artie Fadden?

Mr. GILMORE: He will be judged by history—and history will be his judge, not this Assembly—as one of Australia's greatest statesmen, and I am proud to say that he is one of Nature's greatest gentlemen.

Now I want to tell the Committee a little about the Atherton Tableland. As a maize-growing and dairying area it has suffered from repeated disastrous seasons. I appeal to the Premier and the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry to supply the Atherton Tableland with a maize-breeder. Returns have dropped successively over the years to half a ton an acre and that is not good enough. The farmers there need assistance urgently and I hope the Government will make a plant-breeder available.

The State farm at Kairi is doing one of the greatest jobs for the farmers it is possible to do and I pay high tribute to the officer-in-charge and the field staff.

Mr. Hiley: Is that deterioration of maize production due to the type of maize grown or to the exhaustion of the soil?

Mr. GILMORE: I think it is the culmination of a series of events; but that is for an expert to answer, not me; I am not a maize-grower. The State farm has shown what can be done with improved pastures and the use of legumes. I think it was the hon. member for Sandgate who suggested that hon. members should travel round the State. If they do, I should like them to see the work that is being done at the State agricultural farms, particularly those at Kairi and Parada. Parada is in the Tinaroo area, and they have selected a variety of soils in a square mile of country, or thereabouts. They are growing grasses and legumes together, and the carrying capacity on the worst soil they could find is a credit to them. The C.S.I.R.O. experimental station is doing a wonderful job with tobacco, and I believe that the biggest scourge in the production of tobacco will soon be mastered by the scientists.

Mr. Rae: What causes your biggest losses?

Mr. GILMORE: Blue mould.

I should like to express the thanks of the people of the Gulf Country, an area that I have the honour to represent, for the road system that has been built and the roads that are now envisaged. If we do not have our tongues in our cheeks when we talk about developing the North, we know how necessary these roads are.

Mr. Rae: Will they bring about an improvement in our cattle?

Mr. GILMORE: I think they will bring about that improvement quicker than anything else, because the quality will improve as the roads are built. The 15-year meat agreement will assist the graziers and will also provide better water facilities and better stocking, and eventually the consumer must get a better product. The proposed roads in the Gulf Country will also provide greater employment for the railway workers, road hauliers, and meat-workers on the coast in the years to come.

Mr. Rae: Do you think that country will ever be able to provide a good type of chiller beef?

Mr. GILMORE: That is for the cattle-men to answer. I am not a cattle-man; it is not in my line at all.

The Peninsula was deserted when Labour Governments were in office. One-third of the total rainfall in Queensland falls in Cape York Peninsula and, although the Burdekin is the biggest river in Queensland, the river carrying the biggest volume of water is the Mitchell. Rivers abound in the Peninsula, and the country is well watered. The Labour Party deserted it and left it for dead. The graziers had no hope of getting their stock to market until the "Wewak" came into operation and this Government pushed the roads through.

Mr. Adair: Who brought the "Wewak" in?

Mr. GILMORE: Johnson & Cummings brought the "Wewak" in, and they did a wonderful job to assist the graziers in that area.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. GILMORE: Mr. Taylor, may I ask if this is quite in order?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have given many warnings about continuous interruptions. As the hon. member has drawn my attention to the fact that he cannot continue his speech because of continual interruptions, I now warn every hon. member for the first time that they will be behaving in a disorderly manner if they again interrupt the hon. member who is speaking.

Mr. GILMORE: Sea transport is a great boon to the Gulf Country. To assist the "Wewak" to bring the cattle to the market the Clauson line put two ships on. The excellent appointments for the cattle are a credit to them. During the five days' journey to the meatworks the cattle are fed all the time; water is always available. Consequently they arrive with a minimum weight loss. To the grazier in the first instance, and to the nation as a whole in the second, it is a service to be very grateful for.

It is pleasing to note that, with the development of road transport by Burton Bros., cattle are being bought from the Gulf and the Peninsula to railheads. Road transport in conjunction with sea transport has been responsible for more money or more "station return"—if I could put it that way—to the grazier. Every time I travel throughout my area I see more bulldozers building dams and turkeynests and blocking up gullies. Production is on the way. The country is now experiencing development. We all talk about developing the North. It has really started for the first time in 25 or 30 years. The nation has been liberated from the yoke of Labour politicians. Great progress is taking place and we can look forward to prosperity.

Mining in Queensland is on the "up-and-up." At last the money for the rehabilitation of the Mt. Isa railway line is forthcoming, and that great mining concern can triple its production. When I was up there Mr. Fischer told me that they could mine 30,000 tons a day for 200 years without seeing the end of the lode. Not very far from there, in miles as we measure them up there, the great Broken Hill concern has discovered the Constance Range iron ore deposit. It does not mean much when you say "Constance Range," but what is it going to write in the pages of Queensland's history? It is the biggest deposit of iron ore in Australia—some say it is the biggest in the world. It has been said in the Chamber that at Blair Athol in Central Queensland we have the largest coal deposits in the world. Let us combine the two and make Queensland the greatest industrial State in Australia. It could provide all Australia's needs and, at the same time, export to the rest of the world. Let us convert our natural resources into the finished product. I am reliably informed that Constance Range is a great iron-ore deposit.

In the electorate of my friend the hon. member for Cook—I do not like going into his electorate; he is jealous of it—there is the Weipa bauxite field extending from one side of Cape York Peninsula to the other and coming out on the other side of Arnheim Land. Who knows what wealth is there to be recovered to our advantage?

Then there is Mary Kathleen, the uranium mine. What a great producer that is!

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. GILMORE: They got £450,000 for the road, but that is another story.

I want to appeal especially for assistance for the tin-mining industry. I think I would be correct in saying that more tin is produced in the Tablelands electorate than in any other electorate in Australia, but the price of tin is not sufficiently high to encourage expansion of production.

I think we should do well to look closely at the tin-mining industry. Let us endeavour to get a stabilised price based on 200s. a unit. I am sure that that would encourage production and we are far from self-sufficient in tin. Then, if we follow that up and apply the same taxation concessions to tin as we do to gold, that would be the necessary added inducement.

If we are sincere in wanting to develop this country we must encourage these industries. We do not want to continue developing around the cities, as my friend from Southport said. Let us take a broad view.

I pass now to the great job that has been done in relation to electricity supply. We had to step in and salvage the Tully scheme from the mess it was in, and complete it. Now it is of great benefit to North Queensland but we are running short of time. Time is running out because we have encouraged people to use electricity.

Mr. Pizzey: They have the money to use it.

Mr. GILMORE: Yes. That brings me to the iniquitous surcharge with which the Labour Party oppressed the people in out-back areas in true Labour form. The surcharge was 10 per cent. outside Cairns and it went up to 150 per cent. in Mt. Garnet, out in the bush. That is what the Labour Party did. We as the Government were able to lift that surcharge. I am proud of the Government that did that but, because of the demand, we now have to build a bigger, better, and stronger powerhouse on the Barron Falls. The sum of £10,800,000 has been allocated for that. Can anyone say it is not warranted? It is developing the North. Until the waters of the Tinaroo Dam are required for the growing of crops, they can be used free of charge for the benefit of the people who require electricity.

Money should be allocated for the Flaggy Creek Dam, to take up the leeway, and gangs of surveyors are now working in the Herbert Gorge, determining the sites for storage dams. If the Government remain in office—and there is no doubt they will while the rift exists—I am sure that the Herbert Gorge will be developed and so add to the electricity supplies of North Queensland.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. GILMORE: I do not normally interject and I very seldom reply to interjections, but I have been asked by the hon. member for Maryborough what Mr. McEwen did for the Burdekin. Anyone who has studied the Burdekin scheme would know that the economics of it were based on three sugar mills, each with the capacity of the Tully Mill. With a world over-supply of sugar, what would be our position today if we had three more mills pouring sugar onto the market? Anyone who suggested that would not be very popular with cane-growers.

I turn now to the Tully lands and the opening of them. We have in the Tully area a belt of country growing indigenous timbers that are unsurpassed in cabinet qualities. Nowhere else in Australia can we, or do we, produce such timber. We must consider the proposed utilisation of that land. Much of it is low-lying, swamp country that could be put under grass, but before we open up the area we should first of all declare certain parts of it as State forests and so prevent the cutting out of timber supplies. State forests should be declared immediately.

We seem to be going through an evolutionary period in cattle-fattening. Liquid feed is now available and feed-lot fattening is coming into vogue. I read recently that in one paddock of 80 acres in America 11,000 cattle were being fattened under the feed-lot system. At Kaban on the Evelyn Tableland Mr. Alf Johnston is carrying out a similar experiment. The feed-lot system is a revolutionary trend. Before we destroy the beautiful timbers of the Tully area and so prevent

regeneration of growth—and we have to think of the generations yet to come—let us be scientific in our approach and exhaust every avenue, because once the damage has been done it can never be repaired.

I have seen areas on both the Tableland and on the coast that should never have been opened up. They have now gone back to wild tobacco and bracken; they have not produced what it was hoped they would. If we undertake this proposal, let us have a full investigation so that we may have full knowledge. With great respect to those who want it—and every one of them is a practical man—the hon. member for Herbert, Mr. John Murray, is fattening cattle on third-rate country—and so are the Atkinsons and the Allinghams and a lot of others, on good cattle land. He is in the scrub country where the cabinet timbers grow. This is my reason for believing we should hasten slowly in this scheme.

The small towns on the Atherton Tableland have only one outlet for industry, and that is the timber industry. Over the years we have let the big mills on the coast draw their supplies from the Tableland. By doing that they have preserved the timber at their very front door. Within 7 miles—as the crow flies—from Cairns Timber Limited in Cairns there are millions of feet of timber on the Whitfield Range and in the upper head of Freshwater Creek that have never had an axe in them. They stand today just as they were when Captain Cook sailed by. That timber is within 7 miles of Cairns, yet those mills are denuding the Tableland and taking the industry away from the small towns. There is timber in the Daintree area and at Mulgrave and Tully that they could take. We will have ghost towns on the Tableland if we continue to denude the Tableland. We will drive the people away. We should stop the rot. Far too much in this State goes to the city. It seems to be the idea to build a bigger Brisbane, a bigger Sydney, a bigger Melbourne and a bigger Canberra and take the people out of the bush. I wonder if hon. members saw the statistics the other day showing that we have lost people from the bush. Because we are allowing these things to happen, we are losing them. I counsel along these lines those in Cabinet who are responsible.

Mr. Davies: Which Minister are you hitting at now?

Mr. GILMORE: I am speaking of matters that are of great importance to Queensland. Now that the Theatre Royal has closed its doors, I hope that some hon. members will not try to make this Chamber take its place. These are matters of vital importance and we must tackle them on that basis.

I wish to refer to the bush fires that occur every year on the Cairns Range. The R.S.L. in Cairns took this matter up only recently. The bush fires sweep up the

mountain ranges and every year they burn farther into the valuable regenerating forests. The Labour Party set the match and it still goes on. We will have to do something sooner or later, and the sooner we do it the more timber will be preserved.

When I heard the other day of the opening of the Mourilyan Harbour sugar terminal I thought back to the days when it was opposed over the years by the Labour Party. They would not grant it to the sugar industry. The little lighters would buzz in and take on a load of sugar and sail up to Cairns with it to the great advantage of Cairns. The development of the harbour was opposed by the Labour Party and by Labour members. The present hon. member who represents Mourilyan stood alone against his colleagues and tried to get them to do something. But he failed miserably. He had no chance. Then we came into power and the harbour was opened. We have heard it said in the Chamber time and time again, "We want cheap sugar," "We want cheap this," and "We want cheap that." The development of Mourilyan Harbour is one way in which the price of sugar has been kept down for the people of Queensland, and it is gratifying to me that the present Government were responsible for it.

Again, in Townsville we see evidence of the Government's desire to develop the country. We have gone in for education in the North in a big way. I am grateful to the Government, and so are the electors of Tablelands, for the excellent high schools that have been built there. Though the people of North Queensland generally do not agree on the location of the university, they are grateful for it. Education is going ahead and, as we are so dependent on science today, I am glad that the Government are conscious of the need to make advanced education available to everyone.

It gives me great pleasure to note the extension of free hospitalisation facilities. Queensland was on the verge of losing its free hospitalisation scheme; the former Treasurer, the hon. member for Bundaberg, gave more than one hint of that. Those who were in the Parliament at the time knew, and the Press gave it out, that he would have to review the free hospitalisation scheme; it was common knowledge. Today the scheme has not merely been preserved; it has been expanded. Every person in Queensland may rest assured that if he becomes ill he will be able to receive the very best free hospital attention.

The same Department administers native affairs. More houses have been built for the natives and their design has been improved. Some of those houses we saw at Normanton and Croydon were not very comfortable, but the new style in Mareeba and Georgetown—and I saw some in Mossman—are very much better. Natives are now taking their place in the work force of the nation. They are no longer confined to

reserves, and they are better housed. I am very glad to be able to say that in my area much greater interest is being taken in the welfare of the natives than ever before.

As I said at the outset, I compliment the Treasurer on the way in which he set out the Financial Statement. It has given us much food for thought and a very clear idea of where we are going in the coming year.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (5.37 p.m.): I should like to say this about the speech of the hon. member for Tablelands: never has so much been said by one member about so many subjects that he knows nothing about. As the Leader of the Opposition said, the only subject about which the hon. member did not speak was the Castro regime in Cuba. I wonder whether he had seen the report that Mr. McEwen was about to join the Liberal Party before he praised him.

The projects the hon. member mentioned—the Tully Falls scheme, the Barron Falls scheme, the Tinaroo Dam irrigation project, which feeds the Barron and provides the power about which so much has been said this afternoon—were all begun by Labour Governments, and we are very proud of that. The fact that the hon. member for Tablelands saw fit to praise them is another feather in the cap of the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. Windsor: Which Labour Party did that?

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member heard what I said. The Tinaroo irrigation scheme provides water for the tobacco-growing areas, and the tobacco crop will return—this is the figure given in today's paper—about £5,000,000 this year. The Country Party bitterly opposed that scheme in this Chamber when it was initiated. Let hon. members opposite get round that.

The Financial Statement has not brought cries of joy from the people in the North, and, after hearing the speeches from the Government benches, I should say that hon. members on that side of the Chamber have been on the defensive. The catchcry was that millions would be poured into Queensland, that the Government would create a climate for investment, that there would be an aura of prosperity in this State, and that there would be more jobs than men to fill them. They should say that in Townsville today! The Financial Statement shows, in effect, that none of these things have come to pass after this Government have been in office for 3½ years.

The Treasurer tried to explain why he has budgeted for a deficit. He claimed that the recent margins increase and the drought were responsible for the fact that for the fourth year in succession there would be a deficit in Queensland. I go home nearly every week-end, and as I travel to Townsville it is obvious how badly Queensland is in the grip of the present drought and how

great is the need for water conservation. We can make Queensland a great State only when we become independent of the seasons. We have abundant evidence before us of what drought can do—the Treasurer said that in presenting his Financial Statement—and each morning in this Chamber we hear a question designed to elicit the information that another area has been declared drought-stricken. But in spite of that the Treasurer has seen fit to reduce the allocation to the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply. Does that mean that valuable staff will be lost? In the North we are particularly conscious of the big part that that department and the Department of Agriculture and Stock have played, and will play, in the future development of the northland.

Before I go any further I shall reply to the attack launched against me last Thursday evening by the hon. member for Townsville South. As hon. members opposite listened to his speech—a speech of low quality—they must have felt very proud that they had failed to stand anyone against him in Townsville South, even though candidates were ready and eager. It proves what we of the Australian Labour Party have always maintained, that is, that the Liberal Party will shed its principles as one would shed an old coat, if it is politically expedient so to do.

Because of the hon. member's continued efforts to link me and my party with Communism, which is what caused my first clash with him in this Chamber—and will continue to if he persists in them—let us look at a few facts. Let us see what this "Queen Street-Quisling," this would-be "Moscow-mauler" who draws his skirts away lest he be contaminated each time the word "Communism" is mentioned, this living monument to "slobbering hypocrisy"—I borrow the word from him, if I may—had to say in his first speech in Parliament. I quote from "Hansard," Vol. 182, page 76, when the hon. member said—

"We bucked the machine. We have shown that in the North the feeling is growing. We collaborated with the Communist Party. I told the Press that last October, but the Premier told the party that this story told by Aikens that there was going to be collaboration with the Communist Party in the north was 'hooley.' A man who was not known in the Kennedy polled over 2,000 votes. Ask Mr. Theodore, probably one of the most balanced members in the House, the shock he got when his unknown opponent polled thousands of votes against him. Ask Harry Bruce about the Tableland, and George Keyatta about Townsville."

It is small wonder that he is known in Townsville as "Two-bob-each-way Tom."

The other week we had the extraordinary spectacle of his praising the present member for Herbert. The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, Mr.

Evans, had something to say about Mr. Murray and I quote from the "Townsville Daily Bulletin" of 3 October, 1960—

"Mr. John Murray should be assisting the State Government in its efforts to secure finance to build roads to the Channel Country.

"This was said today by the Minister for Development (Mr. E. Evans). He said Mr. Murray (Liberal member for Herbert in the House of Representatives), was 'running true to form' on controversial political issues.

"Mr. Murray in the Federal House had criticised the decision to build a road network to the Channel Country.

"Mr. Evans said: 'Mr. Murray's acrobatic political feat in sliding off the Country Party platform to become a Liberal immediately he was elected to Federal Parliament is not forgotten.'

"He also said: 'It appears in this case that he is more concerned with his own political hide than adopting a statesmanlike attitude.'

"Mr. Evans said Mr. Murray should be aware that Queensland had budgeted to spend £693,000 this year and would continue the various roads to complete the scheme.

"Queensland would do that, even if some Queensland members would not assist to break down the discrimination that had and still was operating against Queensland.

"Apparently, said Mr. Evans, Mr. Murray had forgotten that 200,000 head of cattle had died during the drought in the Channel Country area.

"Mr. Evans said he would make available to Mr. Murray reports by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and by the State's own Development Director, (Mr. W. Hansen)."

Obviously that man is loved by Country Party members in this Government.

The hon. member for Townsville South saw fit to refer to my family and to my fertility. I would venture to say that it would have been long ago—longer than he cares to remember—that he was relegated to the realms of the "cunning consultant" prefacing all his statements with, "I mind the time when—" So much for the hon. member. If he continues to attack me he can expect attacks from me.

The subject of beef cattle-fattening is very dear to the hearts of all Northerners but especially to those of the people of Townsville, where seasonal work is now causing great worry to hundreds of workers and their families. A rather exciting experiment is being carried out at Kalamia mill in the fattening of cattle. The mill has a machine that can be driven into the standing cane and that shreds it and feeds it into a large holding basket. The shredded cane is fed to young beasts along with a measure of crushed grain and meal and adulterated

molasses. The cattle are kept in areas about one chain by three chains in which there is water and shade, and they have made gains of from 2½ to 4 lb. a day. The first batch of 21 was sold recently and it was claimed by butchers in Townsville who bought the carcasses that the beef was of prime quality. I do not know the exact cost of turning off the beasts but everything at the moment points to its being quite economic.

Here is a way to turn off fat cattle immediately, using the standover cane at the same time. The grain could be grown on well-established farms in the Burdekin valley. There must be hundreds of farms in the Burdekin valley where this method could be employed and I think the Government should inquire into it immediately and, if necessary, purchase some of the machines I have mentioned.

It would not be necessary to wait for the lands to be exploited; the potential is already there. The land is cleared and fertile. I mention the Burdekin valley specifically because it has the type of climate in which cattle thrive. If ever there is an area crying out for exploitation it is the Burdekin valley, and every Northerner should demand that the Commonwealth Government make the building of the Burdekin Dam its next major Australian project. Can we point to one major project in Queensland that was begun by the Commonwealth Government? The answer is "No", and the crying shame of it is that not one of the Queensland members of the Commonwealth Government has raised his voice in protest.

Last week the hon. member for Condamine saw fit in this Chamber to attack the railway workers. I refer hon. members to the following passage of his speech in "Hansard" No. 7 at page 584—

"Hon. members opposite may tear into me as much as they like over the next matter I raise. A railway man who was retired three years ago, after working for the department throughout his working life, told me that he has watched closely what is going on in the service. He spoke to me about the standards set and the amount of work each man is supposed to do in a day. He told me that the number of employees of the department could be cut by a third, and that the remaining employees, if they worked, would be able to do all the work done at the present time. That is the reason for increased rail freights."

I strongly defend those much maligned workers and trade unionists, and say that the hon. member would have been better advised to stay on ground of which he has a good knowledge. I listened with interest to his speech about the brigalow country and the hardships of the small farmers and dairymen under the present Government, but my hackles really rose when he attacked the railway men. Does not the hon. member realise that all of the railway workers are seething with discontent already, and rightly

so, without his unwarranted and unfounded attacks, based on information from a malcontent who sets himself up as an authority and whose genuineness can be gauged from the fact that he was prepared to sell his mates down the river to a Tory.

These workers are justifiably discontented with the failure of the Industrial Court to grant wage increases to all railway men. Its failure to grant wage justice while the tall poppies of the Public Service and the judiciary count their increases in hundreds and thousands is hard to swallow. The average railway man finds it difficult to understand why a small section enjoyed an increase and 20,000 of them received nothing. We can realise their discontent more when we take into account that they have to pay for everyday commodities the same price as those more fortunate ones who got a rise. The average railway man is certainly not sour on his brother because he did get a rise, but he demands wage justice.

Mr. Houghton: Do you believe in arbitration?

Mr. TUCKER: Thousands of those whom the hon. member for Condamine attacked live and work under the most primitive conditions. Get away from that one. Small bondwood huts in which they can barely swing a cat are the places many of these men and their families call home. Those on the small branch lines get their groceries once a week, if they are lucky; their water is carried to them in water gins and must be husbanded like gold, and they have no refrigeration. To them living is always difficult, and in the trying summer months in the North and North-west it is even more so. Statistics show that one fettle in every four suffers from sun cancer.

These people—the hardest working people in the railways—who live under primitive conditions, without any of the amenities of the city such as electricity, running water and refrigeration, or entertainments such as picture shows, football and other sports—in fact, all the amenities found in the more favoured centres—received no increase. I believe a ganger received an increase of 6d. a week for the highly responsible position he holds. He is personally responsible for the maintenance of his length, and his clerical duties include the recording of materials received, including sleepers, keeping a record of times worked by his gang, including time lost and time engaged on extraneous duties, and annual leave must be recorded by him, too.

There are at present four fettle in a gang, including the ganger. Strangely enough the history of the four-man gang goes back 40 years to when the railways were using small "A" class and B15 engines, and when wear and tear on the permanent way was in no way comparable with that of today, with the introduction of 90-ton diesel engines, heavy loads and increased speeds. Big loads of 900 to 1,000 tons are now hauled where

in the early times the maximum load was 150 tons. The terrific wear and tear on the permanent way can be imagined, but repeated requests for an increase in gang numbers have met with the same refusal.

Fettling gangs, relaying gangs, bridge gangs and flying gangs have all suffered as a result of the increase in loads and speeds. Shunters work under extremely dangerous conditions. They work round the clock in three shifts and irrespective of the condition of the weather, be it a cyclone, rain, hail or snow, the shunter is expected to be on duty at the appointed hour. Many insurance companies will not insure them. Five or six have lost their lives in Townsville in shunting operations in the last 25 years, and numbers have been injured. Quite often in cyclonic or rainy weather the kerosene lights used by the shunters can hardly be kept alight. Theirs is a very hazardous occupation and they, too, are hurt at the Court's decision. Cleaners, firemen and guards in the lower wage bracket receive nothing, either.

There is discontent, too, among the tradesmen—the fitters and turners in the iron and woodwork section, the trades assistants and the loco. labourers.

In the goods shed, porters, checkers and checkers-in-charge—all failed to receive increases arising out of the recent Court decision.

Although increases were recently granted to drivers and guards, there is still discontent among train men over the vexatious interpretation given by the railway interpreter.

The most vexatious interpretation is the one governing crews held up along the roads by floods or derailments or for other causes. For most of those delays the men are not responsible, but trains are held up for five or six hours or more and their crews are paid only waiting-time or half waiting-time for the period of the hold-up.

Again, with shunters, so bad had conditions become in the railway shunting yards at Townsville that shunters had to enforce the rules and regulations to back their demands for more engine-power and more men. The department adopted a pig-headed attitude and held out on the men. Trains were held up for long periods. So bad did the position become that finally the Commissioner dispatched a special officer to investigate. That special officer is now the general manager of the Northern Division in Townsville, Mr. Dinsmore. He is a very capable and conscientious officer, highly respected by the men and by the union in Townsville. When he went there at that time he spent hours in the shunting yard, day and night. Finally he reported that the shunters had justice on their side and recommended that their demands be granted, and they were. Here again the men had to resort to drastic action before they obtained justice. That is why I said the department had adopted a pig-headed attitude. After holding out, it

sent a special officer up there, and when he reported that the men had right on their side, their claims were granted. Why were their claims not granted in the first place? Why could not some conciliation have taken place on that occasion? It is typical of the type of thing that is happening.

Mr. Rae: They have never had a better spin in their lives than they are getting from this Government.

Mr. TUCKER: The present Minister is not earning the respect of the men or the unions by these tactics.

Recently a Cabinet meeting was held in Townsville. Next morning the Minister for Transport refused to meet a deputation from the Combined Railway Unions to discuss the many problems affecting the railways and railwaymen. As they came down the steps of the Town Hall I was waiting to meet Mr. Muller, and one of the men who came out was the Northern District Secretary of the Australian Railways Union, Mr. E. P. O'Brien. As they came down, their faces were a study. I felt that the rebuff that was given to those men was ill-considered.

Mr. Bennett: What did they go to Townsville for?

Mr. Windsor: This is not a Queen Street Government.

Mr. TUCKER: I would say to the Minister that courtesy costs nothing. It is not the first time that has been said, and they are not my words, but they are quite true. If the Minister had adopted a conciliatory attitude and met that deputation, even if he had not been able to promise them anything, he would have earned their respect, and I say that in all sincerity. I think the Government will realise very soon that it does not cost anything to be conciliatory to any man, no matter who he is or what he is, or how much you try to make out that is a Communist or something of that sort. If you can meet a man and talk to him as man to man, at least he will go away with respect for you in his heart. When one sees men walk down the steps of a hall, their faces burning, having been rebuffed as these men were, one realises why there is discontent in the railways, and I am sure that there is no more discontent anywhere than there is at Townsville.

Mr. Pizzey: When did they make up their minds about this deputation?

An Opposition Member: When you were out at Magnetic Island.

Mr. Pizzey: Another of your lies. I was never there. I beg your pardon, Mr. Taylor—another one of his untruths.

Mr. TUCKER: I will answer that question through you, Mr. Taylor, if I may. It was on the night of the civic reception that I

introduced a couple of these men to Mr. Chalk and asked that he see them and talk to them. It was there that they requested that he meet them next morning. His answer was that if they were lucky they might meet him down the street.

Mr. Pizzey: Too short notice for a deputation.

Mr. TUCKER: I have arranged deputations at much shorter notice than that. I agree that a number of Ministers have been very considerate, but I could not say the same of the Minister for Transport.

In his speech, the hon. member for Condamine attacked the railway men and also referred in derogatory terms to the 40-hour week in the pastoral industry. I quote from "Hansard" for 11 October, 1960, at page 582—

"Mr. SULLIVAN: That is an interesting point. How many holidays do we give them? Go out into the western areas where they are working 40 hours a week. Under the old system, if there was a rodeo on for two or three days the boss said, 'Righto, boys, we will go to town and have the week-end off.'"

How magnanimous! They would have a week-end off!

"Mr. Beardmore: And they got paid for it, too."

"Mr. SULLIVAN: Of course they got paid for it. With the coming of the 40-hour week those things are all gone."

I do not know how he works that one out.

"If you have a yarn to the fellows employed out in the western grazing areas and ask them whether they are better off under the 40-hour week than previously, when relations were better between employer and employee, you will find that none of them are abiding by the rules of the 40-hour week."

It was the A.W.U. that was responsible for the restriction of hours in the pastoral industry. It was that union that insisted that the Act include a restriction on hours, and the court had no option but to grant it. Because of that, cooks and workers around the homesteads now enjoy a 40-hour week spread over six days. Outside workers like ringers enjoy a 44-hour week spread over the same period. Any hours in excess of that attract overtime rates. Overtime is the crux of the matter; that is what raises the squeal from Government benches. Perhaps they would like to go back to the old times when men worked 60 and more hours a week. They worked from the crack of dawn until well after sunset.

Mr. Windsor: What is your authority for that?

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member asks for my authority. I remember the whole sorry business when I was a child. If anyone here says that it did not happen I say that they are straying from the truth.

Government Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask hon. members to allow the hon. member to make his speech.

Mr. TUCKER: —

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member is going to continue his speech I ask that he continue and not make these long pauses.

Mr. TUCKER: Despite the protestations of hon. members opposite the 40-hour week is working well, except in those cases where graziers are deliberately making it difficult, or appear difficult, in an endeavour to sabotage it. I must in all fairness declare that a large majority of graziers are co-operative, and making it work well. However, when I hear statements like the one I just quoted, I consider that they are made for the benefit of the three-man committee set up by the Minister for Labour and Industry to make recommendations for amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Hon. members will remember that in accordance with their alleged scrupulous fairness in these matters the Government took care to exclude union representatives from that committee. Anyway, it is my opinion that these people hope for an amendment to provide that the court may decide what hours shall be worked. Of course, they hope by insidious propaganda to prevail on the court to vary the hours.

I turn now to something for which a number of my colleagues and I were urging for many years before I became a member of Parliament—country housing for public servants. In the State Public Service the Government have the most efficient and capable men in Australia. Despite the fashionable jokes that go the rounds, public servants work much harder than their counterparts in private enterprise. I make no apology for that statement. Indeed, I can name any number of men who, since the war, have been working under a strain that no man should be called upon to bear.

Without detracting in any way from the ability and loyalty of other members of the Public Service, I should say that the staff of the Titles Office—southern, central and northern, from the Registrar, Mr. Thomson, who is now almost at the end of a long and able career, to the youngest office lad—take second place to none for efficiency.

In the course of their service many public servants move round this vast State, firstly as juniors and finally as senior administrators, keeping up the efficiency of the Service. Time and time again their families are uprooted, their children have to change schools, friends are left behind, homes are sold, and they move into an unknown city or town where conditions may not be comparable with those they left behind. I take my hat off to the wives who go along with their men to make their homes in a new environment.

However, as if that were not enough another bogey since the war has been finding a home at the new destination. The prices of comparable homes can vary by up to £1,000 from city to city and town to town. Hon. members can imagine the feelings of a man selling out in a cheap area and going to a dear one. The same remarks apply to rentals. In Townsville in particular the housing shortage is acute and consequently rentals are very high. A public servant finds himself accepting a country promotion with a rise of, say, £30 for the first year and an increased rental of perhaps £3 a week, with the result that he may be £2 10s. a week out of pocket.

It behoves the Government to look into the housing of country public servants and remove anxiety from their minds by building or acquiring homes for them in country districts. This would ensure, especially in the country districts of the West, that families of public servants would have at least some amenities.

While speaking about public servants, I mention those men who, having given almost a lifetime of service in the country and having been prepared to take every promotion as it came, find themselves passed over when the top jobs in Brisbane become vacant. I should not say that that happens every time. I know that some departmental heads are scrupulously fair, but there are others who are obviously influenced by the proximity of the men working under them in Brisbane. In addition to that, a Brisbane man has a chance to relieve in the higher position and then claim greater efficiency. These outside men cannot do that.

In the instance I have in mind a man worked his way through a department with a number of years of country service, and became the manager of a large Townsville office. He could hardly, by any stretch of imagination, be declared inefficient or he would not have been appointed to that managership. However, when a Brisbane position to which he was entitled by seniority became vacant recently, he was passed over to the advantage of a Brisbane man. His only method of retrieving the position now is by way of appeal. That is wrong.

An Opposition Member: Was there any politics in that one?

Mr. TUCKER: It is wrong that he should have to resort to a costly and unnerving appeal when he was morally entitled to the position. Rumour has it that there certainly was politics in it. My opinion is that, all things being equal, the man who is prepared to go into the country should receive favourable treatment and seniority should be jealously guarded. I believe the present Government are steadily whittling that condition away. If it continues the Public Service will become the rat race of the commercial world.

Finally, the hon. member for Townsville South claimed last Thursday evening that I had made myself unpopular with the Government. My people did not send me down here to play ring-a-rosy with the Country-Liberal Government. I believe it is the job of the Opposition to keep the administration on their toes. I will voice the complaints of my people without fear of the consequences. If that makes me unpopular with the Government it will be a sign that I am doing my duty.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (7.36 p.m.): I have perused the Estimates and have made a detailed analysis of it. Apart altogether from the astronomical figures it contains, it is a most impressive document and sets out in very clear manner the way in which the Government are budgeting for the works and services of the State. Some hon. members have complained that no detailed study of the requirements of the State has been made and that the Budget does not cover the expenditure required in Queensland with its developmental growing-pains. There is no doubt that in the future, as in the past, with natural increase in population and development of resources, Queensland will require an ever-increasing amount of money from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Davies: You are more optimistic than the Treasurer.

Mr. HUGHES: I will deal fully with that aspect as I proceed.

From hon. members opposite we have heard nothing but tongue-in-cheek statements about expenditure, and to some extent they have suggested Queensland is going backwards because its revenue is not spent in proper directions. Having made a detailed study of the Estimates, I challenge such statements. We find that the estimated expenditure for the Department of Health and Home Affairs is £18,074,375, approximately £2,000,000 more than for last year. That has been the trend since this Government took office, although it is very significant to note that under Labour Governments expenditure on the health and welfare of the people was almost stationary. Since the present Government assumed office the annual expenditure in this direction has increased by about £2,000,000 a year.

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member has had time to study the document and should base his submissions on facts. In this direction alone the Government have proved they are providing for the welfare of the people to a far greater extent than Labour Governments when they were in office.

Mr. Bennett: They didn't do much for the Brisbane City Council.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member should know about that. He left no trail of glory in that sphere. I should think he would do well to listen in silence.

The estimated expenditure by the Department of Public Works again shows an increase over the expenditure last year—a very significant amount. Again, the estimated expenditure by the Department of Labour and Industry shows an increase over last year's. I shall deal with that at greater length in my speech when I refer to the Department of Education.

We notice the same pattern of stagnation through the years set by Labour administration in this State. The figures tell the story. The Government are providing as they recognise the need and their duty to the welfare of the people of the State and the children. There is provision for a £2,800,000 increase in Expenditure on education this year. That is very significant because in Queensland we are proud that there is some virility of Government and a proper recognition of the needs of the community. These two departments alone—the Department of Health and Home Affairs and the Department of Education—show a significant increase in the allocation under the Budget. To compile the Budget to give the increases that are shown in almost every departmental vote, including Irrigation, Labour and Industry and right through the Budget, the Treasurer has had his share of headaches and burden on the type and form of expenditure, to relate it to the revenue and income that the State receives.

I say that because I will be dealing in some detail with the amount of revenue that the State receives from the Commonwealth by way of reimbursement and the fact that there is a very noticeable lack of grant from the Commonwealth to the State for any project that will assist not only the economy of the State, but its further progress and expansion. I can see evidence of the financial wizardry of the Treasurer and of his outstanding ability in the figure picture that is presented throughout the Estimates. They evidence to this Committee that not only can the Country-Liberal Parties govern this State, but they can govern it wisely and well and in the general interests of the people and their welfare in every section of the community.

I could speak for hours on the legacy of debt and hardship left to this Government by their predecessors, but I prefer to take a far more objective view and look to the future, because we must look to the future for the benefit of the economy of the State. In particular, we must have courage as administrators and leave something to those who follow us that will be their heritage, so that they may say of this Government, "Not only did they have courage; they had vision to leave us something worth while from which we are now benefiting." That is the general theme running through this

document. Queensland's developmental needs and problems and its expansion are restricted not by the vision of the policy of the Ministers and the members of the Government—there are many members who take a practical and genuine interest in the welfare of the State—but by the very limited financial resources available.

Mr. Davies: Whose fault is that?

Mr. HUGHES: If the hon. member curbs his impatience he will learn something from this speech.

I express a sincere desire that the Government should accelerate the rate of progress and expansion in this State; all Government members do. I believe that only through the grant of sufficient money from Commonwealth sources can we achieve a rate of expansion that will pacify the people of Queensland and satisfy in particular the Country-Liberal Party Government.

Queensland must progress, especially in the fields of manufacturing and other industries. I suggest that the Commonwealth should heed the plea of hon. members of this Assembly and make funds available for a project in Queensland, whether it be an irrigation project or some other type, but certainly a project in some form that will aid the establishment of industry. I think the suggestion has great merit and deserves detailed consideration. In fact, all the factors that have brought about the present condition of the financial structure of the State's economy should be carefully examined. During my research into this matter, I took many notes and some of those I made from the utterances of the Treasurer bear repeating. He said that the Commonwealth Constitution, whilst vesting the customs and excise power exclusively in the Commonwealth—and that goes back to Federation—envisaged a sharing by the States in those revenues. He added that the device of transferring Commonwealth surpluses to trust funds has completely frustrated what was a clear intention under the Constitution.

Now is a good time to consider the sections of the Constitution dealing with these matters,—that is, customs and excise duties passed to the Commonwealth—in particular, Sections 86 and 87. Section 87 provides that the balance of such revenue in excess of 25 per cent. shall be passed to the States. In 1957-1958 Commonwealth revenue from customs and excise was £304,364,644. Queensland received, by way of reimbursement, £1,727,231, or £1 4s. 7d. per head of population as against £2 17s. 1d. per head in 1900. So, while we have received a greater sum than in those days, thanks to increased population, we have received less per capita than in 1900; we received only £1,000,000 out of the £304,000,000 collected.

I relate these facts to Queensland's urgent need for expansion and development. I repeat that Queensland has its growing pains. The State for a long time stagnated under a

Labour administration which had become inept and lazy. So many things were taken for granted and allowed to continue as they were.

In 1957 this Government took office with a vigour unknown in the administrative life of the State for so many years and there was a very noticeable change. It was like a clean, fresh, spring breeze on a hot summer day. The moment the Country-Liberal Government took office, they assessed the State's needs and made a drive to meet the people's requirements in works and services, and in particular they made a detailed study of industry. I will outline some of their considerations as I proceed.

Mr. Bromley: Name one project that this Government have started.

Mr. HUGHES: I will name several major projects, if the hon. member will be patient. With the development that is now taking place, and development that is proposed for the future, there are many ways in which the Commonwealth Government can help Queensland, just as they have gone to the aid of southern States. Even though many Votes have been increased for the year 1960-1961, we need further money for health services, homes to meet the needs of an increasing population, and a system of roads to cope with the modern phenomenon of road transport. I think one in every 3.7 people in Queensland owns a motor vehicle, which proves that it is a motoring age. We need more expenditure on irrigation, education, and the establishment of new industries.

In Volume 224 of "Hansard", page 316, the Treasurer said—

"In the revised formula of income tax reimbursements which was adopted in June of this year, the South Australian base entitlement is £30 4s. 2d. per capita in comparison with Queensland's £25 2s. 3d. per capita."

This morning I asked a question of the Treasurer, and his reply was very enlightening. He said that the figure for Queensland was now £26 per head of population.

Mr. Hanlon: What is it in South Australia?

Mr. HUGHES: The Queensland figure is £26 16s. 4d., and it is fourth on the list. The figure for South Australia is £32 1s. 6d. The average for all States is £25 19s. 11d., so Queensland is just a point or two above the average. As South Australia and other southern States have received grants from revenue, I believe that Queensland is entitled to the same treatment.

Mr. Burrows: Your Government made a claim that if they were returned to office they would be more favourably treated by the Federal Government.

Mr. HUGHES: Hon. members opposite should forget their political bias and admit
1960—2E

that the Treasurer is fearless in his presentation of facts. His courage is to be commended. On all occasions he puts Queensland first and politics second, and it is the bounden duty of every hon. member in this Chamber to do the same. The entreaties put forward by hon. members will not only be heeded by the Federal Government but will also be given effect to in the future.

I do not wish my remarks to be construed as a personal attack on members of the Federal Parliament, because I deplore public face-slapping and wrangling by men prominent in public life; I do not think it will achieve anything. But I believe that this Assembly should put before the Commonwealth Government and the public impartially and dispassionately the facts as we see them, and we expect that our requests, if treated in the same impartial way, will result in additional grants and revenue from the Commonwealth.

Mr. Davies: The Treasurer and the Minister for Public Lands spoke very strongly about that.

Mr. HUGHES: As I have already said, we in this Government—I say this unequivocally—are dictated to by no outside source. We receive no instructions, and we speak fearlessly and as we conscientiously believe we should in the interests of Queensland. I certainly do not get any instructions from the Trades Hall, as some hon. members do.

A considerable portion of the differential represents the added interest burden, so to that extent the argument that the rest of Australia is being called upon to subsidise capital development in South Australia is an enduring feature of our national finance.

The Commonwealth Government are able to carry out the bulk of their capital works out of revenue before initially measuring their surplus. Having then disposed of their surplus by the device of transfer, they lend the bulk of it to the States at interest. There are many figures that I could quote but again I ask hon. members to accept the figures of the Treasurer and other speakers before me. I speak for towns and cities in all parts of the State when I say that we do not seek charity; we seek only adequate revenues as of our right. At the moment I do not think we get them. I think it is morally wrong and strategically stupid to concentrate capital and expenditure in the South. For far too long that has been not only the Federal Government attitude but also the attitude of mind of the people in the South. I do not want to start a States war but I do believe that the people in the South must be mindful that there are avaricious eyes to the north of Queensland, and they are looking south. We certainly do not want Queensland—a State vast in area, sparsely inhabited, a State that is crying out for development—not receiving as of right its share of revenue for its proper development.

I could cite instances where in the South grants from revenue were made for developmental works. The Commonwealth Government made a free grant of 70 per cent. of the cost of railway rebuilding in southern States and provided the remaining 30 per cent. as a loan. They also made a grant from the Commonwealth Sinking Fund for mining development at Radium Hill.

Mr. Davies: How many years have they to repay the loan?

Mr. HUGHES: I am not going into details; I am merely citing cases. South Australia was granted concessions assessed at nearly £750,000 on the Leigh Creek railway.

In recent years Queensland has made a notable contribution to the development of the southern States. Again I quote the Treasurer's speech from "Hansard" of 16 September 1959—

"At the Australian Loan Council in June last, the Works and Housing programme agreed to was £220,000,000. Queensland's share of this amount is £22,750,000 for Works and £3,480,000 for Housing making £26,230,000 in all."

From this detailed study of the capital works and services from the Commonwealth Consolidated Revenue Fund—a most startling document—it will no doubt be understood why I urge that every hon. member of the Committee, in a complete, courageous and sincere manner, use his resources and entreaties to convince those in authority in the Commonwealth Government to see that Queensland, with its crying need for development, gets of right its share of revenue for its proper development.

Mr. Donald: Don't you think the present Queensland representatives look after Queensland's interests?

Mr. HUGHES: I am putting this argument objectively and on a high plane.

Mr. Hanlon: The basic reason is that there are only three members against the Government sent from Queensland and 15 for the Government. That is why the Commonwealth ignore us completely.

Mr. HUGHES: I admit what the hon. member says could appear on the surface to have some substance, but I suggest that, to get the message across to those in authority in the Federal Parliament, it should not be a matter of playing politics or one State against another. Surely Queensland is entitled to a fair share of the available moneys and so recognise the need of those in authority and be big enough to see that Queensland, marching to progress and prosperity, is growing up. One should hope that they would recognise our growing pains and look at it in a broad Australian manner, if for no other reason than that it would be Australia's finest and best defence measure.

Mr. Davies: Do you agree with what Senator Wood said?

Mr. HUGHES: I have already said that I will not deal with inane interjections. For the Snowy Mountains hydro-electric power scheme and the standardisation of the Albury to Melbourne railway line, the total payments from Commonwealth Consolidated Revenue Fund are £132,102,990. In South Australia the Stirling North-Brachina-Leigh Creek-Maree railway and the standardisation of South Australian railways have taken £17,485,909. In Western Australia, Western Australia Waterworks and the development of North-western Australia cost £3,977,267. In Tasmania, for the Australian Aluminium Production Commission, £9,499,850; in Queensland not an ounce of copper, not a solitary £1. Queensland has a blank sheet.

That is the basis of my argument. Queensland makes a valuable contribution to the economy of this country; Queenslanders pay a tremendous amount in excise and customs duties and towards revenue generally and, as a right, they should receive something back from the Commonwealth by way of grants. As I have read from this document, we are not getting our rights.

Mr. HUGHES: I shall further quote figures showing that Queensland should receive consideration in other ways but that such consideration has been noticeably lacking in the past. The figures deal with Commonwealth Government expenditure on relief. I shall deal only with the most recent review. For flood relief, bush-fire relief, cyclone relief and storm-damage relief in the 1953-1954 period other States got £132,483 whilst Queensland got nothing; for 1954-1955 other States got £598,491; Queensland got only £1,804.

That is the general pattern. Queensland has received an infinitesimal amount of the total grants by the Commonwealth to the States for developmental works.

I hope that in the immediate future those in authority will review the situation and come to the conclusion that in the interests of Australia they have a moral obligation to provide funds for a major project in Queensland. We have to discard the notion that we are able to hold our population through two factors—free hospitalisation and a low cost of living—although I am of the firm conviction that they have been major factors in the past. Queenslanders suffer through acts of God in the form of floods and drought. In the tropics we have to contend with the climate, flies, heat and other disadvantages. On the other hand the State has tremendous potential. Apart from forethought, courage, downright common sense and virility of government, Queensland needs financial assistance if it is to be developed. In times of emergency Queensland would be a bastion in the defence of the Commonwealth, but to be effective in that role it

must have increased population, which in its train would bring a higher standard of living and a sounder economy. But to get increased population we must do more than rely on the free hospital policy, to which the Government are pledged, and a low cost of living.

Mr. Hanlon: That is one of your difficulties with the Grants Commission. If you go to the Grants Commission it will probably tell you to "wipe" free hospitalisation as has been done in the other States.

Mr. HUGHES: It is a tradition in Queensland, and the Government are pledged to maintain it. They will never sell out on that policy merely to get a few paltry pounds.

Development in the beef and other primary industries is desirable, but in itself is not sufficient. Developmental projects must be undertaken and secondary industries must be encouraged. During the recent drought we imported butter from the south, which proves conclusively that Queensland's economy, both now and in the future, must not be based solely on primary industries. The accent today should be on industrial expansion, and I hope the Commonwealth Government will heed our plea to provide additional financial assistance for the expansion of industry. The Government are tackling the task vigorously within the limits of their financial resources. We need special assistance to deal with unemployment and decentralisation of industry. We should strive for a harmonious relationship with the Federal Government and try to get them to recognise our requirements.

Mr. Davies: Are any of your Federal members giving any support to your ideas?

Mr. HUGHES: Queensland Liberal Party members in the Federal sphere are as concerned as I am about this matter, and they have expressed their concern to me. They share my views and I hope that their efforts will culminate in fruition.

There is industrial expansion both in the city and throughout the State. I have heard so much, particularly from members of the Opposition, when they have been decrying any suggestion that we should build up the industrial and manufacturing strength of the State. Every time the Minister for Labour and Industry espouses some project or proposal it is immediately laughed at by members of the Opposition. There should be a higher plane of thinking than political hypocrisy. The development of the economy of the State should be above those things.

Mr. Davies: We support any sincere move to develop the State.

Mr. HUGHES: The reasons advanced by hon. members opposite when the Minister for Labour and Industry was telling us of the cement works in North Queensland, and his sincere outlay of energy to entice to this State a £15,000,000 oil refinery, certainly throw back the lie direct to the interjectors.

In 1957 new registrations for companies in the State were 819. In 1958 they were 1,198, in 1959 they were 1,604; for the six months ending 30 June this year they were 1,016, and in the last three months they were 417. Hon. members will see here again the pattern of progress of development and the virility and sincerity of the Government. They will see a jump from 819 in 1957 to 1,100 and 1,600, and in half a year to over 1,000. They will see the general pattern of progress and development of industry in the State. Those figures do not include firms or private businesses; they cover only registered companies. There have been a few closures, the average being about six to 12 a month. Many of the closures have been of companies that have been registered for convenience. I mentioned the other day the Collier-Garland fiasco. Some of them could not be described basically as of benefit to the State. A few that are not of benefit to the State are closing down, and a few television retail outfits are closing down. There are those few closures, but the general average increase is such as to represent a remarkable achievement by the Minister in his drive to obtain industry for the State. Industry means employment and employment means a generally increased purchasing power throughout the whole community and a soundness of the State's economy.

Mr. Windsor: A higher standard of living.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, certainly.

Queensland is still the best State to live in. If hon. members want to "knock" that, they may go ahead. It seems to be the general pattern of members of the Opposition to be "knockers," particularly on industry. I hope they will keep their minds on a higher plane and do everything possible to espouse the virtues of Queensland and assist in the development of industry in this State.

By way of a question the other day the hon. member for Townsville South asked for details of new industries and increased population. The Minister for Labour and Industry replied—

"I would point out that since April of this year my department has sponsored 16 industries for land at Garbutt with the Land Administration Commission."

There is proof positive in one location only of the accent being not on industries for the cities only. This is not Queen Street Government. This is an inducement to industry to expand its resources through the whole of the State and thereby is of benefit to areas generally in cushioning as far as possible, unemployment—which is related to the financial condition of the State—in the sugar industry and other primary-producing industries; in fact, every industry affected through seasonal conditions and changes.

I admire the Minister for the work he has done and is doing in his capacity and for the

sincerity and drive he has shown. I know that his diligence must be recognised sooner or later even by hon. members opposite, because the State's position today is so much sounder than it was a few years ago. However, much remains to be done.

Let me draw the attention of the Committee to one or two ways in which the State is expanding. Whether hon. members opposite want to recognise it or not, the facts are as plain as can be. In authorised and recognised reports that do not bear contradiction it is stated that Central Queensland is to have a £1,000,000 cement works. The Minister said that immediately the first stage of the plant was operating the company would begin construction of a large-scale cement works. Efforts are being made at Port Alma to have a £15,000,000 oil refinery established. The efforts and diligence of the present Government in enticing industry to Queensland are among the soundest moves ever made by any Government. They are tackling something in which there was a back lag; more than that, the State suffered a loss of prestige in the South. I venture to suggest that during the days of stagnation under Labour there was the feeling right throughout the industrial community of Australia, "Do not invest in Queensland. You cannot trust that State. For one thing, you do not know whether the industry will be socialised." (Opposition laughter.) That is part of the platform of hon. members opposite. I suggest that Mr. Egerton could do irreparable harm to Queensland in his spoken words. However, industrialists know that they can trust the present Government and that they can invest here not merely with a great degree of safety but with real hope that the future will bring their investments fit and proper reward.

Mr. Davies: How is it that there are fewer factories in Maryborough and in six of the largest towns on the coast now than there were in 1957? How do you explain that?

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: I hear a number of interjectors on my right and all they are doing is deriding and "knocking" the Minister in his efforts. Those who believe in Labour's line of thought are "knocking" on all sides. They will not give credit where credit is due. However, it can be said without fear of contradiction that the efforts of this Government to foster industry in Queensland are one of the soundest economic moves that have been made in the last half century.

Mr. Davies: Read your newspapers!

Mr. HUGHES: I will read newspaper reports to the hon. member. When the hon. member for Townsville North was speaking he derided the Government for claiming that they would create a climate for investment and an aurora of investment. Again that was derision. He was "knocking" the State.

Let me give him and you, Mr. Taylor, the lie direct. Certainly there is an aurora of investment and a climate for safe investment here now and it is having an effect throughout the State.

In this morning's "Courier-Mail" under the heading, "Tips Us as Big Centre" appeared this report—

"The centre of gravity of Australia's industrial potential was swinging northwards from Sydney and Melbourne as Queensland became more developed.

"The United Kingdom Trade Commissioner in New South Wales (Mr. N. L. Hibbs) said this in Murwillumbah yesterday."

He said he would recommend Queensland to British investors as a rapidly developing State. He is a man with a tremendous knowledge and a wealth of factual information, a man from within the Labour-governed State of New South Wales. Surely hon. members opposite will not dare to suggest that he does not know what he is talking about, yet he recommends Queensland as a State with a tremendous future.

I will prove my point further by quoting the value of exports.

Mr. Donald: A lot of talk!

Mr. HUGHES: This is more than talk. Hon. members opposite would do well to travel round the State instead of seat-warming at Parliament House. If they examine the figures of exports for the three months ended March, 1959 and 1960, they will find an increase for yarns and piecegoods and textiles of about £300,000—from £763,000 to over £1,024,000. That is the increase in exports to other States, and the increase in overseas exports is 200 per cent. There are further examples here showing how Queensland is progressing by means of industrial expansion and a sound economy—machines and machinery £1,360,000, compared with £829,000; other metal manufactures £993,000, compared with £557,000; and rubber manufactures are up, and so are leather and leather manufactures.

I could go on and on, but I think I have given sufficient evidence to disprove this snide innuendo that comes persistently from the Opposition benches. If it is so much against their imbued political beliefs to give any semblance of credit to this Government for what they have done, at least let them be good enough Queenslanders and Australians not to "knock" something that is being done for the benefit of the future citizens of this State.

Mr. Davies: You are doing so well that you don't need any money!

Mr. HUGHES: Of course we are doing well. But because a working man might be able to get bread and dripping for breakfast, in the language of hon. members opposite

he is doing well. In our opinion he, and every other Queenslander, is entitled to nothing but the best.

Although we are doing much to promote expansion, there is still a tremendous amount to be done. Let us look well into the future and lay solid foundations for that expansion now. There is a great need for new factories and the industrial estates that have done so much for Northern Ireland, Nova Scotia, Scotland, and other countries throughout the world. There is a great and ever-pressing need for Commonwealth grants to enable us to set up these industrial estates. In Northern Ireland a tremendous amount of assistance is given to their establishment. It is not just a matter of words being bandied about; money is expended. Under the Capital Grants to Industry Acts, 1954 to 1959, the Government of Northern Ireland will grant 33½ per cent. to new undertakings for new buildings and new and second-hand plant and machinery they have purchased, and to assist them to re-equip and modernise their plant. They paid out £6,500,000 last year. At one time Northern Ireland had a very bad unemployment problem and paid out large sums of money in unemployment relief. They have overcome that problem by means of these industrial estate schemes and they are now an exporting nation. They get their raw materials from Britain, and although they export to Great Britain and pay tax both ways, they can still sell their products. They have removed the threat of unemployment and have added tremendously to the revenue of the country. Men in Northern Ireland now have security in their jobs, a thing that all workers look for.

They also provide the industries with industrial coal and make grants for electricity. Last year they paid out £750,000 for these things. Under the Industries Development Acts of Northern Ireland, they encourage new industrial expansion and undertakings. As I said, they make their assistance so attractive that it is possible for a manufacturing business or industry to become established in Northern Ireland with the use of buildings and land at almost no cost. They get a 33½ per cent. grant to help them. Queensland has a justifiable claim on the Federal Government for assistance to the extent that we are able to provide a similar service, to give the incentive to decentralise industry for the general good of all. It is not a matter of politics but a properly planned expansion in which the Commonwealth should assist.

I think that they should go further. They should help in the industrial development of Queensland to the extent of allowing tax concessions to new industries, particularly in the North and the West. They should permit profits to be ploughed back for a given period of time on a tax-free basis. That would give an incentive.

Mr. Adair: That would help.

Mr. HUGHES: I am glad that the hon. member for Cook supports me.

I could cite what has happened with the industrial estates scheme in Scotland, but time does not permit me. Suffice it is to say that when war broke out there were only four industrial estates in Scotland. Today there are 21, with 360 tenants and 40 industrial factories.

Many of the goods that we receive in Queensland are made in the industrial estates in Scotland. I will not mention brand names, but typewriters, accounting machines, cash registers and shavers come from there.

Let me touch on the subject of education. The accent is on education throughout the State. It is the day of "Give the boy a chance." That is borne out by the increase of millions of pounds in the Vote for the Department of Education. As I say the Government are placing the accent on education. Present-day commercial, industrial, manufacturing and communication methods are very complex, and they are marked by rapid changes. This is the machine age. I am concerned about school pupils and their ability to understand and master old and new concepts. The horse-and-buggy days, the days of the pick and shovel, the days of strong fingers and backs, are gone.

This is the space age, the electronic age. The new age presents new problems in education. There is a legitimate claim on the individual to carry out responsibility and use his powers to preserve democracy and to enhance its prosperity and material welfare. The duty of educators is to make the most of everybody who seeks an education, whether he be gifted or merely average. I take the view that it is necessary to cultivate everyone's talents to the utmost so that we have at all levels the greatest possible fund of ability, skill and understanding on which to draw. Gifted children come from both humble and well-endowed homes. Individuals differ to a marked degree in the capacities called for an education. Rates of learning, rapidity of comprehension of printed material and ability to handle abstract concepts after mastering them, are fundamental abilities required in education. But they differ from one individual to another, or for each individual they differ somewhat from one field of study to the next.

Time will not permit me to say all I should like to on this matter. At present we expect children to attain mastery by uniform ways in a uniform time. That is a questionable practice. We have in our primary schools a system of funnelling children through their courses in a certain time. We must seriously consider what is the irreducible degree of skill that all pupils should have as part of their mental equipment, and more particularly the significance of the much discussed Scholarship examination.

I canvass the suggestion that we should seriously question the existing practice of requiring children of tender years to submit en masse to particular examinations at particular times and ask whether the important point at stake would not be that a child should proceed at his own pace, mastering his schooling as he goes along and sitting for his examinations when he is assured of success, rather than that he should be considered a failure if he does not do it in a certain time, more particularly en masse and in strange circumstances and surroundings.

I believe that the practice of cramming and channelling instruction through a bottleneck leads to mental anguish, torment and nervous tension in the very young, although at present I believe the Scholarship examination should continue. I am not advocating dispensing with that examination because of incentive and the setting of a standard, but I think it should be a standard for which children are properly prepared and for which they can enter with confidence.

I believe we should rather reorganise the present system to suit modern needs and conduct the Scholarship examination in the school classes within each separate school. I should like to be able to speak on this subject much more fully but time does not permit.

I believe that, where so many children are desirous of an education today, there has been what could be called a "tidal wave" of students. This highlights the financial sacrifice of thousands of parents in keeping their children at secondary school. In this regard I advocate increasing the Scholarship allowance in order to assist particularly those in the low income groups. A tremendous amount of good could be done in this way. The general sentiment in the community is that parents want their sons and daughters to attain a higher position than they had themselves. I commend their self-sacrifice. The assistance that would be afforded them by an increase in the Scholarship allowance would pay dividends later on because these boys and girls are the future leaders of commerce. I put forward the suggestion that we should increase the Scholarship allowance.

The Government are spending millions of pounds on education, and so are the non-State schools. I should like to cite a case that I think warrants consideration. In doing so, I put forward the suggestion that non-State schools could be assisted to the extent of making interest-free loans available to them to enable them to house their pupils adequately and build schoolrooms.

Mr. Ewan: We are subsidising them now, you know.

Mr. HUGHES: I am suggesting interest-free loans. I instance the case of St. Francis' Convent at West End, where £22,000 is needed to provide classrooms. They have been getting their money in small amounts and by personal loans and gifts, but they

are £7,000 short. That amount cannot be obtained. It can be borrowed at 12 per cent. interest, but that is simply usury. What a dreadful position! I think the Government could assist tremendously by providing interest-free loans for non-State schools.

Mr. Hanlon: Don't you think it should be taken up with the Federal Government, because they are doing it in the Federal Capital Territory.

Mr. HUGHES: It is being done in the South. The policy has great virtues, and there is a need in Queensland for similar assistance. Let us consider the matter with tolerance and without bias.

(Time expired.)

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) (8.36 p.m.): I have listened with interest to the debate. I should have thought some Government members would have spoken more forcefully in support of the Treasurer. It was apparent, as it was in the Address-in-Reply debate, that they realise heavy weather is ahead. After being in office for three years they are beginning to realise the magnitude of their task, and are not displaying the vim, vigour and enthusiasm they showed when they took over the Government benches three years ago. Although they are in only their second term of office, they are always bringing up the past. That is a sorry state of affairs.

Mr. Smith: You do not agree with your party's old cry about the Moore Government.

Mr. NEWTON: We have to plan for the present and the future. Whether the Government are a Labour Government or a Country-Liberal Government, their task is to cater for the annual increase in population and its demands, and the requirements of a modern society. After studying the Budget I should say the outlook for Queensland is not good. The going in the next 12 months will be heavy, and the picture may not be any better when the next Budget is presented. It is quite evident that the Treasurer, with the limited funds available to him, is trying to cater for all the requirements of the State. We dealt with this subject during the recent election campaign. We saw the gloomy outlook ahead of us and attacked the Government on their financial policy. The going for the Government during the last six months, and even before they faced the people, was very heavy, as indicated by dismissals in various Government departments—not mass dismissals, I agree, but dismissals from time to time.

Mr. Pizzey: They were all casuals.

Mr. NEWTON: They were not.

Mr. Pizzey: Your Government always did the same thing.

Mr. NEWTON: They were not casuals. In some of the departments the dismissals were of permanent employees. I am vitally concerned about the effect of the Government's

policy on employment, and I am thinking of employment in Government departments dealing with housing, schools, hospitals, forestry, main roads, lands, agriculture and stock, and so on. Government employees, whether permanent or casual, have to find other jobs if they are dismissed. I am speaking not only of the metropolitan area, but of Queensland as a whole. If hon. members were to look at the list of the various Government departments they would know as well as I that we have what we call "camp towns".

I am concerned about people in the various Government departments. If money is not available for the departments, what will happen to these people who give service to Queensland? I have a knowledge of these matters because I have travelled the South-west, the Central-west, and as far north as Proserpine. During the last six and a quarter years I have visited nearly every small town from there to the border, and I have seen how Government employees in the camp towns give service to the country people in building bridges, dams and many other essentials.

If there is to be any cut in those departments, the people who have sacrificed everything and have lived in these "camp towns" will have to return to the cities. I am speaking now not only of single men. Many married employees also have lived in the tents or huts, or semi-tent-huts; hon. members have seen them in the Forestry and Main Roads camps and the other camps I have mentioned. Their dismissal will present a major problem for the Government because they will be faced with the problem of finding employment for them.

The other day the hon. member for Fassifern referred to the Moogerah Dam. I do not know whether hon. members have been there, but it would have opened their eyes to see the number of people in the camp before it broke up—tradesmen and trade-unionists—who have sacrificed everything to give the men on the land what they require. The Moogerah Dam site is one of the biggest in the State. Before they went there they were working on the dam in the North that has only recently been finished. The huts were re-erected, and the families came because they have followed that type of work for years. I am very sincere about this, because I have seen it and I know what these people do for the State.

If there is any cutting to be done in the expenditure of departments it is to be hoped that the Government will consider the question that I directed to the Minister for Transport when the workers were sacked at Banyo. I hope they will transfer these people from one department to another.

Mr. Pizzey: What about in the private sector? Boilermakers are wanted in the private sector.

Mr. NEWTON: In reply to the Minister, let us look at the position elsewhere. I will put it fairly and squarely.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member please address the Chair.

Mr. NEWTON: From my inquiries I have found that when retrenchments have taken place, or when people have been compelled to shift from one industry to another, they have more or less "given away" the trade they have learned and taken up something else. They have become disheartened. We heard the other day that we have not enough tradesmen. That is because, after putting years into an industry, it suddenly collapses and they get disgusted and seek some other avenue of employment.

The Financial Statement deals with the railway deficit and I am going to speak on the two aspects of that subject that I know something about. The one that concerns me most is the closure of lines, whether in the metropolitan area or in farming areas, for it can react greatly to the detriment of the workers or farmers concerned. In areas with both rail and road transport, at least freight rates have been kept down. But what will happen to the workers or the farmers when a line is closed? The road transport people will immediately increase their charges.

Mr. Sullivan: Competition will rule that out.

Mr. NEWTON: I am pleased to have the hon. member's interjection because I dare say I can answer it better than any other hon. member. Immediately the railway line closes the road transport people will do what others do in the metropolitan area; they will form themselves into an association and fix a price. Competition does not enter into it with them. I have seen it happen so often. People start off with free competition but, before long, they form themselves into an association and agree to charge the one price. It will certainly happen with road transport when they know the railway has gone. I am a great stickler for the railways because I know what will happen otherwise to the farmers and workers. We should do all we can to keep the railway lines open. I do not know how it can best be done—that is a matter for the Treasurer—but perhaps it could be financed from some other department or some other source. Obviously they must be subsidised.

Mr. Sullivan: Cut one service to keep another going; is that your idea?

Mr. NEWTON: No. I do not mean to reduce any services at all. My idea is to find finance elsewhere to maintain rail service to the farmers and workers.

I worked on the Warwick-Maryvale line for years before the war. Road transport came in because in most cases it saves the

farmers carting cream miles and miles by horse and sulky. It might sound strange to speak of horse and sulky, and this was only back in 1935, but, to save transporting their cream by horse and sulky to the station, they patronised road transport. We had a first-class gravel road from Maryvale to Warwick. Today it is a bitumen highway. I have not been back there since the war but I dare say the railway is patronised only when wheat is carted to the nearest bulk store. They grow wheat there.

A similar position exists with the Cleveland-Lota line. Road transport has been there for years to my knowledge. I was down there during the war and I returned there after the war. Road transport was there then. A couple of fruit trains run each week. They are not actually fruit trains but trains that take the vegetables out to link with the other trains that go down south. To transport strawberries more quickly to the Sydney market the farmers are using road transport. I have seen them down there loading at about half-past 4 in the afternoon to catch the Sydney train at Clapham Junction at half-past seven. That is the sort of thing the railways are competing with. It is a sorry state of affairs for the Cleveland line because many farmers probably would still appreciate the rail service. Many workers come from that area to the city. And what is the service that is being provided at present? On week days, Monday to Friday, there are 14 trains a day, including steam trains with a number of carriages on Saturday 11, and on Sunday eight. In fairness to that area, I think it would have been better to consider first cutting the services. Looking at the train time-table, it seems that trains are warranted early in the morning, not so much in the middle of the day, and again at night when the workers are returning home. I think it is a pity that the line is being closed.

I wish to refer now to Cabinet meetings being held in provincial cities, and I do not want to be misinterpreted. It is probably costly to hold Cabinet meetings in provincial cities, but I am not greatly concerned about that. What I am concerned about is that when Cabinet meets in the country and announces through the Press the approval of projects costing millions of pounds, it should be clearly indicated to the Press how the project will be financed. We have many people working in Government departments, and if they see that £4,000,000 is being spent on a particular project they will think everything is rosy. It will tend to give them a false sense of security. I have no objection to Cabinet's announcing the approval of the project, but I think it should be made quite clear to the public where the money is coming from.

Mr. Sullivan: That would be just as important if they held the Cabinet meeting in Brisbane, wouldn't it?

Mr. NEWTON: Exactly, but I want to make sure that the public do not get a false impression that the Government have plenty of money. If they have not the money, let them tell the people. It is quite possible that when Cabinet meetings are held in provincial cities and £4,000,000 projects are mentioned in the Press, people will think that the Government have plenty of money and will spend their own money more freely.

Mr. Walsh: They would be borrowing from the hire-purchase companies.

Mr. NEWTON: That is the point I am coming to.

Mr. Sullivan: If you were living in the country, wouldn't you think it was a good idea for the Cabinet to come out there?

Mr. NEWTON: I am not objecting to that. I am trying to ensure that we do not leave a false impression in the minds of the people of Queensland.

Mr. Sullivan: They could just as easily get a false impression if the Cabinet meeting was held in Brisbane.

Mr. NEWTON: That may be so.

Having listened to the various speeches, I now have a fairly good idea of how the drought is affecting farmers in Queensland, and I think that if the Premier and the Treasurer had approached the Acting Prime Minister, Mr. McEwen, during the absence of the Prime Minister, they might have received a favourable hearing. It seems that under the new formula, and with the setting up of a special Grants Committee, the hands of the Government, whether Labour or Liberal-Country Party are fairly well tied. but I think this would have been a wonderful opportunity for the State Government to approach the Federal Government for assistance.

I am also concerned about the curtailment of work. I believe there should be no curtailment of work in peace-time. Looking at the Federal Budget, I think the Commonwealth Government could grant something to the States out of the heavy defence expenditure that is provided for. Again this year we see that it is somewhere near £200,000,000. An extra couple of million pounds would not be missed out of that fund. I can see no reason why we should be spending this huge amount of money for national defence in peace-time when we could be using it to develop what is necessary for defence in Queensland. If we could get the money to build the roads and aerodromes we need, standardised railways, hospitals and things of that nature, are they not just as important in peace as in war?

It is pleasing to note in the Financial Statement that a considerable sum has been set aside for education. We fully realise that we cannot sit back on this important matter. Development all over the world proves that we need to encourage young people to go

right through the educational field, that we must ensure that they enter the professional fields in this atomic and jet age.

Mr. Walsh: They are going to sack 700 women teachers.

Mr. NEWTON: Yes, and we are told they are going to sack more. It is a tragic state of affairs when we realise that there are 50 and 60 children in some classes and that in some instances they are being taught by young teachers in their first year.

Education should be a National responsibility rather than a State responsibility. A national standard should be laid down for all States. If such a scheme were initiated the State Departments of Education would handle the finances for education, just as is done at the present time with State housing. Queensland is not the only State that is having problems concerning education. The Victorian Government are endeavouring to get an extra £1,000,000 from the Commonwealth Government to help them out of their difficulty.

The Budget lays down the Government's programme for the free hospitalisation scheme. In the policy speech delivered by the Deputy Leader of the Government, Mr. Morris said—

“Queensland has made greater progress in health administration in the last three years than any other State in Australia. I reiterate the pledge of the Premier that Queensland's free hospitalisation system will not only be maintained but will be improved and extended.”

That appeared in “The Courier-Mail” of 12 May, 1960. Although we may still be enjoying free hospitalisation in Queensland the programme has been lagging, particularly in the building of hospitals and maternal and child-welfare clinics. I am not at all surprised to see that that is contained in the programme for this year.

Mr. Windsor: £2,000,000 more this year.

Mr. NEWTON: That is quite true. The reason for that is the lag in the building of hospitals and maternal and child-welfare clinics in the Government's previous term. That is why more is being allowed.

I understand that in the Budget there is no curtailment of the grant to local authorities up to June 1961. Here again I would have liked to see the grant much more than it is, not merely for the metropolitan area but for all local authorities.

Country local authorities must be facing similar problems to those in Brisbane. Since the war there has been rapid expansion which has brought about many problems. In my electorate it would be difficult to find any dust-free roads or any general system of water channelling. Those things are important in the country also but in the city our children, and indeed the public

generally, are more closely housed than they are in the country and epidemics could occur at any time in the outer suburbs of Brisbane.

In his Budget speech the Treasurer laid emphasis on present building activity in the State and made it look as if times were good and prosperous. The building industry is probably the most peculiar in the State. Since the war it has been hit twice, once in 1952 and again in 1957, and when it “flops” it does so overnight. When that happens it affects not only the building industry itself but also a considerable number of subsidiary industries such as sawmills, joinery works, metal works, electrical shops and many others. If no building work is going on the other undertakings cannot sell the articles they produce. Great care must therefore be exercised in the building programme in this State. It is true that at present we have quite a good housing programme in operation in addition to there being a considerable amount of commercial building in progress.

I do not want to take anything from the Gold Coast representatives, but quite recently I was visited in my capacity of field organiser for my union by several persons from the Gold Coast. It is an area that I have visited regularly. At the time it was hinted that valuations on the Gold Coast would be considerably increased and these people asked me what was the next best port to get a job. They told me that land valuations had affected the building industry at that time. I do not know what the position is now. As I have not since seen anybody from there.

It is true that the position, judging from the Budget, looks quite good. Quite a bit of building is to be carried out by the Government on schools and in the Department of Health and Home Affairs. That will boost the industry for a while.

For some considerable time the building industry has been of great assistance in employing seasonal workers during the slack seasons. The Treasurer is probably thinking about that. Early this year, when the meat-works finished their season sooner than expected, numbers of meat-workers were working as labourers and semi-skilled workers on building projects, including schools and other Government projects, around the city. The building industry can bring about stability when seasonal industries provide employment for a shorter period than usual.

The Treasurer had much to say about the effect of marginal increases. They have been granted to high-ranking members of the community, judges and Court members, as well as the white-collar workers. I want to make it clear that I am not opposed to increases for white-collar workers, but we found on this occasion—as in the past—that the Government agreed to pay the increases to them, but not to physical workers. I have a high regard for physical workers. Even the biggest machine will fail if its smallest cog breaks. Physical workers

live in a different way from white-collar workers. Their work is harder and they are affected to a greater extent by climatic conditions. Whenever marginal increases are suggested for them, however, complaints are raised. The Treasurer said that the marginal increase of 28 per cent. has had a big effect on the Budget. We must remember that workers who were granted increases by agreement amounting to 27s. 6d. and 17s. 6d. a week have not received a marginal increase. If they had received it, the effect on the Budget would have been much greater. The margins decision should have been applied to the workers who, under an agreement with their employers, got increases of 27s. 6d. and 17s. 6d. The employers agreed in 1956 or 1957 to pay these over-award amounts, and they should not have been taken into account in any decision in the application for a 28-per cent. marginal increase. The application should have been granted, and these workers should have got an increase. The previous Labour Government had a similar problem. The 1957 formula was three-sevenths of the basic wage. On that occasion tradesmen received 18s. and semi-skilled workers 9s. Through no fault of the trade unions the court gave its decision six weeks after the case was heard. The employers kicked up a row about it and they had my sympathy, but we were not in a position to tell the court how or when it should give its judgment. In 1955 the two-and-a-half-times formula was applied. Tradesmen received 11s. but no increase was granted to semi-skilled workers. The Labour Government had to bear both these marginal increases and I do not remember them making any big song about it. They realised it was something that had to be met and if they employed labour these increases had to be expected from time to time.

The dispute at Commonwealth Engineering Qld. Pty. Ltd. has been mentioned. The workers in that company are working under both State and Federal awards. They are registered in both the State and Federal courts. Their Queensland organisers' operations extend a long way down into northern New South Wales. I was very concerned at the recent dispute at the Commonwealth Engineering works. The Government appointed two members—the Deputy Leader, Mr. Morris, and the Minister for Transport, Mr. Chalk—to investigate the dispute and see what they could do to settle it. The most unfortunate part about it is that those two gentlemen, to my knowledge, did not endeavour to meet the members of the union who were out on strike, or their leaders. That should have been done, because two other members on this side of the Chamber and I did not hesitate to have a discussion with the union leaders on the problem. We even visited Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. and had a discussion with the management so that we could hear both sides of the story.

I remember quite well on a deputation to the former Minister for Public Works, Mr. Heading—he always gave us a very good hearing—who said he had learnt a very bitter and hard lesson during the 1946 bacon factory dispute. He was the chairman of directors of the company. He said that dispute taught him—I am sure he will verify these words—that there are always two sides to a question.

I will come back to the Commonwealth Engineering dispute. On the figures we were shown by the management, if the metal-trade workers in that establishment were granted a 28 per cent. margin on what the workers were getting at Granville in New South Wales, they would be entitled to at least £1 6s. 9d. It was clearly indicated that in New South Wales the men were getting £7 6s. above the basic wage in that State compared with £5 2s. 6d. in Queensland. There was a difference of £2 3s. 6d. The New South Wales company is the same as that in Queensland. We said to the management, "On the figures you have shown us this company could definitely afford to pay the workers in Queensland something extra." The management made it quite clear that they were willing to put the matter before the management in New South Wales provided one person in particular did not object. That was where the downfall arose in the dispute and that is why I bring it to the attention of the Chamber. That person was Mr. Grounds, the secretary of the Metal Trades Employers' Federation. It is quite evident that when the management put up the proposal to him, in the light that they were willing to put the proposal to the management in New South Wales that something should be offered to the workers, he stood flat-footed and dictated not only to the management, but evidently must also have dictated terms to the Government, too.

Within a day or two of our negotiations, the legislation that none of us like to see used was invoked and a state of emergency was declared. True, the workers have returned to work, but they still have the feeling that they were not given justice, that they were hit with the back of the axe. If the matter had been handled in the right way, that would never have happened.

In my 6½ years' experience as a trade-union official—as a field worker and State organiser—I have travelled throughout the State; I have been on the spot at Industrial Court hearings, and I have attended many conferences with employers, and often we have been able to settle a dispute quickly. If we had taken the other course, and if we had had to wait for the dispute to be settled by arbitration, we would have been waiting a very long time.

In any talk of margins we must consider the whole subject of apprenticeship. Apprentices give five years of their lives to industry, not at a very high wage, to learn a trade so that we will have tradesmen for tomorrow.

Despite the shortage of tradesmen today, not enough young people on leaving school take up apprenticeships in industry. I do not blame them. I live very close to most of the abattoirs and bacon factories in my area and young lads about 16 or 17 years of age can earn twice as much pay there as a third or fourth-year apprentice can. Any action taken on margins has a big effect on apprentices. Any increased margin that tradesmen get is automatically passed on to the apprentices. Apart from that, apprentices have not to my knowledge received any direct wage increases since 1956 or thereabouts. Irrespective of the politics of the Government, the problem of margins has arisen before and probably it will come up again.

I read in tonight's "Telegraph" that the cost of living in Queensland in the last quarter showed an increase equivalent to a rise of 3s. in the basic wage. I am pleased that the Minister in charge of prices is in the Chamber. His answer to the question I asked him some time ago was reasonable. I am concerned most about when and how the approach is to be made to the Federal Government on prices and other relative matters. The working man is not so much worried about the increase in the price of butter, sugar, or any other single commodity. He pays the increased price, but he is hit hardest by the increased price of things containing those commodities. One finds that the price of nine or ten other articles increases when the price of butter or sugar is increased.

I wish to deal now with the arbitration system. When the subject of wages has been raised, the Deputy Premier has often said, "Why don't you abide by arbitration instead of the law of the jungle?" Unions and their members may negotiate with employers for improved conditions in their award or for increased wages or margins. Having reached agreement with the employer, they must then go back to the court either to have the agreement duly registered in the court or to have the benefits written into their award. If they did not do that the benefits they had gained would be of no use to them, because they could get them today and have them taken from them tomorrow. But once a provision is written into an award or an agreement, there must be an application to the Industrial Court to remove it.

I do not think there is any question of getting away from arbitration. When a union applied for increased wages years ago, it went to the court, presented its case, and usually got a particularly good hearing. Today a union must be able to prove to the court that the production of the industry is at an all-time high level and that the profits of the industry are able to bear the increase asked for. That is the custom and practice of the court at present. I can recall my own union, the Building Workers' Industrial Union, applying to the court for the 27s. 6d. and 17s. 6d. from 1956 onwards. We submitted three cases, basing our claim

on "like-with-like," and showed that our tradesmen had to serve the same apprenticeship as skilled tradesmen in other industries who had received the 27s. 6d. On all occasions our claim was rejected, and in plain words we were told by the court to go and get it in the same way as the other people had got it and then to come back and they would write it into the award. That is putting it very plainly so it can be clearly understood.

On the subject of unauthorised strikes, I advise hon. members to buy a copy of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and study it. I am no lawyer, but if one did everything one should to make a strike legal, one would still be beaten, because the court has the right, despite the fact that one has complied with every clause in the Act, to say that it is an illegal strike and the men must return to work. I ask hon. members not to be misled by some of the statements that are made from time to time, because the position is very serious. It is even more serious now because a committee has been set up by the Government to inquire into the Act.

Many matters should be looked at. In the last three years there has been a strong attack on a number of the provisions of the Act, those dealing with statutory holidays in particular. It was very significant that last year, the State's centenary year, when the Government were good enough to declare a public holiday to celebrate the Centenary, most employers in the building industry exercised what are regarded as their rights on statutory holidays. Although it may appear that under their awards and the provisions of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act workers are paid for statutory holidays, they do not receive them at all if the employer asks them to work on holidays and they refuse. It was a shocking state of affairs for employers in the building industry to ask their employees to work on that day. After all, a public holiday for that purpose is declared only once in 100 years. The same thing has happened with other public holidays. That is one matter among many that the committee should take into consideration when examining the provisions of the Act.

The present Act is a very powerful one. It has strong penal clauses. Fines of from £10 up to £100 can be imposed on a trade unionist. As various penal clauses can be linked together, costs against a union and its members can amount to thousands of pounds. Even though the Act presently contains such strong penal clauses, shortly after the Government were returned the Deputy Premier said in an outburst that the penal powers of the Act would have to be strengthened. They are sufficiently vicious now to the ordinary trade unionist. The best way to overcome industrial problems would be to adopt a more serious approach to what the Minister for Labour and Industry has suggested from time to time—better

employer-employee relationship. But to bring about better employer-employee relationship, the principle must be applied not only to one particular phase of their relationship but to all.

Mr. HARRISON (Logan) (9.29 p.m.): This debate presents an opportunity for hon. members to draw attention to any matters they consider deserving of special attention. Although I wish to speak mostly on matters of general interest, for a few moments let me refer to a matter of particular concern to many people in one part of my electorate. I refer to the closure of the Lota-Cleveland railway line. First of all I express my thanks and appreciation both to the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Education and Migration for their respective assurances that adequate alternative transport will be provided. However, I do think it is my responsibility to point out that sudden decisions of this nature create problems. They certainly do not leave much time for any really thorough investigation following them.

The consequences that must naturally flow from the shifting of responsibility for transport in any area from the railways to road transport are quite serious. One immediate consequence of the decision to close this railway line and to rely solely on road transport is that the railways pass a burden—and quite a heavy one—onto the shoulders of the local authorities and the ratepayers of the area. The result is that the responsibility for providing any necessary additional roads or improvements to existing roads—undoubtedly both those things would occur—would be placed on the local authorities. New roads would have to be built and existing ones strengthened to serve the needs of heavy bus transport. They will have to be brought up to a standard much higher than that at present, and it is estimated that that could easily cost the council in that area more than £100,000 over a short period of time.

This rather sudden shift of responsibility from rail to road transport suggests to me that we have a look into the Main Roads Department's policy. I think it would require some relaxation of the present policy of that department in not approving any new roads until the building of all roads already gazetted has been completed. In the circumstances, I hope that consideration will be given to that matter so that the burden will not fall entirely on the local authority.

I sincerely feel that that line is in exactly the same position as so many other railway lines throughout Queensland that have played a part in developing the State and that were once the sole means of transport between centres.

Mr. Hanlon: You did not do as well as the Country Party fellow from Wallaville who got his kept open.

Mr. HARRISON: Over the years, many people made their homes along this line and

found employment along it. Some men in my electorate—in Cannon Hill, Murarrie, Dobby, and places like that—now find themselves cut off from direct access to their places of work and from the places where they naturally do their business.

Mr. Walsh: What would be the interest involved in that line?

Mr. HARRISON: I think the figure was quoted at about £10,000 or £11,000.

Mr. Walsh: The Treasury will still have to carry that, even if the line is closed.

Mr. HARRISON: That is so.

When this proposed new system of road transport comes into operation it can only be operated over a very long and costly round-about route. The difficulty cannot be overcome until a road bridge is built across Lota Creek. People in the area have advocated the building of that bridge for the last 40 years, but it is now urgently needed, and I hope it will soon be an accomplished fact.

Mr. Walsh: What was the loss on the line for the year?

Mr. HARRISON: I have not the figure with me.

Mr. Walsh: It would be over £100,000. Don't you think it would be right for the Government to divert that saving to the construction of a road bridge?

Mr. HARRISON: It would be a very good idea.

Before I leave the closure of this line, I must draw attention to the rapid development of the whole of the Redlands area. A comparison of statistics for the years 1950 and 1960 will prove my point. There were 2,819 properties rated in 1950, and the figure grew to 6,000 in 1960. The population in 1950 was 5,670; it is now 8,100. In 1950 there were 2,000 occupied dwellings, compared with 3,116 in 1960. In addition we find a vast increase in subdivisions of land within the last two years. The shire council at present has between 6,000 and 7,000 blocks under consideration. I give those figures to show the readiness of people to reside in, and their preference for, an area that is convenient to Brisbane and Moreton Bay. The one amenity it lacks is a reticulated water supply. Just as I hope it will not be long before a bridge is built over Lota Creek, I hope it will not be long before residents of the Redlands area get this amenity.

I now turn to a wider field, that is, rising costs. It is one of the most important and serious problems in Queensland, particularly as it affects our ability to continue as a producer and exporter of primary products. I was pleased to hear several of my colleagues, particularly the hon. member for Somerset, refer to the matter during this

session. I support and confirm their views and share their concern. The real menace of rising costs is not clearly recognised by many sections of the community that manage, by some means or other, to preserve, equitable relationship with the ever upward movement in costs. I seems to me that we are again letting ourselves into a mad race to keep level in which many people—far too many—are not stopping to think where it is all leading, or to feel any sense of responsibility towards those sections of the community that are quite powerless to obtain any corresponding adjustment in their position. I refer, of course, to those who are hopelessly lost in this mad race and compelled to live on a pension or a fixed income.

Listening the other day to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, while I could share his concern for the effects of rising costs on the wage-earner, I could not help feeling he was missing a vital factor in this ever-growing problem when he claimed that the wage-earner had to bear the full burden of rising costs. By way of interjection I tried to convey to him that it was not a matter of the wage-earner bearing the full burden, but rather one of the wage-earner understanding that we all have a problem on our hands that has grown to a stage where it must be shared and faced by everybody. If ever we are to find an answer to it we must learn to share the burden. It is not borne by any one section.

When the Leader of the Opposition spoke in the recent debate on the Treasury Funds Investment Act Amendment Bill, I was more interested. I should like to quote what he said because I heartily agree with him. In "Hansard" No. 6 at page 512 the Leader of the Opposition said—

"Any added burden, whether it be interest rates, wages, freight or taxation, will make it progressively harder for Australia to face up to the problems confronting the world today."

He went on to say—

"However, the problem of inflation is tremendously important. We of the Australian Labour Party will use every possible occasion to force home to the Australian people the need to take a lively interest in it. Apart from our political responsibility as members of a party, we have a collective responsibility as members of Parliament to join in an effort to combat the trend in cost structure, which is imperilling the economy of the country.

On the other hand, we have the problem of either stabilised or falling prices for primary products with an accelerated price for manufactured articles. Demand for the farmer's produce is increasing year by year whereas the prices he gets for them are either stabilised or declining. It is impossible to maintain that position for very long."

We could agree with those words. I sincerely hope that he and his party will live up to what he said. If they do, we will get along much better. How many people really stop to think of the overall and damaging effect on the economy of these constantly rising costs?

Mr. Burrows: Do you think the Government realised that when they abolished price control?

Mr. HARRISON: I think so. I do not think that is the real basic reason for it.

I want to know how many people stop to think of the damaging effect on our primary and exporting industries. I want to know just how long we can expect our economy to remain stable if we allow our export industries, which have to compete on the world markets, to become crippled by our internal costs, most of which, I would say, have been thoughtlessly imposed. When we attempt to analyse the reason for this blight of ever-rising costs, surely we must realise that one of the main reasons is that far too few people feel any sense of obligation to give equal value, either in goods or services, for the level of reward they receive. In plain language, a little more honest effort and hard work all round by all concerned would help a great deal to get us out of the dangerous position we are in today. Unfortunately, this sort of wholesome remedy which, by the way, never hurt anybody, seems to be regarded as impossible to rely on as a way of getting us out of trouble because it is generally regarded as too politically unpopular.

Let us take a closer look at the position of the primary producer and see just how he fits into the picture of rising costs. Generally speaking, most hon. members will agree that the primary producer can hardly be expected to put more time and energy into the conduct of his business, for he usually works longer hours than most other people in the community. In many cases he works every day of the week throughout the year. Hon. members will realise that at present he has his back to the wall properly with the widespread drought that is threatening disaster in so many rural areas. I do not think there has been a sufficient appreciation of the efforts of the primary producers to cope with the present drought's threat. I say without hesitation that the effects of the present drought would already have been much more apparent and much more serious if it had not been for the solid work put by primary producers in recent years into improving the capabilities of their properties to withstand at least the ever-occurring dry periods that we must expect in our Queensland climate. They have done this by greater attention to better water facilities and irrigation wherever possible, by more conservation of fodder, by improving pastures and by erecting fencing for the subdivision of their land. Much more could have been done in this direction if there

had been greater recognition by all Governments, particularly the Commonwealth Government, of the national importance of still further reducing farm costs wherever there was opportunity to do so.

It is only fair to mention one outstanding form of assistance that has been given by the Commonwealth Government over the years. Great credit must be given to Sir Arthur Fadden for his share in the decision to allow valuable tax concessions to primary producers to encourage them to build up their properties steadily by way of equipment and improvements. This assistance has been one of the main reasons why primary producers have stood up to this drought better than any other in the long history of droughts in Queensland.

Mr. Duggan: And McEwen pushed him out of Cabinet for all his record of service that you talk so much about!

Mr. Davies: He was a Queenslander, too!

Mr. HARRISON: He did a good job. He understood the need for assistance of that kind.

I am not unmindful either, of the valuable assistance, both in advice and field work, given by our own Departments of Agriculture and Forestry and of Irrigation and Water Supply, by the C.S.I.R.O., and by the Universities. For all that, the urgent need to reduce rising farm costs remains. If primary producers are to survive and continue to contribute over 80 per cent. of our exportable wealth, all primary-industry organisations will have to do something for themselves. They will have to get together more closely and more effectively than they have in the past in order to succeed in influencing both the Government and public thinking on this very vital matter.

Next week in Canberra there will be an assembly of representatives of all the primary industries of Australia at the Federal level. They will meet with the object of creating a stronger and revitalised National Farmers' Union, which will ensure its place as a co-ordination of primary producer organisations and discuss ways and means of emphasising that role from an organisational point of view. The functions of this National Farmers' Union will include attention to matters of a broad nature that affect primary producers generally. One thing that I know will be put up by Queensland, among many other suggestions for improving its effectiveness and ability to do a good job in the interests of the primary industries, is that to complete the structure of the National Farmers' Union, as an organisation adequately meeting the needs of Australia's primary industries, it would be imperative to engage the services of a full-time officer who would be fully capable of assembling and presenting a case covering all aspects of any matter affecting the economics of primary industry, including the relationship between that matter and the general economy of

Australia and also taking into consideration the effects of overseas conditions on trade and industry.

That is a wide responsibility, and I am very hopeful that a landmark will be reached next week by general agreement that the primary industries of Australia realise that they are facing a very difficult future and that their only hope is to get together and present a reasoned case to State Governments, and particularly to the Commonwealth Government, and be in a position to ensure that some good solid thinking should be done on matters affecting the primary industries.

I will admit that up to the present our primary industries, because of their organisation, are in a quite different position from big business, commercial undertakings, or even trade unions, because we have had until recently only a part-time secretary at the Federal level. Now we have a full-time secretary, and it is time we got together and built up a structure there with some of the best brains in Australia to ensure that the primary industries present the best possible case in their own interests and in the interests of Australia.

I should like to deal briefly now with some of the opportunities that a Commonwealth-wide organisation such as the National Farmers' Union will have to advocate on a national level not only a vitally necessary reduction in present farm costs but also a better balanced programme for the development of the whole country. First I would mention the need for a complete overhaul of the present tariff protection given to secondary industries, where possibly in many instances justification could no longer be shown for further tariff protection. That is indisputably adding to primary production costs in Australia. Next I mention the need for research by such an organisation to enable more authoritative information to be placed before arbitration courts on the effect that ever-upward wage determinations will have on the economy of the export industries of Australia. I know that they have an effect on the whole of the economy, but a particularly damaging effect on the export industries. I have heard many members recognise that.

I want to mention some matters that should be kept before the notice of the Federal Government, who have a national obligation to provide adequate financial support for all activities that will help to offset farm costs. I do not think they have helped nearly sufficiently when we consider their failure to provide adequate financial reimbursement, and how it has retarded Queensland's development. It has reduced our ability to carry into effect plans that we know are vital for the State's proper development. For a start, I ask the Committee to consider this State's Department of Agriculture and Stock. Because of the work it has done over the years it is certainly in a position to provide

the proven practical answers to many agricultural and livestock problems, but unfortunately, in common with other departments, it is far too short of finance to enable it to function to its full capacity.

Let me refer to a new factor that is looming in the livestock world—I refer to growing losses through infertility in both dairy and beef cattle. In artificial insemination we have an effective instrument to control infertility and, at the same time, to lift production. Unfortunately, until now, we have had insufficient money to bring the practice into general use. We have lagged behind in applying our scientific knowledge. We know how to make use of this important scientific advance now, but lack of finance prevents its being brought into general use.

I am not going to elaborate on this matter because I hope to have an opportunity to speak about it when the Estimates are debated. But I do want to emphasise that losses through infertility in breeding herds is a matter of very great seriousness, and it is rapidly getting worse. We have to adopt what measures we can to stop it. I have heard percentages quoted, but I do not know that anybody has made a statistical survey. But the percentage of losses in calving in dairy and beef herds is a very serious matter, and the cause of a tremendous loss of income. I understand that infertility is much more widespread in beef herds than is generally recognised.

I would now like to deal with a few more things that are neglected in the allocation of money by way of reimbursement from the Commonwealth Government, and to point out some of the benefits that could be derived from the establishment of irrigated and dry land pastures. There again we have the know-how through our technical, scientific and extension staff in the Department of Agriculture and Stock and we could do much more if we had more money.

I particularly commend the C.S.I.R.O. work in introducing more strains of grasses and legumes and, in fact, breeding in Queensland new types that are much better suited to our tropical and sub-tropical conditions. I feel sure that these grasses and legumes will give us much greater return from our dairying and beef production than we get from most of our native grasses and legumes.

The Department of Agriculture and Stock has also done splendid work throughout Queensland in providing experimental stations in certain areas. I have a special word of appreciation for the experimental station at Redland Bay, which deals with fruit and vegetables. It is greatly appreciated by the farmers of that area.

I would like to mention briefly one other new development that is creating much interest. It is the experimental work being conducted by the Government, the C.S.I.R.O., the University and the graziers, in the development of new breeds of cattle better

suited to our tropical and sub-tropical conditions. It is good to see this work being carried out. I feel it will have a big influence on the productivity of our beef herds and there is a possibility that it might be extended into our dairy herds. One of the features of these cattle is that they have the ability to thrive better in our hot conditions and to withstand the ravages of ticks better than normal British breeds.

Mr. Windsor: Are they cross-breeds?

Mr. HARRISON: Yes. They use them to cross with the normal British breeds.

Mr. Windsor: What are they?

Mr. HARRISON: We have the Brahmin type, the Santa Gertrudis and our own breed in Queensland—Droughtmaster cattle.

I also commend the work of another Queensland department, the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply.

Mr. Walsh: They have been practically cut out this year.

Mr. HARRISON: Surely not in a State like Queensland where we have such unreliable rainfall. High priority in finance must always be given to water supply and irrigation under such conditions. It provides for a steady continuity of production for a comparatively small outlay, especially in already-developed areas. I pay special tribute to the Farm Water Supplies Assistance Act, which has been of great benefit to many farmers. The benefit is obtainable immediately and it is a system that does not require a great deal of money.

Mr. Pizzey: The available money was not all taken up last year.

Mr. HARRISON: Many people recognise its worth. The scheme is not of great financial magnitude, in many cases being financed by the individual farmers themselves. However, it is very important that, if a man has a property capable of development, he should not be denied the right and opportunity to do something that is done by his neighbour who possibly can finance it himself. I have always maintained that one of the best bets for the future is water conservation and irrigation.

All the matters I have mentioned could have a tremendous effect in offsetting the crippling handicap of rising costs and could return handsome dividends by way of increased production. My main point is that most of the items in the cost of production are entirely beyond our control. And that raises the matter of the assistance that can be provided to the primary producer, over and above the tremendous effort he is already making. Our exports of wool, meat, dairy produce, sugar, grain and other crops now provide 80 per cent. of Queensland's income, and no Queensland Government could ever allow the scourge of rising costs to cripple our export industries. A better answer will have to be found to the present problem.

While I fully appreciate the difficulties experienced by the Treasurer this year in apportioning to various departments the totally inadequate tax reimbursement and loan moneys from the Commonwealth Government, a better answer must be found. The only satisfactory one would seem to be a system of priorities that would ensure in the future continuation of planned development of the whole State. In the final analysis the answer indisputably lies in better recognition by the Commonwealth Government of their national obligations. I am not blaming the Queensland Government because I do not think in the circumstances they can do much better, but we cannot afford to relax pressure on the Commonwealth Government. We must strive for recognition of Queensland's claim to a greater participation in national development. In that respect I refer again to the National Farmers' Union. I sincerely hope that through its efforts and representations it will be able to make governments, particularly the Federal Government, recognise Queensland's claims, I trust it will exert a very strong influence on the Federal Government.

Mr. Jones: Who will be representing the dairymen of Queensland at that conference?

Mr. HARRISON: I will be one.

I now want to say something on another matter that has a great bearing on the cost structure and production in Queensland. I refer to noxious weeds. I was surprised to read that recent studies in the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Canada have revealed starting losses in production caused by noxious weeds. The figures indicate an estimated loss of from 10 to 12 per cent. in pastoral, agricultural and dairy production. When that percentage is applied to Queensland the loss from noxious weeds amounts to over £30,000,000 annually. We could largely control that loss if we gave it the proper attention. We have allowed the problem to run away during the last hundred years and it is time we made a more effective effort before we finish up, in another 100 years, many times worse off.

Mr. Hilton: Don't you think a reasonable effort has been made in recent years?

Mr. HARRISON: Yes. I am going to say that, but I am showing what the loss has been where they must be making at least corresponding efforts and probably greater efforts than we are making.

I wish to outline the disappointment I and most landowners feel at the delay in the release of the insects that, within the last two years, were imported to assist in the biological control of Noogoora burr, which is one of the worst and most widespread of our noxious weeds. We did a tremendous amount of work and fought for years for approval to get these insects, and we finally got one from the United States called mecas,

and another one from India called nupserha, both of which are known for their ability to attack Noogoora burr. These insects are fairly selective. I have often spoken of what we hoped the insects would do for Queensland, but for some strange reason their introduction has not turned out quite as well, or run a course as smooth, as we expected. We know very careful safeguards must be taken to see that insects brought in for biological control do not run wild and damage plants of very great value. We were told by our scientific advisers and entomologists that they would attack sunflowers and a few garden plants, but they are of little value to Queensland compared with the damage that is done by Noogoora burr.

It was agreed that these insects should be allowed into Australia for tests and experimentation to see if they would damage other plants. We were under the impression that they would be released on the understanding that they did no greater damage than we already knew they would. They were tested for a couple of years on dozens and dozens of plants, and they were also put into a laboratory at Samford and tried out for effectiveness.

These are the results: they have proved that mecas from the United States will do a job, and thrive and work reasonably satisfactorily along our coastal belt and well inland, but they are just a little doubtful that they will work so well in the western areas. Apparently the insects come out from the chrysalis stage when the weather gets warmer. That is not quite sufficient out west as they are wanted to come out after rain, or just after rain, when the Noogoora burr is there then to attack.

Mr. Ewan: The bulk of the Noogoora burr is on the coast rather than beyond the Divide.

Mr. HARRISON: On the western streams, too, it does great damage and is a handicap to the wool industry.

There is still a tremendous area of the State in which the insect that I speak of could do a good job. To my mind, it has done all that has been asked of it, but for some reason its release has been held up. I wish the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation were present in the Chamber, because he and his colleague the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry will be called on to deal with this matter. I hope Queensland representations to the Commonwealth authorities controlling the release of the insects will be successful and that there will not be any further delay.

Mr. Hilton: The Commonwealth Government are holding out on you.

Mr. HARRISON: Yes, at the moment. But I do not want to be unfair to them. They may come good in the end—I hope so—but we have lost a season.

We could have had a man back to the United States to get more stocks of the

insects so that we might build up their numbers and get on with the job. We are just losing time. I will not speak any further on the subject because I know we will be hearing more about it in the future.

While on the subject of noxious weeds, let me mention a very important function of the Co-ordinating Board. I do not think many people know much about the work of that board. There is no phase of rural land protection more important to the economy and progress of the State than the control of noxious weeds. Among the responsibilities of the Co-ordinating Board are the planning and control of eradication of noxious weeds through the local authorities of Queensland. It has done very valuable work but experience has shown that some amendments to the provisions have become necessary to strengthen its capacity to do an even more effective job. Chief of those amendments would be to define its powers more clearly, particularly to facilitate the legal processes that have to be taken where land-owners and occupiers are not reasonably complying with the provisions of the Act.

Mr. Hilton: Where local authorities themselves are not complying!

Mr. HARRISON: Yes. The whole position becomes difficult and open to doubt if it becomes necessary to prosecute an owner who absolutely refuses to carry out his responsibilities when he is able to. You can go to court and fail in a prosecution. The law needs tightening up; the hon. member for Carnarvon would know that.

There is something else that I want to recommend strongly. Probably these recommendations will come from other quarters, too, but I want to mention this because it has always been in my mind that we could get much more effective work if we appointed some regional inspectors or supervisors to help in this work. Not many would be needed in Queensland, but enough—six or eight or so—to co-ordinate the work of groups of local authorities. At the present time each local authority appoints its own supervisor. Often he is a first-class man, doing his job of controlling and dealing with the eradication of noxious weeds on roads and reserves and so on. Another might not know very much about it so that the work is not properly done, or sometimes there is even a lack of interest. If we had a group of well-trained men who knew their job thoroughly, they would be able to advise and assist the local authorities and their supervisors in carrying out the duties required of them in the control of noxious weeds. They would help get better co-operation with the land owners and advise them on correct methods of control, particularly in the application of hormones.

Mr. Burrows: Why couldn't you supply them with the hormones if they wanted them?

Mr. HARRISON: I did not know that they could not be supplied.

Mr. Burrows: We could not get them in our district, even if we wanted them.

Mr. HARRISON: The hon. member probably did not go the right way about it.

Mr. Burrows: You go to the local authority, don't you?

Mr. HARRISON: Yes. Most local authorities do have supplies on hand, and they are there at no cost until they are issued. The hon. member should raise the matter with his local authority.

Mr. Burrows: Who stopped the local authorities from retailing the knapsack sprays to landholders at cost price?

Mr. HARRISON: I think the hon. member should address that question to the Board.

I should also like to deal with the important job done by the biological section of the Department of Public Lands. They are charged with the responsibility for survey, research and experimental work with noxious weeds. At the request of the Co-ordinating Board, they do that work for it. The work of this section could be improved by re-organisation to enable its services to be made available not only to the Co-ordinating Board, which is the principal body concerned with noxious weeds, but also to the Department of Agriculture and Stock or any other department, and I believe that there is fairly wide scope for re-organisation in this direction. I hope that we shall have amendments before us at some stage, and I do not wish to make any more than a sketchy reference to the question now.

There are so many other matters having a very close relationship to this matter of farm costs that one might be tempted to speak for too long. However, there will be opportunities to speak about them on the Estimates, and I reserve further comment till then.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.