

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 25 OCTOBER 1960

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 25 OCTOBER, 1960

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

QUESTIONS

SALE PRICE OF HOUSING COMMISSION HOUSES, ARMSTRONG AREA, TOWNSVILLE

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin), for **Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South), asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

“(1) Is the Housing Commission offering to sell homes in the Armstrong area in Townsville that cost approximately £800 to erect and have been maintained since out of the rental paid, to the tenants for prices of £2,500 and more?”

“(2) If so, and as this would represent a clear unearned profit to the Government of £1,700 on one house, what would be the aggregate profit to the Government if every rented Housing Commission house was sold at the present inflated value?”

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

“(1 and 2) There is more in this question than meets the eye at first glance. It is the practice of the Commission to offer houses for sale at close to their current value. It is quite true that, in some cases, there is a considerable book profit to the Commission on some particular transaction. But it must also be remembered that the Commission has a very vast housing portfolio covering more than 3,000 dwellings and not all of these could be sold at a profit. Indeed, I gave this matter a great deal of consideration eighteen months ago and my conclusion was that, having regard to some of the less fortunate estates where quite plainly the Commission in those days got very poor value for the money expended, it appeared that the current sale value of all the dwellings owned by the Commission was only slightly in excess of the total value at which they appeared on the books of the Commission. However, the Honourable Gentleman's question entirely magnifies the degree of this problem. From July 1, 1959, to date, 14 dwellings were offered for sale to tenants at a net sale price of £32,806, an average of £2,343 for each house and land. The cost of these properties was £26,632, an average of £1,902. These properties were at Armstrong. Is the Honourable Gentleman serious when he describes the sale prices as being at inflated values? The Honourable Member will be aware of the extent of the drainage, filling, kerbing, channelling and roadworks development carried out at Armstrong. The cost of such development was over £47,500. The tenants quite clearly understood that they could continue as tenants. With that knowledge, a number of them proceeded with the purchase and having regard to the way in which Townsville is presently booming, I think they have been very wise people.”

SAWN TIMBER PRICES AND TIMBER
ROYALTY

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) asked the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry—

"(1) In view of the recent increase in the prices of sawn timber by some 20s. per 100 super. feet to include kiln-dried timber, mouldings and rough hardwood used in house construction in Brisbane, will he advise the extent of any royalty charges increased by the Forestry Department?"

"(2) Is it not a fact that a big proportion of this sawn timber used in Brisbane comes from the Northern Rivers of New South Wales and is not subject to Queensland Forestry royalty?"

"(3) Can he advise whether full consideration was given to the effect on costs of house construction when the increased prices were prepared and agreed to by the Timber Stabilisation Board?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

"(1) The increase in log prices for Crown hardwood at Brisbane as from October 1 was 11s. 5d. per 100 super. feet. This arose out of consideration of the Timber Inquiry Committee's report which has been published. The new prices include allowance for increased logging costs and increased freight in the large area required to supply Brisbane. It would be difficult to estimate the average increase in royalty involved as many sawmillers have been bidding higher prices than upset at Crown auction sales for hardwood timber in this area."

"(2) In response to the demand for hardwood timber in Brisbane supplies have come from Northern New South Wales. It has been the practice of the New South Wales Forestry Commission to assess its royalties for sawmills in the economic zone supplying Brisbane on the Brisbane price."

"(3) The matter was given careful consideration. The Queensland Timber Stabilisation Board was not consulted before the rise in Crown log prices at Brisbane were gazetted."

COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL
AID FOR DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) asked the Premier—

"In view of the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Holt's statement in the House of Representatives on October 20, as reported in the Brisbane "Telegraph," that so far no formal request had been received from the Queensland Government for drought relief and that any request would be carefully examined, will his Government take immediate action and ask the Federal Government to participate in any drought relief schemes that are considered so necessary by Members of all Parties?"

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

"One submission was made to the Commonwealth on September 23, and another on October 19, 1960. The recognised channel of communication is from the Premier to the Prime Minister and evidently Mr. Holt was not aware of either of these submissions when he made his statement on October 20."

SALE OF HOUSING COMMISSION HOUSES
AND LAND

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

"In view of his reported statement in the "Telegraph" of October 20, concerning purchase homes and land through the Housing Commission,—

(1) What is the average length of time prospective purchasers have to wait for completion of homes after the deposits are paid?

(2) In what districts will the homes be available?

(3) How many allotments are presently available for home-seekers?"

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

"(1, 2, and 3) From the way in which the question is framed, it seems that the Honourable Gentleman has misunderstood the effect of my statement to which he refers. The Housing Commission has, for a great number of years, assisted home builders in two principal ways. Through what can best be described as its Workers' Dwelling Scheme, the prospective home builder acquires his own land and then secures the assistance of the Commission in the design, supervision of construction and financing of the dwelling. The second method has been for the Commission itself to clear land, subdivide it and then, in agreement with the prospective home owner, it arranges the erection of the home and the completed house and land are then sold to the home owner on a single contract of sale. At the present time, it is doubtful whether the Commission has power to sell building allotments as such. It can sell a completed home, including the land, but it cannot sell the land separately. The extended activity which I am contemplating will enable the Commission to sell allotments as such. From this, it will be seen that there is no relation between the sale of land and the waiting time for the completion of houses. However, in case there is some significance that has escaped my notice, a check of the last fifty houses completed in the Metropolitan Area showed that the average length of time was 15 weeks. Where the house is to be constructed to a special plan and specification the average period from selection of a plan to the acceptance of a tender is 13 weeks. The State has in all 5,366 allotments, of which 1,055 have

been developed, 963 are being developed and 3,348 awaiting development. Included in the above figures is the Metropolitan Area, where 53 sites are presently available, roadworks are being carried out for 240 sites, tenders are under consideration or being called for road works for 92 sites and clearing is being carried out preparatory to calling tenders for road development of 818 sites."

RELAYING OF RAILWAY TRACK, BUNDABERG-VERDANT SIDING SECTION

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) asked the Minister for Transport—

"In respect of the relaying of sections of the North Coast Railway, can he give any assurance that this work will not be discontinued in cases where only short distances remain incompletd, for example, between Verdant Siding and Bundaberg where there is an incompletd section of about three miles and it is strongly rumoured that the gang in that area is to be paid off?"

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

"The relaying of those sections of the North Coast Line in the Maryborough District included in the programme for the current financial year has been or will have been completed by June 30, 1961. The men in the gang referred to by the Honourable Member will not be paid off as it is proposed to transfer the gang to the Gayndah Branch in about twelve weeks' time to carry out relaying work on that section. It is necessary when arranging the relaying programme to carry out the work in the order of priority in which the track needs attention."

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Queensland Radium Institute for the year 1959-1960.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under the Milk Supply Act of 1952.

Orders in Council under the Forestry Act of 1959.

FEES PAID BY CROWN TO BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS

RETURN TO ORDER

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Return to an Order made by the House on 30 August last, on the motion of Mr. Davies, showing fees paid to barristers and solicitors for the year 1959-1960.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 21 October (see p. 916) 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. PILBEAM (Rockhampton South) (11.15 a.m.): I wish first to congratulate the Treasurer on the Financial Statement that he has placed before the Chamber. There is no doubt that Queensland is fortunate in having such an efficient and capable servant as Mr. Hiley to set the financial pattern from which arise the services to the public under the headings of health, education, administration of justice, and the like, and the developmental projects that are so important to Queensland. The Treasurer is highly regarded in the accountancy profession—and with justification. His integrity and singleness of purpose match his efficiency and these traits are amply evidenced in his latest work—the Budget that has just been presented.

I have listened with interest to the debate on the Financial Statement over the past few weeks, but I have listened in vain for some criticism that would expose weaknesses in the Treasurer's workings. I have been particularly concerned to try to discover out of the specious arguments that have been advanced some constructive criticism, some attempt to analyse a portion of the Budget and to show how an advantage could be obtained by dealing with that particular section in a different way. I have heard no such constructive alteration urged. In my opinion it is not constructive criticism if a claim is made that more money should be spent on one project, unless it is shown at the same time how that money can be obtained.

Mr. Davies: What would the hon. member call his criticism before he came into Parliament? Would that be destructive?

Mr. PILBEAM: You see what I mean, Mr. Taylor! It is all very well to say that we should spend another £500,000 on irrigation projects. I agree that more money should be spent on irrigation, but one is not offering constructive criticism unless he can show how that £500,000 can be derived.

I can truthfully say that here has been no real fault-finding with the document. It is therefore apparent to me—and I think apparent to most people—that this Budget, presented by a master of his craft and taking into consideration in their true perspective the needs and requirements of the people of Queensland, is as good as can

be presented, and could well be adopted in its entirety as the financial background for the forthcoming year's activities.

One criticism that has been levelled at the Treasurer is that he has been guilty of presenting three consecutive budgets in which deficits are shown. In my opinion, as a member of the accounting profession, I would say that that is no indictment of the Treasurer. It is true that small deficits have been shown in the past three years; they have not been unreasonably large considering the overall totals of receipts and expenditure. In fact, they were small enough to pay tribute to the accuracy of the Treasurer's forecasting. It is very easy to bring down a Budget that will result ultimately in a surplus at the end of the year. Anybody can do that. I could take the Budget now and demonstrate how it could be altered to show a surplus. It is very easy to cut down on the allocations to the various departments, or to cut down on the amounts set aside for the State's developmental projects so that, even allowing for unexpected eventualities, the Budget must result in a surplus. But there are two great disadvantages in presenting what we know is a loose Budget. In the first place it results in a curtailment of the Government's activities, which in turn retards the State's developmental projects. Secondly, it is well known to members of the profession that it is a melancholy fact that when you budget for a surplus you inevitably budget for wastages. If specific amounts are not set aside for definite objects, or if amounts are left unclaimed or are not capable of being claimed for a definite project, inevitably those amounts will be filched for some other project that is not necessarily to the advantage of the State.

I admire the Treasurer, then, for his courage, even though he has been severely criticised for presenting tight Budgets year after year by means of which every source of income has been fully used for the people of Queensland. I see no advantage in budgeting for surpluses at the expense of necessary works. In the sphere of local government, cities and shires have been repeatedly warned by the Treasurer of the day, and Treasurers of the past, for not carrying out the works they set themselves out to do, thereby finishing the year with a surplus. I can remember quite well the hon. member for Bundaberg, when he was Treasurer, castigating local authorities for carrying over surpluses. I do not believe in doing that. I pin my faith in tight Budgets such as the ones that have been presented by the Treasurer.

I agree with previous speakers that we should press for a greater share of income from Commonwealth sources. I am not going to make any strong criticism of the formula under which we derive income, but I think we should press for a greater allowance by way of developmental grants. I think that other

States are receiving a far greater proportion of the available money in this field than Queensland is. I am quite happy to allow the advocacy in this particular sphere to rest in the hands of the Treasurer and the Premier of the State. I do not think we could do better.

I again commend the Treasurer for presenting tight Budgets in order to make money available for developmental works and the various services given to the people of Queensland by the State. The best of Budgets can only set out on one side the total income expected to be received during the year, based on figures for previous years, and on the other side the allocations made available for essential services and developmental projects. This Budget does just that, and, if a deficit is forecast, it is only to ensure that curtailment of essential and necessary work is not allowed.

In a study of this Budget appreciation must be expressed at the fact that no new taxes are to be imposed, and also that it is proposed to grant relief from land tax limited to partially relieving the impact of re-valuations. It is only too easy when preparing a Budget to grasp at every means of avoiding a deficit, and the Treasurer is to be commended for placing consideration for the public before financial return in this regard. It is well known that many landowners will feel the impact of considerably increased valuations. They must be relieved to know that this Budget will not be balanced at their expense.

I sympathise with the Treasurer in his efforts to balance the Budget in times such as these, to allow for maximum employment in face of ever-increasing wages and costs. The impact of margins was severely felt last year, and, no doubt, will be more heavily felt this year. To achieve maximum employment and to ensure a continuance of satisfactory service to the public, the Budget has perforce had to allow for increases in the level of the charges for some services rendered by this State to the public. But, as the Treasurer has stressed, in many cases the extra costs of these services will be offset by the greater degree of recoverability.

In considering the Budget, and in particular that part of it dealing with the railway finance, sympathetic consideration must be extended to the Treasurer and the Minister for Transport in regard to this tremendous problem.

No-one will deprecate the work of the Minister for Transport—work that is thankless and never-ending, work that at times must seem almost hopeless. In the face of world transport trends, which have gone through the horse-and-buggy phase, have reached the steam phase and are now well into the age of road transport and even air transport, how can anyone cavil at this statement by the Treasurer—

“Unless this year can produce some material improvement, there will be no

alternative to a policy of slowly rejecting the financially inadequate services and confining the operation of the railways to those lines where the volume of traffic makes their retention, if not fully, at least nearly economic."

So far I have dealt with the not-so-happy aspects of the Budget. Now let me comment on some of its brighter aspects, of which there are quite a few. In particular, in the spheres of education and health the position is good. The main increases in expenditure come under those headings. The Budget allows for the construction of new school buildings, nine high schools and 11 primary schools. Further, the capital expenditure on University buildings, including the one at Townsville, will be an all-time record, and that is very wonderful news for Queensland. In particular, on behalf of Central Queensland I commend the Budget for the extension of tertiary education to the country. We congratulate Townsville most warmly on the fact that it has achieved a University college. We are happy to know, and I think it is almost certain, that in a few years' time, with the sympathetic support of the University Senate and the relevant Minister, we should have a University college in Central Queensland, possibly at Rockhampton. That is wonderful news for those of us in Central Queensland who have fought so hard to have a University established in our own locality. I am very proud of the fact that we have a first-class committee in Rockhampton working towards that end, and those people are not selfish, despite what others might think of them. I think I should mention one of the best efforts they made. In preparing the background of a case for the Minister, many people were approached to grant scholarships or to donate money for scholarships to the University when established there. These people have decided that they will not wait until a University college is established in Central Queensland, but will make those scholarships available to the Queensland University. I think that is a first-class, generous offer, and it merits full consideration of their case in a few short years.

The allocation to the Department of Health and Home Affairs will mean a continuation and extension of free hospitalisation, and will also make possible further housing for the aged, a problem in which I am particularly interested. We have heard much discussion on housing, and it is possible within the fabric of the Budget to seek means to relieve housing shortages throughout the State, and at the same time to get the fullest support from the State and Commonwealth Governments. I can say now that in Rockhampton, and quite a few other places in Queensland, there are some very fine housing settlements for the old people, and they carry a wonderful subsidy. The Rockhampton settlement is just a pattern of what is done elsewhere. The authority concerned has only to provide 25 per cent. of the total cost of the home. The State Government supplies 25 per cent. and the Federal Government supplies 50 per cent.

Mr. Hilton: Before the Commonwealth came in, the State used to give 50 per cent.

Mr. PILBEAM: I do not know about that.

I know that despite the criticism levelled at this Government, and the Commonwealth Government in other directions, in this matter the Commonwealth Government are begging the people to take advantage of this subsidy. They have a large amount of money available for the housing of the old people, and they had to increase the subsidy from 30s. in the £1 to £2 in the £1 before they could arouse much interest in it. Because of this wonderful subsidy from the Commonwealth Government and our own Government we are rapidly building up in Rockhampton a first-class housing settlement for old people and we will be able to let these houses for £1 a week fully furnished. We will also be able to get rid of the substandard and slum-like cottages that were formerly occupied by old people in Queen's Park on the other side of the river, and a lot of old people will be able to preserve a measure of independence to which they are fully entitled. These old people are able to look after themselves and they are not willing to go into Eventide. They will have attractive dwellings; these are practical little cottages to be let at a nominal rental of £1 a week. The old people will be able to preserve a full measure of independence and live happy and contented lives. We should be more interested than we are in the care of the aged. It is very proper that in this year's Budget the same measure of subsidy as previously is allowed by the State Government and we can be sure that the same measure of subsidy will be given by the Federal Government.

The Budget makes interesting reading in the field of development. Included in the Budget is provision for such ambitious undertakings as the Barron Falls hydro-electric extension project, for which £1,163,000 is provided; the Mt. Isa railway Project Fund, for which £4,813,000 is provided; and the Tully Falls Hydro-electric Project Fund, for which £352,000 is provided. These are all works of a national character and are well justified. I congratulate the Government on pressing ahead with them and I congratulate North Queensland on getting the benefit of them.

In Central Queensland we are a little backward with development. Possibly some of the fault lies with us. At the present time there is an office for development in North Queensland. I notice in the Budget that there is an allocation of £6,000 to maintain that office. In Central Queensland we have no officer responsible for development. I can assure hon. members that in an effort to rectify this defect the people of Rockhampton intend to appoint their own developmental officer and pay fully for his services.

Mr. Thackeray: Who are they, the rate-payers?

Mr. PILBEAM: It will not be the rate-payers of Rockhampton, although ultimately it may be ratepayers. But they will not be approached as ratepayers.

When we put up this project I am quite sure that we will have in Rockhampton a capable officer who will investigate, and place before the Government, worth-while developmental projects that will receive, the support of the Government.

We are already making considerable advances in the developmental field in Central Queensland and, with the full support of the people in the area and private enterprise, we will continue to. The greatest development that has taken place for years in Central Queensland is now right at our door. I refer to the proposed refinery at Port Alma, which will benefit the whole State. I am very glad to be able to say that the whole project has stemmed from the civic-mindedness of the people of Rockhampton who have combined as one to construct the road to Port Alma and rehabilitate the port. In this effort they have been fully supported by this Government. And I am quite sure that when the final proposal comes from Ampol it will receive the sympathetic support and co-operation from this Government that it deserves.

Mr. Hughes: Don't you think the Government should be commended for their initiative and drive in obtaining industrial development in Queensland?

Mr. PILBEAM: Yes. We hope to co-operate with the Government in that development by appointing our own developmental officer in Rockhampton. We intend to put schemes to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must indicate to hon. members that, if they are asking the speaker a question and they want that question recorded, they must speak up. I point out to hon. members speaking from the back benches that not only is it hard for me to hear them but it must be extremely difficult for the "Hansard" staff to hear because the microphone is on this table. I ask them to raise their voices slightly so that they can be heard more distinctly above any conversation.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. PILBEAM: As I said before, in the field of private endeavour and local government, supported by this Government, development is taking place in Central Queensland. The road to Port Alma has been built and the final touches are being put to it now. The main contributors to the road, of course, are the Rockhampton Harbour Board, the Rockhampton City Council, certain public-spirited Rockhampton citizens, and this Government. The port will be rehabilitated with the construction of a large concrete breast wharf to which the sole contributor will be the Rockhampton Harbour Board, with a guarantee from the Rockhampton City

Council. This will make it the first large wharf construction ever undertaken in Queensland without payment of one penny of Government money. We do not mind that. We can see the possibilities of the project. It will be of the utmost benefit not merely to Central Queensland but to the whole State.

Moreover, in the field of private enterprise, Ampol Petroleum Pty. Ltd. has already reclaimed a large area of land at Port Alma and will shortly commence construction of a £250,000 ocean oil terminal—again at no cost to the Government. I do not mean that the Government have not supported these projects; they have. The projects would not have been possible without their co-operation and support. I am speaking in the Budget debate and pointing out that these advances have been made without any financial outlay by the Government.

Even more wonderful development is possible at Port Alma. If Ampol receives a full measure of Government support it is almost sure that a £20,000,000 oil terminal will be constructed there. That will be a great day in the history of the State. I am pleased to be able to say that Ampol investigations of Port Alma have been satisfactory in every respect and the port fulfils every requirement of a modern and large-scale refinery. I am quite sure the company is almost at a stage where it will make the final approach to this Government, and if it does, I rely on the full support of the Government, of which I am proud to be a member, to bring about this highly desirable industrial development.

Another great development that could take place in Central Queensland is in regard to beef-cattle industry. Much has been said about the need to build all-weather roads in the Gulf country and to open up the Channel country and bring about its development. I agree that those roads should be built—in fact I supported the motion seeking Federal Government support for their construction—but, at the same time, I must advance the claims of Central Queensland for development of the cattle industry in the brigalow and spear grass areas. Development is possible on a much greater scale in these areas than could possibly be envisaged in the Gulf country or the Channel country. The cattle numbers in the brigalow and spear grass areas could be increased by millions, compared with an increase of thousands in other areas. We must not make the mistake of risking the substance in grasping for the shadow. It has been proved conclusively that the largest cattle numbers in Australia are within a 200-mile radius of Rockhampton, and I shall show hon. members that we can also produce cattle in that area equal to the best in the world. I know that I am not speaking parochially now, because all hon. members, I am sure, have read the remarks of His Excellency the Governor in which he said that the brigalow belt in Central Queensland offers the best opportunities for development of the beef-cattle industry. They must also

have heard the remarks made from time to time by Professor P. J. Skerman, and only recently, at Cool Waters, at the conclusion of the cattle school, he said—

“With the short killing season in the Rockhampton district this year, this problem”—that is, the shortage of cattle numbers—“has been brought home more forcibly. There has been agitation for road connections into the Channel Country to bring out more fats. There is no doubt that the Channel country fats do fill in at an important period of the year when other fats are becoming scarce, but we cannot bank on the Channel country for “continuity” because of the irregularities of its seasons. The answer to Rockhampton’s problem lies largely in the development of a few million acres of brigalow and open downs not far from its back door—down the Dawson Valley, up the Isaacs and McKenzie and in the Central Highlands. These are the main areas with soils suitable for cropping although there are opportunities nearer home along river and creek flats and, with drainage, some of the better-class flats around Marlborough, Kunwarara, Archer and Bajool.”

As I said earlier, the standard of cattle is equal to the world’s best. Ten years ago, at the Rockhampton show, we started a competition for a K-wagon of fats. It was said at the time that the class was impossible, because one could not get 18 head that were reasonably even. The idea originated in Chicago. As a matter of fact, Mr. Mick Hutton, of “Bingegang”, Dingo, wrote to Chicago and got full particulars, and, despite a good deal of opposition, introduced the competition—in 1950-1951, I think it was. The standard of that K-wagon class has improved considerably over the years. It is a really practical test of what a person can actually grow on his property. He cannot pick out a good beast here and there; he must pick out 18 good ones.

This year the beef from the winning K-wagon in that class was sent to Smithfield Market in England, which is probably the leading cattle market in the world, for comment, not for judging. It was examined by two leading judges, Mr. C. George Bolton and Mr. Sidney H. B. Emus, and these were their remarks—

“Winners of the ‘K’ Wagon Competition all Aberdeen Angus. This was an excellent exhibit. The carcasses were all of the right type, and more in line with market requirements today than the average carcass in the Smithfield Competition. There was evidence that most of the animals in this ‘K’ wagon had gone back a little in condition before slaughter but that is no detriment here, but rather a loss to the producer. The result was a very nicely finished display, probably the best to date, and eminently suitable for the current demand. The weights, quality and

finish all being First Class, the high percentage of lean flesh to bone stamped them high class for this market.”

They also said—

“It would appear that the 1960 Rockhampton Show has marked a new milestone in the history of the Beef Industry in Queensland, proving that well-developed steers can be produced in quantity under 18 months old. Bearing in mind the fact that comparisons here are with the world’s best, with which these showed up quite favourably, it is safe to assume that subsequent shows will produce some real champions.”

That should convince every hon. member of the Committee that in Central Queensland we can produce cattle equal to the world’s best. We are already producing 2,250,000 annually, and according to the experts of the C.S.I.R.O. we could produce three or four times that number with reasonable concentration on fertilising and the sowing of suitable grasses. I repeat that we must not forsake the substance by grasping at the shadow.

I turn now to the payment of subsidies to local authorities. I have been too long in the local-government field to feel very happy at the thought of subsidies being reduced. Local authorities throughout Queensland are doing a wonderful job. Theirs is the really practical work of putting down streets, providing drainage, and all the other amenities for which modern people strive. I should hate to think that future Budgets would envisage a cutting down on subsidies payable to local authorities. I am very pleased that a record amount is made available for local authorities throughout Queensland in this Budget. That wonderful feature of the Budget will be recognised by those who know what they are talking about.

I join with previous speakers who have made suggestions about future Budgets. I cannot offer any constructive criticism on this point, but I join with them in making a plea to the Government to give full consideration to irrigation next year. Water is a major requirement throughout the world, not only for agricultural and grazing pursuits but also for the extension of industry. In Rockhampton we have the wonderful Fitzroy River, which carries more than 50 per cent. of the water carried by the largest river system in Australia, the Murray-Darling. We have several schemes for the development of the Fitzroy River basin to bring valuable water to the brigalow belt, which is regarded as Australia’s best agricultural and grazing prospect. If we pull the brigalow we are still short of water. That area has only an annual rainfall of from 10 to 20 inches; the natural rainfall must be augmented by irrigation. At least four major irrigation schemes could be undertaken with this wonderful river, as a result of which it has been assessed by experts we could carry a huge population in the Fitzroy River basin. I appeal to the Government to give

full consideration in future years to the extension of irrigation. I know it is hard to get the money, but the reward offered is so great that maximum consideration must be given to irrigation in the future. I refer not only to small schemes but also to the bolder and more imaginative major schemes that will help substantially to populate the State. Of course, nearer at home we have a proposal, not a water-conservation scheme but the building of a barrage across the Fitzroy River sufficiently high to stop the encroachment of the tide. It would convert the river at Rockhampton from a salt-water to a fresh-water stream. It would give industry at Rockhampton a tremendous reservoir of fresh water, making Rockhampton equal to any city in Queensland on the industrial front.

We do not ask anyone to do anything unless we work hard in our own interests. We have already investigated the scheme as fully as we can. We have provided £12,000 to set up a full-scale model at the University in Brisbane with whom the engineers of the Department of Local Government are co-operating. I think I am on safe ground in asking the Government to give full consideration to assisting us with this major project.

I do not intend to take up any further time on the Budget at this stage. I understand there will be further opportunities for discussion in the debates on the various Estimates. I content myself finally by commending the Treasurer for his courage in presenting his Budget, which, as I say, is a tight one, particularly as it was framed at a time when Queensland was facing disastrous drought conditions. In so doing he made it possible for every department to carry out the maximum amount of work with advantage to the State. I sincerely hope that his expectations on this occasion will be exceeded, that we will weather the drought and at the close of the year disappoint the Opposition by showing a slight surplus.

Mr. DONALD (Ipswich East) (11.52 a.m.): During the debate on the Address in Reply the Minister for Labour and Industry and other Government members sang a vicious hymn of hate against leaders of the trade-union movement of this State and the Australian Labour Party. So unjust and so unchristian was their criticism that it prompted the hon. member for Merthyr to suggest that the heads of the various Christian churches of this State should be requested to set aside a Sunday on which special services and prayers could be said for the members of this Chamber.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I rise to a point of order. If I heard the hon. member correctly, he insinuated that I suggested a day of religious observance being held as a result of the Deputy Premier's comments. If that is so, it is entirely incorrect and I ask him to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I ask the hon. member to accept the explanation of the hon. member for Merthyr.

Mr. DONALD: I will accept his explanation. I should like hon. members and the general public to read "Hansard" and confirm my statement. I point out to hon. members that prayers are said in this House every day for the benefit of members. They were apparently not sufficient to convince the hon. member for Merthyr and his Government. He pleaded for a much wider sphere of prayer and he cannot deny it.

As one who has spent a lifetime in the working-class movement in Queensland, on both the political and industrial fronts, I feel I would be lacking in my duty if I did not reply to the unfair criticism made. All the evidence submitted by those Government members who spoke was by way of newspaper cuttings and photographs that appeared in the newspapers, and that is the medium I intend using in my reply to their very unfair criticism. The first is from a newspaper journal called "Australian and New Zealand Weekly." It appears in the edition of 25 June, 1960, under the heading "Growing Russian Trade with Australia."

For the benefit of hon. members opposite this journal is in no way connected with the Australian Labour Party or the trade-union movement either here or at home, where it is published. It is published in London. It was established in 1884 and is still appearing. It therefore cannot be classed as something inconsequential. It has a constant reading public and what it says must be taken as authentic. I refer hon. members to this passage—

"Russia is now the seventh strongest foreign buyer of Australian goods.

"Official trade figures show that in the 10 months to April 30th, 1959, Australia sold to the Soviet Union £A.49,000 worth of goods and that in the corresponding period of this year sales to Russia soared to £A.11,750,000.

"Over the same period there was also an increase of more than 20 per cent. in Australian imports from Russia. In the 10 months to April 30 last these amounted to £A.455,000, an increase of £A.109,000."

Firstly, I have no objection to the improvement in our trade relations with Russia. Australia is still mainly a primary-producing country and can remain solvent only by trading with other nations. It may interest hon. members to know that the gross value of Queensland's primary production for 1958-1959 was £277,782,000, or 20 per cent. of Australia's total primary output. Incidentally, beef was the State's best income-earner, the gross value of production being £60,239,000 for the year 1958-1959.

With the expansion of our secondary industries during recent years, many people have overlooked the importance of our rural

industries. It is a fact that they provide approximately 80 per cent. of our export income and make the success of our secondary industries possible.

Despite rising costs and highly competitive marketing conditions overseas, the output of our rural industries has increased by almost 50 per cent. since the end of World War II, without any appreciable increase in the number of employees in those industries.

Australians have often been told that they ride on the sheep's back and, as wool provided about 45 per cent. of our export income last year, we are still apparently riding on the sheep's back. We know that some of this wool found its way to Russia, as did some of our stud sheep, and, if hon. members opposite who represent the grazing fraternity in this Chamber are proud of this fact, they are welcome to the credit for it.

Quite an amount of our primary and other products must be going to Russia, because the value of exports to the U.S.S.R. reached £A11,750,000 last year. While most if not all of the commodities exported to the U.S.S.R. last year were produced by the workers of the country—and with very few exceptions they would all be members of some trade union—none of those workers, and certainly none of those trade unionists, would be the medium through which the trade negotiations were conducted. While their skill and labour were responsible for the production of these goods sold to Russian interests, they would not themselves be the sellers, so they cannot be accused of trading with a Communist country. The traders and the sellers and the negotiators would be supporters of the Liberal Party, strong supporters and liberal contributors to that party's political fund. However, I am not suggesting nor am I implying that they had any connection with the Communist Party, that they are Communist sympathisers or fellow-travellers. If I did, that would be false reasoning and therefore incorrect, just as the accusation of the Minister for Labour and Industry and other Government speakers, being based on false reasoning, was incorrect, that is, when they claim that the trade unions are under Communist domination because they elect in a democratic manner a Communist to a position of trust in the organisation and/or as the leader of the organisation.

Members of the Communist Party become leaders in the trade-union movement because they are elected to those responsible positions by the rank and file of their organisations, and elected in a most democratic manner. Surely the Government members are not going to object to that. If they do, they forfeit any right they have to be considered democrats, as they would be taking away the right and privilege of trade unionists to elect their officials without outside interference, and in accordance with democratic practice. Let me emphasise again that it is done in a very democratic manner. I doubt very much if there is one trade union official in the

Commonwealth of Australia who is elected to any position of trust in his union merely because he happens to be a member of the Communist Party. However, I do not know that many are chosen to fill responsible positions in the trade-union movement in spite of the fact that they are members of the Communist Party. The reason for that is easy to explain. They have been chosen because of their outstanding ability to negotiate with management and to win improved conditions and higher salaries and wages for their workmates. The only way they can be displaced—the only way they should be displaced—is to demonstrate to the rank and file of the trade unions that the election of non-Communist leaders and the adoption of more traditional policies will be equally effective in removing fundamental grievances. This requires that those trade-union members who are not members of the Communist Party and have the qualities needed for leadership should exhibit the same enthusiasm, the same energy and the same efficiency as their Communist rivals. The non-Communist trade-union leaders, while constantly maintaining advances in the status and power of the workers, must show an awareness of the longer-term strategy and have clearly in their minds not only the type of socialist economy they finally desire, but also the method by which this may be achieved, without losing in the process that democratic system of political organisation which is equally vital.

The Deputy Premier took strong exception to five A.L.P. members sitting with four Communists on a strike-committee meeting. Does he suggest they should have walked out and left the negotiations, and the conduct of the industrial dispute, to those trade-union leaders who are members of the Communist Party? No other interpretation could be placed upon his criticisms. One could be pardoned for thinking as I have suggested.

Let us look at the trade-union leaders whose photographs appeared in the "Telegraph" of 12 September, and who were seriously criticised by Government speakers. There is Tom Millar, the President of the Queensland Colliery Employees Union, with whom I worked for a number of years as a district and federation officer of the Miners' Union. That did not make me a Communist, nor did it make Tommy Millar a supporter of the Australian Labour Party; nor did it interfere with our efficiency as trade-union officials. Nominations have been called recently and a vote will take place in the very near future for officers of the Queensland District of the Miners' Federation. What do we find? Tom Millar, the Communist, was elected unopposed to the position of president. Surely that is an indication of his standing with the membership of the union, even though he is a Communist. This is revealed more sharply by the number of nominations received for the position of district secretary.

For the position of district secretary there were four nominations; there were also four nominations for vice-president; six nominations for check inspectors—two required; four nominations for district councillor to the federation—one required, and three nominations for union representative at the A.C.T.U. congress. I think that illustrates just how democratically the members of the union undertake these important tasks.

Dr. Delamothe: Do Communists make better trade unionists than non-Communists?

Mr. DONALD: No, I am not going to say that, nor am I going to admit it. I thought I made that very clear previously and I do not want to waste time by repeating it. Tom Millar has won the support of the members of his union because of the service he has given to it over the years and not because he was a Communist.

Mr. Ramsden: Wouldn't you say that shows the weakness in the A.L.P. that they cannot put up a candidate?

Mr. DONALD: In answer to the interjection by the hon. member for Merthyr, who is totally devoid of any knowledge of the working-class movement and of the trade-union movement, I think I made it perfectly clear that I was elected by the same men who elected Tom Millar, and I served with him for a number of years. That ought to supply him with the answer to his question and at the same time perhaps convey an impression for the benefit of Dr. Delamothe, too.

Mr. Bert Milliner of the Printers' Union is also a member of the Q.C.E. It is true that his photograph appeared in the "Telegraph" with other members of the strike committee. He had the distinction not only of being a prominent A.L.P. member but also of being selected by the workers of Australia, and the A.C.T.U., as one of Australia's representatives on the I.L.O.

Then we come to Archie Dawson, secretary of the Electrical Workers' Union of the State. While members of the Government were trying to traduce him and to link him with the Communist Party, they did not mention the fact that he spent his 18th birthday on the battlefields of Flanders fighting in the "war to end wars." Nor did they mention that he had won a decoration for his service to the country on the battlefield. No, all they could say about Archie Dawson was that he went to Red China. He did go to Red China, and, what is more, he compiled a report on what he saw there. His report should be read by members of the Government Party; then they might be more tolerant and they might have their views widened considerably, particularly as it is a report by a man who went to Red China as a representative of the working class of the State. He made his own investigations. Here was a report by a man who had fought for his country and won a distinction at the early age of 18.

I am dealing with these men in the order in which their names appeared in the paper. The next is Jack Egerton. We all know him. I have known him since he was an apprentice in the Ipswich railway workshops. He is a man who is not afraid to speak his mind. In his anxiety to serve those whom he represents, Jack Egerton often exhibits great enthusiasm and energy—some of which can be, and often is, used in an attempt to discredit him in the Australian Labour Party. He, too, is a member of the Q.C.E. He was elected to that body by the Labour-in-Politics Convention that was held in Brisbane at the beginning of this year. He narrowly won his seat, tying for last place with two others and winning on the final ballot. That does not detract from his efficiency or his enthusiasm or his zeal. Subsequently he was elected by the Q.C.E. to the inner executive.

Mr. Fields I do not know personally. I know he is a member of the Communist Party and, in response to inquiries I have made, I have been informed that he is a very good citizen. That is natural, of course, because a good unionist is always a good citizen, and he is a very good trade-union official.

The next man is Mr. G. M. Dawson, secretary of the Building Workers' Industrial Union. He was for many years a prominent member of the Australian Labour Party but he left us to join the Communist Party. He has made no excuses for joining that party.

Mr. Ramsden: Why would he do that?

Mr. DONALD: Why did the hon. member for Merthyr leave the church? I might ask him that if he persists in his silly and irrelevant interjections. I wish these people would grow up in mind as well as in body.

Mr. Dawson is without any doubt a very efficient trade-union official, and he was elected to that position not because he was a Communist but in spite of it. At the present time a ballot is being prepared, if it is not already in progress, to determine who will be the elected representative for the coming term. Would the hon. member for Merthyr and others of the Liberal Party like him, including the Deputy Premier, suggest that, if the members of the union return him as their General Secretary, as they have done over the years, he should not be allowed to accept the position because he is a Communist? Do they suggest that the people should walk away from him? That, of course, is the logic of their arguments!

Next on the list is George Whiteside. I have known him for many years, even before he became an official in the Federated Engine Drivers' and Firemen's Association. He has always been not only a good trade-unionist and trade-union official but also a very good member of the Australian Labour Party. It is true that he is now president of the Q.C.E.

We come then to Jack Hanson. I first met him on the train that was conveying

delegates from Southern Queensland to Mackay for the Mackay Convention. I am not referring to the last Mackay Convention, but to the one held there when the Hon. Forgan Smith was Leader of the Parliamentary Australian Labour Party and Premier of Queensland. He is the son of the late Hon. E. J. Hanson, who for many years gave excellent service to our State as an M.L.A. and filled the position of Speaker with distinction and credit to himself and his party. For the information of the hon. member for Condamine, who made a great song about the cheekiness and unfairness of the workers in asking for a reduction in their working week to 35 hours and the impossibility of granting it, let me remind him that it is not very long ago that the representatives of the working class in Queensland had before them at their first convention in Mackay a request that the weekly working hours be reduced from 48 to 44. The same opposition to the reduction of the working week was raised then as the hon. member for Condamine is raising now. There is nothing new in his suggestion, only the old Tory-Conservative hatred of any benefit that the working class may get, whether it is a 35-hour week, an increase in wages, or any other amenity. We eventually got the 44-hour week because the workers of Queensland asked for it through their representatives at the Convention, and the economy of Queensland and Australia will not be impaired when the workers get a 35-hour week.

What did we see in this Chamber when the legislation for a 40-hour week was introduced? We saw Country Party members, very loyal to their party, opposing it; but we also saw members of the Liberal Party cross the floor and vote with the Government. That was for political expediency, not for political honesty.

The next person is Mr. Arnell from the Waterside Workers' Federation, who is a member of the Australian Labour Party and was for some time a member of the Q.C.E.

That is the record, as briefly as I can put it, of those persons who are criticised by members of the Government parties, and not one of them can be challenged about his honesty of purpose or citizenship.

Let us see what Senator E. B. Maher said about Red China. He is at present a Country Party Senator for Queensland; at one time he was Leader of the Opposition in this Parliament. He was always a front bench member of the Opposition and a very important member of the Country Party while he was a member of this Assembly. I read from a report in "The Courier-Mail" of 5 September, 1960—

"Tokyo, October 4.—Senator E. B. Maher, of Australia, said here today that means must be found to include Communist China in any future disarmament talks, even though she was denied a United Nations seat."

They are fairly strong words.

"Senator Maher (C.P., Queensland), speaking before the Inter-Parliamentary Union conference, said the conference should strive to encompass Red China in any disarmament framework.

"In Europe, generous terms by victor to vanquished could resolve such problems as the division of Germany and self-determination in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

"He said that Russia held the key to worldwide disarmament and peace."

None of these people to whom hon. members opposite refer as Communists has said anything nearly as strong as that. If they are not convinced by what a leader of the Country Party has said, let me now quote what the Rt. Hon. Harold Macmillan, the Conservative Prime Minister of Great Britain, said in a television broadcast to the people of Russia.

I quote from a document issued by the United Kingdom Information Service, not a pamphlet of the Australian Labour Party or the trade-union movement, but one issued by the British Conservative Government that is sent to every hon. member in the Committee. The Minister for Labour and Industry and other hon. members opposite could have quoted from this document, but they preferred to tell their cock-and-bull story about the alleged shortcomings of members of the Australian Labour Party and trade-union leaders. Let me emphasise again that I am quoting the words of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, the Rt. Hon. Harold Macmillan, M.P., in his television broadcast to the people of Russia on 2 March, 1959. He said—

"You may well ask—if British policy is so pacific and so reasonable, why then are the relations between our two countries not better. Well, the reasons are complicated, and go back to all sorts of misunderstandings and perhaps mistakes. But I suppose the real reason is this—that we each see the world differently. We take a different view of life and politics. All the same, we are all men and women, and I am sure we have much more in common than many people would admit. So we must somehow establish confidence between our countries and governments. How are we to do this? I would suggest three ways."

The three ways he suggested did not include coming into Parliament and castigating those who were working for the benefit of the nation, those who have won distinction in fighting for the people of the nation. This is what he suggested—

"First we should each avoid acts which disturb the existing position anywhere in the world to the other's disadvantage; for such acts must, to use your Prime Minister's words, produce dangerous situations. Secondly, let us recognise that each side needs concrete reassurances. Words are not enough. Deeds count. Thirdly, let us see if we can make a start and go forward

step by step. Agreement on one thing leads to agreement on another. It's the first step that counts. That's why I'm here."

He said, "That's why I'm here." That is why the Prime Minister of the greatest nation in the world, the mother of democracy, the nation that has shown the world the right way to go in many instances, is in Russia and on the television in Russia—so that there can be peace and understanding between the Russian people and the British people. What a pity that hon. members opposite do not follow the same pattern, that they would not listen to the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and refrain from unfair criticism. Let me continue with Mr. Macmillan's words—

"There is one other practical step that I would also advocate. Visits by Delegations such as mine are all very well in their way. But what we really need is thousands of visits to each other's countries by ordinary people. Nothing would do more to help understanding. Tourism between us is increasing; let it grow much more. We have never refused a visa to a Soviet tourist, so come to see us. Our people will certainly come to visit you. In the present state of the world military conflicts between great powers can bring victory to no-one but must mean disaster for all. Similarly, in the political field; an attempt to gain total victory may well produce disaster. So let us work together with patience and understanding."

None of the men accused by hon. members opposite were guilty of making an appeal like that. I agree with every word of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, in spite of the fact that he is a Conservative and I am a Socialist. Our members have been criticised, both politically and through their association with the trade-union movement, because they join delegations to Red China and the Soviet Union.

The Conservative Prime Minister of Britain said—

"What is really needed is thousands of visits to each other's countries by ordinary people."

By "ordinary people" he meant working people, the useful people of the nations.

He also said—

"Let us have delegations."

That is what the working class of Australia is doing through both the A.C.T.U. and other working-class organisations, but it does not meet with the approval of hon. members opposite. They try to insinuate about and reflect on the sincerity and loyalty of members who work with Communist members in the trade unions.

The Minister for Labour and Industry produced a photograph in this Chamber. I, too, will produce one but it will not be of ordinary people. In this photograph we see Mr. Casey, now Lord Casey, shaking hands with Russia's Deputy Foreign Minister, Mr. Firubin. They were shaking hands on

Russia's resuming diplomatic relations with Australia. There is Mr. Casey very obviously shaking the hand of this Russian gentleman, and probably saying—

"Well, old fellow, it is very nice we are together again. I think we should continue so. That Petrov affair was unfortunate, you know, because he is still a pensioner. He is still drawing thousands of pounds from the people of Australia for doing nothing. Let us forget about him."

It is very obvious from the photograph that Russia's Deputy Foreign Minister, Mr. Firubin, is saying, "Shake hands, Comrade, we too want peace. Let us get together and work for peace." Is Mr. Casey a Communist? Is he revolted? No, he was made a lord and given a seat in the House of Lords in England, one of the highest positions in the British Empire. Yet when a man who has fought for his country, who has won military distinction and decorations, speaks to a fellow trade-union official in conference when they are being most unfairly attacked by the employing class, he is a man who it is suggested should be sent away. All he is doing is speaking on behalf of the people he represents but that is a crime that is unforgiveable. No seat in the House of Lords for him; no praise for him from the people opposite.

I have a photograph here of the same Russian gentleman at the Murwillumbah High School. He is surrounded by 10 young Australians, all seeking his autograph. Are those 10 young Australians to be taken away and put in prison because they are likely to contaminate the rest of the students at the Murwillumbah High School? Should they be subject to the criticism of the Deputy Premier of this State?

Hon. members know what happened when delegates to the E.C.A.F.E. were invited to a Parliamentary function here. Everyone who was present at that function knows that you could not get near the Russians for the members of the Liberal Party. Mr. Gunn, the hon. member for Wynnum, and I waited patiently for an opportunity to speak to Mr. Firubin. I was anxious to meet him.

Mr. Sullivan: Of course you were.

Mr. DONALD: I am always anxious to meet people to obtain information for myself. Eventually, when we were successful we were speaking to them for about two minutes when along came a messenger from the Treasury Department who said that the Hon. T. A. Hiley, Treasurer of Queensland, would like a chat with Mr. Firubin, and we were brushed aside. We could not get near them for members of the Liberal Party. That cannot be denied.

The unfair attitude of hon. members opposite is adopted for a specific purpose, that is, to further mislead the people of Queensland so that, on a minority vote, they can remain the Government of this State and, to the detriment of Queensland, serve the people whose interests they represent.

Mr. Sullivan: How long were you with them the day before?

Mr. DONALD: The day before or the day after, the week before or the week after—no working-class representative could get near them because of the attendance on them of members of the Liberal and Country Parties.

I now refer hon. members to the following article, which appeared in "The Sunday Mail" on 26 June this year:—

"Power Plant Aim on Coalfield

"Brisbane and Southeast Queensland may have another major power station—situated on a coal field—by 1966. The State Electricity Commissioner (Mr. Neil Smith) indicated this yesterday.

"Mr. Smith said that electricity could be generated at the source of coal and supplied to Brisbane and Southeast Queensland at a lower cost than from Brisbane power stations. This is the basis of plans now under consideration which will involve the construction of another major power station which must be in service by 1966," he said.

"Cheapest' View

"Mr. Smith was commenting on a suggestion by the Lord Mayor (Alderman Groom) that Brisbane's future electricity supplies might be generated from the coalfields.

"Mr. Smith said the Commission agreed with the principle that it was not a matter of what particular authority should generate power, but that it should come from the cheapest source.

"Alderman Groom had said that electric power supply in Brisbane would be more efficient if the Southern Electric Authority moved out of Brisbane.

"Mr. Smith said the Commission could not agree that the task of electricity supply in Southeast Queensland would be eased by severing responsibility for distribution of electricity in Brisbane from the rest of Southeast Queensland.

"The Commission could not agree with this from economical and technical standpoints."

I have consistently spoken for a number of years of the mistake being made in building generating plants in Brisbane and not on the West Moreton field. All my arguments and pleadings were cast aside by those who were supposed to have expert knowledge. They said that we could not have a power-house on the West Moreton coalfield because of the inadequate water supply. My reply to that was, "If there is not sufficient water in the Bremer River, there is an abundance of water that is almost always fresh at Redbank on the Brisbane River." The argument was still raised that the volume of water would not be sufficient to allow electricity to be generated economically on the coalfields. It was argued that it must be generated in

Brisbane. Not being an expert, I was prepared to accept the decision as final and correct.

Another disadvantage I pointed out was that in carrying coal to Brisbane all the impurities are taken with it, and the railway hoppers have to be taken back empty. If it is taken down the river in barges, the barges have to return empty. If it is taken by motor trucks, they have to return empty. I have always asked would it not be better and more economical to have a common washing plant at Redbank on the banks of the Brisbane River, where the coal for the generating plants in Brisbane could be washed before being taken to Brisbane. My suggestion was not heeded. I had the privilege of visiting the brown coalfields of Victoria at Yallourn. It has probably the biggest power-house on the mainland of Australia, and produces the cheapest electricity on the mainland of Australia—and let us not forget that it is produced from brown coal, not black coal. It is situated on the banks of the Latrobe River, which is not even as big as the Bremer River. There is my answer to those who would not listen to my arguments.

We reached the stage when the Government in their wisdom brought to Queensland representatives of the firm of Merz & McLellan to make an investigation into the possibilities, or to make a survey of Queensland's power requirements for some years to come. The people of the West Moreton district, particularly those in the coal-mining industry, are anxiously awaiting the publication of that report. We are awaiting it with some alarm and mixed feelings. I asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity when the report would be published and available to the public. His answer to my first question was that it was not finished, and that he did not know when it would be compiled and ready for publication. During the life of this Parliament I repeated the question, and on that occasion I got a satisfactory answer. The first answer was unsatisfactory because the Minister said that the report had not been compiled and therefore he could not say when it would be published. The report is now being compiled and the Minister says that when it is ready it will be submitted to Parliament. These people came from Britain to Queensland to make a survey of the requirements of Queensland power and recommend where a power station should be established.

The remarks I quoted from Mr. Neil Smith, the State Electricity Commissioner, indicate that in the not far distant future we are going to have another major power-house in the south of the State. It is puzzling to me that the colliery proprietors of the West Moreton district should not be consulted because that district produces three-quarters of the coal requirements of Queensland and has the largest quantity of reserve coal. The colliery proprietors were not taken into the confidence of this body. They made no approach to them. Mr. Thomas, the

secretary of the Queensland Colliery Proprietors' Association, did not know officially that they were here. I believe they had a brief discussion with the members of the Coal Board.

If we are to set up a power station to generate electricity on the cheapest possible basis and with the greatest efficiency, then the powerhouse must be on a coalfield with an abundance of coal and an adequate water supply. It has been rumoured—I hope it is only a rumour—that it is the intention to set up this power-house on the Callide coalfield. The measured deposits are 62,500,000 tons with an indicated 7,500,000 tons, making a total of 70,000,000 tons of coal on the Callide field. At Bundamba there are 93,000,000 tons of measured coal and 21,000,000 tons of indicated coal, making a total of 114,000,000 tons of coal. In North Ipswich there are 10,500,000 tons of measured coal and 1,500,000 tons of indicated coal, making a total of 12,000,000 tons. That is a grand total on the Ipswich field of 126,000,000 tons of coal compared with 70,000,000 tons at Callide. In addition, there are big coal deposits in the Rosewood district, adjacent to the West Moreton field.

One important aspect that the public must remember when we are talking of a coal mine or a colliery business is that a coal mine is a wasting asset. A coal mine is not like another industry where the asset can be added to in the course of manufacture or production. Every day that the mine works diminishes the assets; every week diminishes the assets; every ton of coal that comes out of mother earth means less coal remaining to be won. That is important and should be considered before judgment is passed on the coal-mining industry. The industry—particularly in West Moreton—has never failed to meet any demand put on it. No matter what crisis the nation has gone through, the coal-mining industry of West Moreton has met every demand in full. Never once have we had a blackout in Brisbane, and never once has any industrial undertaking had cause to complain about the supply of coal for its requirements.

The industry has improved in the aggregate production from 921,304 tons in 1949 to 1,536,526 in 1957, although production last year fell to 1,525,001 tons. It is to be observed that there has been an increase in the production of cleaner coal. It is not to be thought that the drop in production was due to any fault of the mining industry. It was because the demand for coal in that year was less than it was in the preceding year. Thus not only has production been stepped up but the production has been considerably improved, and, what is more important, over £2,000,000 has been spent by the colliery proprietors in the West Moreton district in recent years to modernise their plant and to make the industry more efficient. Lest hon. members feel that I am painting too glowing a picture of the West Moreton

district, let me quote from a paragraph that appeared in today's "Queensland Times", our daily newspaper in the Ipswich district. The senior scientist with the Australian Coal Association at the research laboratory in Ipswich, Mr. Le Page, was reported as saying of West Moreton—

"Colliery owners were doing 'remarkably well' in this field, Mr. Le Page said and a fantastic amount of money has been poured into the industry in the past five years."

Dr. Noble What is the extent of the reserves in the West Moreton field?

Mr. DONALD: I thought I had already stressed that. I said that in the Callide field, according to reports, we had 62,500,000 tons measured and 7,500,000 tons indicated, making a grand total of 70,000,000 tons. In the West Moreton fields we have 114,000,000 tons of coal at Bundamba and 12,000,000 tons at North Ipswich, or a grand total of 126,000,000 tons, plus that in the Rosewood district.

In case it should be suggested that the figure of £2,000,000 spent recently by the West Moreton colliery proprietors is incorrect, I stress that I have quoted a prominent and independent authority, who described the sum as a fantastic figure. Whether hon. members will agree that it is fantastic I do not know, but at least that is his view. If hon. members take into consideration what it costs to modernise a colliery today, they will realise that I am not exaggerating and that Mr. Le Page is certainly not exaggerating when he uses that term. The continuous miner, such as has been installed at the Box Flat colliery—and there is another on the surface awaiting installation—other collieries are contemplating putting them in—costs between £40,000 and £50,000. A washing plant is essential. Even Great Britain uses them extensively to rid the product of impurities. The washing plant costs up to £100,000. A cutting machine costs between £8,000 and £9,000, a shuttle-car £16,000, a Joy loader—14 B.W. is the most popular—£18,000. I think it must be conceded that that is big money.

Again, it must be conceded that everyone in the coal-mining industry in the West Moreton district has played his part and played it well. Talk of establishing a generating station elsewhere gives very little encouragement for the further outlay of capital and for further improving methods of production and the quality of the product. I am sure hon. members will agree with me there. These companies are expending considerable sums of money, but, if they think their efforts will be in vain and that coal orders will be placed with another field, what encouragement have they to keep going on this forward move? We used to be accused in Queensland of being very antiquated in our methods of winning coal. That charge can no longer be levelled against the proprietors and workers of the West Moreton district. I

therefore feel sure all will agree with me that that would be very poor reward indeed for what has already been done on the West Moreton coalfield by the proprietors. I do not want it to be thought that I am pleading for the colliery proprietors—I have not consulted any of them—but I am pleading for what I think is in the best interests of the community, and particularly South Queensland. I am pleading for the business people of Ipswich and West Moreton and for the workers, too.

Before his unfortunate collapse, the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt, in speaking on the Budget, was delivering what seemed to me to be a very intelligent and interesting speech and he was quoting some authority that said that the right economy was to keep men in employment, because one man created a job for another, and the second man created another job for still another man, and so on. The principle applies in reverse when a man is sacked. When a man is deprived of his right to earn a living by honest toil, when he is dismissed and cannot produce, someone else who is dependent on him for his food, clothing, and shelter, is thrown out of work, and so it goes on. That has been known to economists for many years—employment begets more employment; unemployment begets more unemployment. That is why I am so concerned about the uneasy feeling that exists on the Ipswich coalfields that we are going to lose more orders and that, if we do, there will be unemployment on the coalfields.

The logical place for a powerhouse is on the West Moreton coalfields. I think I have made it perfectly clear that we have abundant water there and the best reserves in southern Queensland. Another thing to be taken into consideration is that West Moreton has a well-settled community and the best balanced economy in Queensland. That is because we have been able to blend our primary and secondary industries. I regard coal mining as being a primary industry. We have the coal mines, on which the industrial strength of Ipswich was built; we have our railway workshops and woollen mills, and we are continually getting new industries. If the livelihood of the coal miners is taken away, the economy of not only Ipswich but the whole of Queensland will be upset. The building of a powerhouse at Callide would disrupt the economy of the West Moreton district and be a disadvantage to Queensland. All sections of the community would suffer—those who are engaged in the coal mining industry, and those who get their living directly or indirectly from it. Many people depend directly and indirectly for a livelihood on the West Moreton coal-mining industry.

Some years ago, at the request of the Miners' Federation, the Federal Government set up a Committee of Inquiry under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Davidson. He made an extensive tour of all the coalfields in the Commonwealth, and he was surprised

by the standard of the homes of the miners in the Ipswich and West Moreton district and the fact that so many of them owned their own homes. That may have been strange to a person from the South, but it was a result of the home-building conditions provided by Labour Governments for not only members of the mining fraternity but the people of Queensland generally. The judge said that more mine-workers owned their own homes in Queensland than in any other State, and that the standard of the homes far surpassed that anywhere else in Australia.

Any further loss of orders for coal would be disastrous. There has been, as I think all hon. members know, a serious drop in the consumption of coal by the railways as a result of the use of diesel locomotives, and that is one reason why the Government should not neglect, as they are neglecting now, the electrification scheme. They should push on with that scheme, particularly from Rosewood to Sandgate, because it would then make the railways independent to a large extent of fuel supplies from overseas for our locomotives. We would be able to supply all the coal needed for the generation of electricity. Fortunately, the consumption of coal by powerhouses of the City Council and the Southern Electric Authority has compensated to some extent for the loss of trade with the Railway Department.

The building of a powerhouse on the Callide field would benefit a few—I am prepared to admit that—but it would bring unnecessary suffering to many on the West Moreton coalfields. I hope that common sense will prevail, that any additional powerhouse will be built on the West Moreton coalfield, and that past mistakes will not be repeated.

I should like to read from the report of the Coal Board to emphasise what I have been saying, but I do not think time will permit me to do so.

Mr. Windsor: You have an example of the advantage of a generating plant on the West Moreton field now.

Mr. DONALD: I thank the hon. member for Ithaca for his interjection. We have a striking illustration of the advantage of a generating plant on the West Moreton coalfield. That illustration can be seen at the Haightmoor colliery. The coal from the colliery is supplied direct to the powerhouse by mechanical conveyors—no cartage at all, no transport costs. What can be done at Haightmoor can be done right through the coalfield.

I have insufficient time to deal with other matters to which I desired to refer, but I shall reply to the accusation by the hon. member for Condamine that one-third of the railway employees are loafers, insinuating very clearly that the Railway Department should sack one in every three of its

employees. It ill becomes a member of the grazing fraternity to accuse the Railway Department of employing men who are so devoid of interest in the community that one-third of their total number are loafing and are a burden not only on the department, but also on the State. Although they are already operating at a heavy financial loss, the railways are incurring an even greater financial loss by carrying fodder to starving stock, and transferring starving stock to other places of pasture. There is nothing wrong with that at all, but would private enterprise carry fodder at a reduced or uneconomic rate? Hon. members opposite should not say that because there is a deficit at the end of the year the Railway Department has not given service. The hon. member for Rockhampton South said how unwise it was to budget for a surplus and how wise it was to budget for a deficit. I am not going to say whether he is right or wrong, but Labour Governments have shown that they can develop the country and still show surpluses year after year. I remind the hon. member for Condamine that workers in the Railway Department can do their jobs cheaper and much more efficiently than private enterprise. If the hon. member doubts my word let him turn up "Hansard" and read the reply of the Minister for Transport to my question about the average cost of repairs to locomotives for the year ending 31 December, 1957, at the Commonwealth Engineering (Qld.) Pty. Ltd., Evans Deakin, Bundaberg Foundry and the Ipswich railway workshops. Mr. Chalk gave these comparisons—

"P.B.15 class locomotives: Evans Deakin and Co. £12,592, Commonwealth Engineering £11,838, Ipswich Workshops £5,091."

A sum of £5,091 against over £12,500 for Evans Deakin & Co. yet we are told this was done with one man in three loafing in the Railway Department! What a profit private enterprise must be making! Take note of these figures—

"C.16 locomotives: Evans Deakin £13,732, Commonwealth Engineering £12,048, Bundaberg Foundry £12,842, Ipswich Workshops £8,221."

This time nearly £14,000 for Evans Deakin against £8,000 for the Ipswich workshops. Again let me emphasise that of the employees in the railway workshops only two out of every three are working, according to the hon. member, yet they were able to do this work ever so much cheaper, and I again emphasise, ever so much better than private enterprise. But it does not end there. The comparison goes on—

"C.17 locomotives: Evans Deakin £12,229, Commonwealth Engineering £12,277, Bundaberg Foundry £13,200, Ipswich Workshops £6,055."

Almost in every instance the work was done at half the cost to the community in the Ipswich railway workshops, but unfortunately it is the policy of the Government to farm

both new and repair work away from the Ipswich railway workshops. Here are more figures—

"B.18½ locomotives: Evans Deakin £16,398, Ipswich Workshops £8,372."

Again the work was done at half the cost at the Ipswich railway workshops. Is it any wonder that the Minister for Transport made no comment on the figures in his reply to my question? That is a correct reply to a question asked to ascertain just why there was all this adverse criticism of railway employees. The railway workshops at Ipswich, as hon. members know, have produced men who have gone from Queensland to fill important positions in other railway systems throughout the Commonwealth. Men who have been trained at Ipswich railway workshops have gone into private enterprise and are now managers in private enterprise throughout the length and breadth of the State.

Despite the views of the hon. member for Condamine, these men learn their trade thoroughly and do work that enables them to hold their own with any tradesmen in Australia.

The work being performed at Ipswich, and at other railway workshops throughout Queensland, has won the commendation of people who have visited the shops. When His Excellency the Governor, Sir Henry Abel Smith, paid a visit to these workshops a short time ago he was amazed at the number of skilled tradesmen employed there and loud in his praise of the quality of their work. That is the verdict of all who are prepared to give justice to the Queensland railways and the people who work in them. Whilst the hon. member for Condamine was attacking these people and suggesting that the Government and the Minister for Transport should dispense with the services of one man in every three, he did not attack those people who are getting more out of the railways in interest than the railways themselves are getting.

(Time expired.)

Mr. ROW (Hinchinbrook) (12.52 p.m.): Firstly, I congratulate the Treasurer on the presentation of the Budget. He is recognised, not only by members of the Government benches but by members of the Opposition, as a keen and alert Treasurer. I appreciate that the debate on the Budget gives hon. members the opportunity to discuss a wide range of subjects. In my speech this afternoon I propose to deal with matters with which I am familiar and in which I am interested. The first is subsidies to local and semi-government bodies.

I realise that previous speakers have spent considerable time on this subject and I do not want to bore hon. members by endless repetition, but in the expansion of this State subsidies are matters that eventually will have to be considered. I am pleased to see that no restriction of subsidies is envisaged in the Budget.

In my speech in the debate on the Address in Reply I spent some time in pointing out that the ever-increasing burden on the landholder is the only direct means of financing local authorities, and referred to the value of subsidies in offsetting the burden of charges that councils have to bear in providing continued and ever-increasing amenities for the advancement of their communities.

I believe that local authorities should at all times receive prior consideration on subsidies. Reference to local government at the present time is somewhat superficial if it does not include the rather rousing question of valuations. Whilst criticism has been aimed at the heads of the Valuer-General and his staff, it cannot be denied that they have consistently adhered to the principle that the value of land is the amount a prudent buyer is willing to pay for it. I am not prepared to believe that the majority of buyers, whether on the Gold Coast or anywhere else, are imprudent, and, although some anomalies inevitably occur, I believe the Valuer-General deserves appreciation for his efforts, in the face of the strong criticism he has encountered, to adhere to sound valuing principles. At the same time I think the position caused by revaluation in various local authority areas calls for a complete review of land tax and local authority rating methods. In regard to land tax I know that the Premier and the Treasurer are alert to the position. They realise that values have changed so greatly and so rapidly that people whom land tax was never intended to involve have in fact become involved. Some who own little more than the land on which their home stands have become liable for payment of land tax. I feel sure that the Government do not wish to burden such people with land tax, and the promised review of the position by the Government will entirely relieve such people of the responsibility to pay it.

The effect of higher valuations in local authorities is a matter for local government itself, and any local authority that takes advantage of increased valuations to impose crippling rates is doing a great injustice to its area. Such a policy would soon drive settlers out of the local authority area to one where a more reasonable policy is adopted. I have said that the effect of increased valuations on rates is a matter for local government action. I believe, however, that simultaneously with the review of land tax, consideration should perhaps be given by the legislature to a revision of the rating principles as set out in the Local Government Act. I think that the altered circumstances brought about by recently revised valuations should prompt a thorough investigation into the question of rating by local authorities on a usage basis or some more equitable method than the present one. Frequently the valuation of a residential block is as high as the valuation of a site on which a business is situated, merely because the demand for building sites has increased. Under the present law a local authority has no alternative to levying the

same rates in the pound on the respective sites, but I suggest that the site that is merely providing a home for a man and his family should not be as highly rated as one on which a business is situated and which is providing revenue.

This problem may be overcome by providing units of rating—for example, to a site occupied by a home, one unit of rating; to a farm, perhaps two units, and to a business site in a township, perhaps three units. I am not suggesting this as a firm basis by any means, because the whole matter would require thorough investigation.

I think the home owner must receive some measure of consideration or some measure of protection in matters of valuation. There is a moral obligation on every man who can possibly do so to provide a home for his wife and family, and all Governments have an obligation to ensure that the establishment and maintenance of homes for all families preferably owned by such families remain economically practicable. I know of no better way to halt the inroads of Communism and other evils fed by discontent than to ensure as far as possible that every family has its own home, and we as a Government would be failing if we neglected to consider every possible method to this end.

I should like to refer briefly to subsidies to regional electricity boards, with which I have had some personal experience. The subsidies have greatly assisted regional electricity boards and have played a very important part in keeping tariffs as low as possible having regard to the tremendous expansion that has taken place in rural areas, particularly in the reticulation of electricity to the more remote areas. Over the past eight years, in the shire of Hinchinbrook, £650,000 has been spent on capital works alone. It is now estimated that only 800 of a population of 13,000 are without electricity, and they are in the really remote areas. Steps are being taken to give them power, too.

The iniquitous and unfair system of surcharge, or "rural rating," as it was called for want of a better name, has been abolished during the term of this Government. I understand that Mackay is the only one of the five regional board areas now paying a surcharge, and it will be only a short time before that is abolished. It is pleasing to note that the people in areas served by a transmission line now pay tariffs identical with those in the base-load areas. Subsidies have played a most important part in keeping the guarantees required for rural extensions to the minimum of 10 per cent. of the cost of the extension. However, as power lines are extended to the more remote areas, the costs involved are fast becoming beyond the capacity of the consumer. Some more practical approach to the guarantee system, based on the potential of the consumer to pay, will have to be considered.

People living in the country and developing it are justly entitled to the amenities of the urban dweller and should not be penalised unduly. It has been the concern of those charged with the responsibility of expanding this State over the years to arrest the drift to the city and I know of no better means to control that drift than to give these people amenities such as electricity, telephones and good roads.

In this debate there has so far been very little reference to sugar. In his statement the Treasurer referred to the increase of 1d. a lb. in the sugar price and also to the 7½ per cent. increase, and subsequently the 8½-per cent increase, in the required amount of peak. This increase was necessary because of the unfortunate cyclone in Mauritius and the subsequent shortfalls under the British Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, and because the U.S.A. took a certain tonnage of sugar from the British West Indies.

I should like to refer particularly to the soundness of the case presented last March to the Queensland and Commonwealth Governments for the increase of 1d. a lb. in the Australian sugar price. Up to that time there had been no change in the price since 14 May, 1956, and the industry had carried very substantial charges which occurred in the four years following. The industry was able to show in its statement that in the period between the end of the 1955 season and the end of the 1959 season wage rates had increased by about 20 per cent.

I quote the following as an example, using the central district as a base because, as hon. members will realise, parities occur among the southern, central and northern areas. Wage rates in Central Queensland at 24 October, 1955, included the field worker's weekly wage of £12 14s. 6d. At 26 October, 1959, it was £15 17s., or an increase of 24.5 per cent. The rate for cutting cane in the central area, 15 tons to the acre and over, was 14s. 0½d. It increased to 16s. 7d. as at 26 October, 1959, or an increase of 18.1 per cent. The general mill worker's hourly rate in 1955 was 6s. 7.5d. whereas in October, 1959, it was 8s. 2.3d., an overall increase of 23.6 per cent.

I am sure it will be appreciated that wage costs are by far the predominating cost in the raw-sugar industry. It is therefore well worth noting that the sugar-growers' request for an increase of 1d. a lb., which was granted, was an increase of only 10 per cent. on the price previously ruling. Because of cost absorption through increased efficiency, the industry was able to restrict its price application to half of what would have been necessary if there had not been increased productivity within the industry during the previous four years.

Mr. Gaven: Who was responsible for that?

Mr. ROW: The case was presented by the sugar industry to the Queensland Government, who in turn presented it, on behalf of the sugar industry, to the Commonwealth

Government. I would say that the Queensland Government's presentation of the case, and their support of it, played a very important part in securing the increase of 1d. a lb.

The industry has advanced in a number of directions. Perhaps the most important have been higher yields of cane and sugar per acre, increased crushing rates at the mill, and the establishment of bulk-handling facilities on a large scale at Bundaberg, Mackay, Townsville, Lucinda Point and Mourilyan. These five bulk terminals, with related harbour works, involve a total capital expenditure of £9,000,000, and this Government have given the industry every assistance in bringing the desired bulk-handling proposals to fruition.

Unfortunately, however, since the industry completed its case for an increase in the home-consumption price, costs over which the industry has no control have continued to rise. For example, the weekly wage for the field worker in the central district has risen from £15 17s. in October, 1959, to £16 8s. 6d., with another increase of 3s. only the other day, making a total increase of 14s. 6d. The scheduled cane-cutting rates for burnt cane, 15 tons to the acre, in the central district have risen in the same period—since, October, 1959—from 16s. 7d. to 17s. 3d. a ton, and the hourly rate for general mill-workers has increased from 8s. 2.3d. to 8s. 5.8d.

I want to make it quite clear that I have no argument with the amount of money that the field-worker or cane-cutter gets. I have cut cane myself. I could have been regarded as an f.a.q. cane-cutter—a fair average quality cane-cutter. I know the hard work involved in cutting cane and in growing it. I say quite frankly that the conditions under which field-workers and cane-cutters work in the sugar industry are second to none. The average cane-farmer—and quite a few of them cut cane themselves before they bought their farms—knows that good conditions count a great deal towards keeping a good gang. So, although we are compelled by the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to give certain conditions, we nevertheless do so gladly mainly to keep the cane-cutters contented. Nowadays cane-cutters appear to be a dying race.

Recent rail freight increases on fertiliser will cost the sugar industry about £80,000 a year. The effect of cost increases is that the industry is continually losing more and more of the 1d. a lb. price increase it received last May. Its ability to compete in the sale of sugar to export markets abroad is constantly being undermined and weakened. Of course, it will be appreciated that a considerable concession is given to the fruit processing industry in the form of rebates. When a rise of one penny was granted last May, the rebate increased from £2 14s. to £5 a ton, and the increase in actual money was from £120,000 to £264,000 a year.

In this constant search for other means of increasing efficiency, the industry is now looking very critically at the methods of

cane harvesting and transport, which have remained virtually unchanged for many years. Mechanical harvesting is now seen as an economic necessity, and a great deal of investigation and thought is being given to the best means of introducing it on a large scale. In my own district we have two mechanical cane harvesters working, and it is proposed next year, as a co-operative effort by the mill-owners and the cane-growers, to purchase more machines. The Massey Ferguson machine is doing a particularly good job.

The rationalisation of transport through the rezoning of cane areas has already received much attention from the sugar industry because of transport savings that result therefrom. An interesting experiment that could have far-reaching effects is being carried out in the Mossman district this year, where the economics and possibilities of conveying mechanically harvested cane in a chopped-up condition from the field to the mill is being investigated as an alternative to the old system of rail transport.

I mention these things, Mr. Taylor, to show that the industry is taking positive steps in an endeavour to continue to absorb some part of its increased costs in the future, as it has in the past.

The opening of lands in the Tully area—in fact, one might say the whole subject of the opening of land on the coastal belt—appears to be becoming a controversial subject. With your permission, Mr. Taylor, I shall read a statement by Councillor Garbutt, the chairman of the Shire Council, that appeared in "The Herbert River Express." He is regarded in the North as a man with a good knowledge of the cattle industry in Queensland, and a man who has gained that knowledge by practical experience. He is a member of an advisory committee to the Minister for Public Lands, and he read this statement at a meeting of the Hinchinbrook Shire Council last Thursday. The newspaper report reads—

"I do not wish to buy into the controversy raging around Mr. Muller at present, nor to appear to be kicking a man when he is down, but being a member of a fact finding committee appointed to investigate and make recommendations to the Minister for Lands, I feel I must reply to some of Mr. Muller's published statements."

"Mr. Muller's statement that the high rainfall area of North Queensland was not suitable for cattle fattening must have been made either from pure inexperience of the true position, pressure from the Forestry Department against acquiring the land or that he is not at all interested in the development of North Queensland."

"Take the first possible reason. We who live in North Queensland know that cattle fattening on artificial pastures has been highly successful for a number of years, and the only reason it has not developed is either lack of finance or lack of land."

"Does Mr. Muller think that men of the calibre of R. L. Atkinson, Tom Firth, Stan Collins, Basil Dore, Fred Drew, Mullins Brothers, Fred March, Teitzel Brothers, and all those cattlemen on the Daintree, to mention only a few, don't know what they are doing?"

"They have had tremendous success with their projects and are still developing more land as fast as finance will allow. The demand for land in these areas is terrific."

"Only the other day, two blocks of land in the Tully area, 1,000 acres each, were balloted for, and there were 244 applicants. Would anyone say that these people did not realise the potential in the area?"

"Then again we have had men like the general manager for Australia of Borthwicks, the big meatworks firm, visiting here, and his amazement when shown what was being done, wanting to know how his firm could acquire some of this land."

"Mr. Beaver, managing director of Amagraze, is also keen to go into the scheme."

"Only two nights ago, the Pastoral Inspector of one of the biggest firms of station owners in Queensland rang me to know where his firm could get land in this wet belt, that his firm could develop and send their bullocks on to it to fatten."

"I might add," he said, "that this man has had a lot of experience in this same wet country."

"I could go on and on, but I just wanted to prove that Mr. Muller's statement that cattle could not be fattened in this area was entirely wrong."

"Take the second reason," Cr. Garbutt said, "that pressure from the Forestry Department was holding up this scheme. This is the reason I firmly believe myself, after having sat in on a meeting of top Forestry Department men and Lands Department men. The Forestry Department object very strongly to taking any land they have control over. Even the present Minister for Lands, Hon. Mr. Fletcher, M.L.A., told us that a firm had approached him for 20,000 acres of land in this area and that they were prepared to spend £2,000,000 on developing it. But the Forestry Department claimed there was £150,000 worth of timber on it so they could not possibly have that."

"This is what I firmly believe is going to stifle what could be the greatest single upsurge of development since the sugar industry got into full swing."

"It does seem rather strange to me that only a few years ago, when a further quota of assignments was allotted to the sugar industry, the Tully mill area looked like being duplicated, and a lot of this same land that is now required for cattle fattening was then earmarked for cane farms"

and apparently there was very little objection to the land being acquired then, so why now?"

The same thing happened when the Victoria Mill was developing the land in the Abergowrie area. There was no objection and they went ahead. The land was bulldozed and 140 farms were developed. This thriving area became a glorious sight to gladden one's eyes. Attractive homes were erected in this prosperous area, which was growing and producing crops where previously only rubbishy timber grew.

The newspaper report continues—

"Here we have a project, that if developed soundly and quickly, could keep the four meatworks in North Queensland going for at least 10 months of the year instead of five, with hundreds of men being gainfully employed most of the year, which would mean more permanent families in North Queensland.

"Also the domestic meat market would have a permanent source close to consumers from which to draw its supplies.

"I fully realise," Cr. Garbutt said, "that the Forestry Department is also playing a big part in providing employment. But I was at a Local Government Conference in Mackay only a fortnight ago and 21 Local Authorities representing nearly every area from Mackay to Cooktown were of unanimous opinion that the Forestry Department were doing very little to develop any of the areas that they hold, and a resolution was carried at that conference pressing the Minister to develop the areas that they hold on the tableland behind the wet belt. Now the last reason—that the former Minister for Lands was not interested in North Queensland—I would hate to think that this is so," he said, "but for any man to spend such a short time looking at those areas and then go back to Brisbane and say that this country would not fatten cattle, makes one wonder."

As one who is particularly interested in the subject, I should like to have a few words to say about the development of North Queensland. I draw the attention of the Committee to two important items mentioned by the Treasurer in his Financial Statement. The first one I am referring to reads—

"Cattle slaughtering fell below the previous year's level, numbers available having been reduced by both drought and the rate of previous killing."

The second one reads—

"As I write this closing paragraph, my desk is being covered with evidence of widespread drought conditions. The seasonal prospect is relatively worse than twelve months ago and the next few weeks may determine whether the coming year is to be marred by one of those severe droughts that periodically form part of

the Queensland experience. If it should be so, the effect on prospective railway earnings could be severe."

Apart from spasmodic rainfall over the State the drought has continued. Its effect on individual farmers, graziers and those supplying the State's requirements, as well as on the railways and State Government finances, will almost certainly be very severe. Again we have a reminder that severe droughts are part of Queensland's climatic pattern—that is, most of Queensland. Equally, we should be reminded that there are parts of Queensland that do not suffer from drought. They are fortunate enough to have rain over every month of the year. I refer to the wet tropical coast where records show that, over a period of 31 years, in only one month did rain fail to fall.

I should not have to plead as I am for the fullest possible use to be made of the land resources of this fortunate area, but I do plead and I will keep on making that plea until I am satisfied that there is full recognition of the production possibilities of this area. Having seen the lush green pastures growing on the properties of the Dores, Mick Mullins and Collins Bros., to mention just three, and having compared them with the dry, almost bare conditions in other areas, I am even more convinced of the need to push ahead with the development of the wet coastal areas.

I should like to commend the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation on his decision to open up blocks 94 and 95 inland from Tully. That was a valuable first step. The demand for land of this type is evidenced by the fact that there were 249 applications for one block and 244 for the second. I commend the Minister also for his announcement of a further nine blocks to be opened up in the Cardwell shire. A further valuable start has been made.

I am also pleased to hear that a further survey will be made to ascertain what additional land may be available, having regard to the real needs of the Forestry Department for future reforestation and of the timber industry for millable timber, already available or within sight.

In my speech in the debate on the Address in Reply I made the statement that there was, or would be, at least 500,000 acres—250,000 acres of Crown land and 250,000 acres of Forestry reserves—in the Cardwell shire alone and that only 25 per cent. of the Cardwell shire was rated, the balance being tied up in Crown and Forestry land.

I fully realise the importance to the area and to Queensland as a whole of the timber industry, but I believe we can lose our sense of proportion on afforestation. Assuming there is on a certain block of land £10,000 worth of timber that could be cut by those who want it and can find a market for it, it should not be held in its native state for years when people are prepared to spend at least

£100,000 to develop it and when that development will give not only £10,000 but £10,000, £15,000 or £20,000 annually—not just once but, I repeat, annually.

We need this type of development in the wet tropics of Queensland—and the first requirement is land. Before going on to talk of the other needs for this development I mention that, until there is further development—and the wet coast offers an excellent first step—the meatworks and meatworkers in North Queensland will continue to suffer periodic seasonal unemployment, which is of such great concern to the Minister for Labour and Industry, to the workers themselves, to the meatworks, to the towns, which lose annually such a large amount of possible turnover because the men are not receiving full wages over the whole year, and to the railways, which lose freight that would otherwise be carried.

First of all, it must be stressed that rain every month will enable the cattle to be turned off in those months that are now slack. In fact, the pattern of wet coastal-fattening would fit in very well with the pattern of meatworks killing. The best times to turn off cattle on the wet coast are those when the meatworks are slack, which is now.

I was in Tully on Sunday and was over a considerable amount of that land. When I left Brisbane the South was as dry as a bone, but up there the grass is as green and lush as it is possible for it to be.

Let it not be thought that this is any pipe dream. An expansion that brings in 100 new properties fully developed will provide a minimum of 50,000 head of cattle annually, possibly more. The total cost of development to full production, with the necessary clearing, soil preparation, seeding, fencing, dips and yards, and a machinery shed, is likely to be £30,000. Much of this can be earned while the property is being developed. The initial finance required is a fraction of the total sum. I do not consider that this is by any means beyond the realms of practical men. Finance can be found from a variety of sources if the land is made available. That land, or a very large part of the area required, can be found. This project, once there is a full appreciation of its possibilities, should be a very suitable one for the Commonwealth Development Bank. I think that finance from other sources within and outside Australia should come in. I have a particular case in my own area of a young man with his own bulldozer, and his father is prepared to back him. He requires 2,000 acres of wallum country so that he can develop it. So far, I regret to say, I have been unable to get land for him.

To ensure success in this project, more research is needed. The Department of Agriculture and Stock has done a most valuable job at South Johnstone and Utchee Creek, but more work is needed and for this the assistance of the C.S.I.R.O. would be

highly desirable. It is hoped that the new research station and farm at Townsville will not be long delayed. Behind the coast, in the drier areas, there are large numbers of cattle that could be the reservoir of store cattle for fattening on the coast. With a more certain fattening area available, more suitable young steer stock could be turned off for fattening quickly. It must not be forgotten that this area too cannot be neglected, if more store stock are to be available in the requisite numbers.

Transport improvement would play its part—although it may not be the first requirement. I understand the improvement of the Mt. Isa railway will mean more trucks for cattle and the faster movement of cattle trains. A road scheme has been announced. The Clausen Shipping Line will remove cattle from the Gulf and the Peninsula, and very likely from the Northern Territory. But transport alone, even when all the roads are built, the railway improvements completed and the ships running to full schedule, will not suffice. There will be a need to cut down the loss of young cattle that occur from birth to the age of turnoff, and even to see what can be done to increase the calving rate.

Numbers of investigations have been made on this point. The result of one is given on page 73 of the report called "The Economics of Road Transport of Beef Cattle—Northern Territory and Queensland Channel Country." This report, prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, shows that in a herd of 15,000 there are likely to be 6,000 cows for breeding when the station is turning off its stock at three years. It might be expected that these cows would have 6,000 calves. In actual fact the number of calves is much less than this figure, so that the number of yearlings, male and female, is more likely to be only 3,600, or 60 per cent. Even then there are likely to be further losses, so that a turnover of only 1,650 steers, out of the 1,800 steers that reach yearling age, can be expected. Although 1,800 yearling heifers can be expected to go into the herd as replacements, only 300 cows can be expected to be turned off annually. The rest fall by the wayside.

Diseases of various kinds account for some of these losses. But the main factor is undoubtedly drought and the nutrition deficiencies resultant therefrom. The development of the cattle industry, which means so much to Queensland—and can mean so much more—calls for a broad vision, aided by careful examination of all the facts, economic and scientific. We must be prepared to make use of all the knowledge we have, and also to seek new knowledge. In the matter of improving nutrition on cattle properties inland, much can be hoped for from the station acquired by the Government for research purposes. We will need, too, to have a look at the possibilities of making better use of the

time available to our extension officers whose job it is to bring information on new methods to those who will put it to the best use. The extension officers are trying to do a job under conditions that, at times, are extremely adverse. They waste a tremendous amount of time travelling from property to property. Most of their time is taken up in travelling. I believe it may be desirable, just as we have the Flying Doctor Service, to give consideration to providing in the Out-back a flying veterinary surgeon and a flying rural extension service. The goal would be worthwhile to many people—the suppliers of farm requirements, the transport services, the meatworks and the townships where the meatworks are situated, as well as the men who produce the cattle. This would be the direct result, but indirect advantages would accrue even more widely. We cannot miss the opportunity with an Australian and even a world need for meat staring us in the face.

Even without these proposed schemes, there is already evidence in my own district and in the Tully area of a large increase in improved pastures. Private landholders are going ahead with cattle-fattening and pasture-improvement; men from the interior are looking for, and buying, land in the coastal areas with a view to providing a place to put their store cattle and fatten them for adjacent markets.

Mr. Sullivan: Do you think this development is economical with a 35-hour week?

Mr. ROW: No.

In my own district bulldozers are at work clearing areas. However, one of the main troubles could be obtaining the right type of seed as it is useless to clear and cultivate land unless you get enough seed to give a good coverage. I have reason to believe that there will be grasses available, such as Guinea grass, molasses grass and green panic. The latter is more suitable for sandy ridges and the drier type of country. However, it is difficult at present to buy suitable legumes in bulk. Centro is no doubt available, but very strict control must be exercised on Centro, particularly the imported variety. As hon. members well know, Centro was imported from Java and with it we got the curse of the cane-farmers, the giant sensitive plant. I suggest and emphasise that control must be strictly enforced if Centro is imported.

Another legume that does very well on the coast, in conjunction with Guinea grass, is Stylo, a native of Brazil. If this fattening scheme is to be developed a lot of Centro and Stylo, will be required. I understand from practical men who know what they are talking about that Stylo will grow on poor, gravelly soil, and even if grown without the help of artificial grasses—that is, sown after a discing or ripping—it will do very well on spear-grass or wire-grass ridges, and it will lift the carrying capacity of stock by at least 100 per cent.

A new species of grass named Pangola, in conjunction with legumes, has made wonderful progress in the wallum type of country. A great deal of progress, investigation and research has been made by experimental stations at South Johnstone and various other places. At Abergowrie College near Ingham, which was visited by the Minister for Education when he toured my area recently—I extend to him the thanks of my community—there is a very interesting and quite extensive range of grasses and legumes. This will be a very important factor in the development of grasses and legumes in my district.

So it will be seen that great progress has been made by a community anxious and willing to expand North Queensland. I fully agree for once in my life with the Independent member for Townsville South that we must combine and divorce from political allegiances our endeavour to further develop and expand North Queensland.

Mr. INCH (Burke) (2.50 p.m.): I have listened with interest to the many debates that have taken place on the introduction of the Budget, and to the amount of praise that has been heaped on the Treasurer. He must be staggering under the load of praise he has received in the last week from members of the Government parties.

I listened with interest to the various reasons advanced by speakers on the Government side for the failure of the Treasurer to balance the Budget. They ranged from the drought to a statement by the hon. member for Condamine, more or less to the effect, that the railway workers were the cause of the loss sustained by the Railway Department. It ill behoves any members of this Assembly to castigate the railway workers and call them loafers. We have only to cast our minds back to the war years—and I notice the hon. member for Condamine is wearing a returned soldiers' badge; all credit to him—to recall the magnificent job done by the railways to ensure that supplies were carried to men in front-line trenches as well as to people of the State. At times railway workers had to carry on for very long hours without sleep and there were instances of men going onto their jobs while they had medical certificates in their pockets to the effect that through insufficient sleep, they were unfit to carry out their duties. Those are the men the hon. member for Condamine castigated and more or less called loafers; those are the men he charged with being responsible in some measure for the loss sustained by the Railway Department. Much the same is going on today. Let me cite the case of a railway engine driver, who, on 17 November, 1959, appealed to the Railway Appeal Board against a fine imposed on him for putting out the fire in his loco. He had been on duty for 23 hours without sleep. When about 13 miles out from a particular station, he rang from a siding and informed the stationmaster that he had been on duty for about 23 hours and that he desired relief as he was incapable of carrying

on his work. When he pulled into the railway yards, he again approached the stationmaster and the foreman shunter and repeated his request for relief. Apparently they took no notice of it. So, rather than fall asleep on his engine and probably drop the plate and burn his firebox out and what-have-you, he decided there and then to draw the fire of the engine, which he did. The department took action against him and a fine of £2 was imposed. He appealed and had it reduced to £1. But that case shows the hours those men put in, yet the hon. member for Condamine said the railway workers were responsible for losses sustained by the department. Surely there is evidence that they do a very good job and that the slight that has been cast upon them is not justified.

Mr. Davies: Did that incident take place in a grazing area such as the one the hon. member for Condamine represents?

Mr. INCH: Yes, in a western area.

From recent reports published in the newspapers of the statement by the Minister for Public Works and Local Government that all Government buildings in the north-west, the far north and western areas were to be air-conditioned, I naturally assumed that the expenditure for it had been provided in this year's Estimates. As I had already advocated the air-conditioning of schools throughout those areas in my speech in the Address-in-Reply debate, I am naturally pleased that the Government have taken notice of my suggestion and that they are prepared to extend the proposal to include all other Government buildings.

However, one other matter of great importance to the people of the Far West, particularly to the medical and nursing staff and patients of the Cloncurry Hospital and other hospitals in the West—this is inter-related with the air-conditioning of Government buildings, such as schools, hospitals, and so on—is the necessity for the installation of refrigerated chambers in the morgues at these hospitals for the preservation of bodies awaiting autopsies and ultimate burial.

In the far-western areas, such as the Cloncurry district, where for weeks on end the temperature soars to, and indeed beyond, the century mark, the need for such refrigeration is very great indeed, for the smell of decomposition is noticeable in bodies after a period of approximately 12 hours. In effect, this means that there is only a 12-hour limit from the time of death to the commencement of decay in districts that experience these temperatures, and I am led to believe that the use of formalin after a period of 24 hours produces virtually negligible results.

During the last 12 months there have been several cases at least where bodies that have been dead for over 24 hours have been brought to the Cloncurry morgue for post-mortem examination and subsequent burial, and the stench from them has been intolerable and distressing to patients and staff. In some

cases relatives have to travel up to 1,400 miles to arrange for the funeral of people who have been found dead or who have died in the hospital, and hon. members can well imagine the distress that is caused to them when they arrive there and find that they are unable to give the deceased person a church service before burial because of the condition of the body. As will be realised, it is virtually impossible after that period.

Over the past three years, applications have been made to the Department of Health and Home Affairs by the Cloncurry Hospitals Board for a refrigerated chamber at the hospital. The Board estimates the cost of a two-chamber receptacle at £2,000. However, the applications have been continually rejected. I think the Government's attitude has been very parsimonious, and I ask the Minister for Health and Home Affairs to sanction the immediate installation of a refrigerated chamber at the hospital.

The domestic staff of the Cloncurry Hospital have to live out, and this is the cause of much discontent. The hospital is about 1½ to 2 miles from Cloncurry, and hon. members can imagine how uncomfortable it is in the extremely hot weather for these people to trudge from their place of residence to the hospital and back. Some of them ride bicycles, and if they cannot do that they have to hire a taxi-cab, which costs them roughly 10s. a day and leaves very little in their pay packet at the end of each week. I ask the Minister to give sympathetic consideration to providing accommodation at the hospital to enable the domestic staff to live in.

At present some age pensioners are inmates of the Mt. Isa Hospital. I understand that a new hospital will be opened in the near future and that accommodation will not be available in it for those old people. I suggest that part of the old hospital be set aside as an annexe for them. They do not want to be torn away from their relatives and friends. In any case applications for admission to the Eventide Home in Charters Towers would take a long while to finalise. These people do not want to shift out of the town in which they have lived for so many years. I commend the suggestion to the Government. If the Government provided an annex at Mt. Isa I am sure the people there, the Women's Auxiliary, the local shire council, and the business people, would be right behind the scheme, only too happy to do everything they possibly could to further the project.

Apart from the need to air-condition Government buildings there is also an urgent need to repair them, especially in the Far West. Some of them should be completely rebuilt on modern lines if the Government want to avoid never-ending demands and frequent necessity for repairs. There should be better facilities for the public and the staff. I refer particularly to police buildings at Cloncurry, and the very poor standard

of the Police Station, C.I.B. office and the quarters for single men. They are all in urgent need of repair. When I was in Cloncurry recently I paid a courtesy visit to the police station and on my rounds I noticed many matters that badly needed attention. The police station which consists of a small three-bedroom, gable-roofed, corrugated-iron cottage, no doubt served its purpose in the very early days when a sergeant of police and a constable constituted the entire force there, but today an average of six men work at the one time at this shack, which is the best way to describe it. It is completely inadequate for a district of its size. The C.I.B. office which is situated in the backyard of the police station is a masterpiece of structural engineering and design! It has to be seen to be believed. It is a disgrace to the community and the Police Department. It is an outstanding example of shocking treatment for western districts compared with the metropolitan area with its predominance of parliamentary representatives. Incidentally this position was aggravated by the recent redistribution, which gave four more members to the city and reduced the number of country members by one.

It has been neglected for years. It was built from scrap timber and roofed with tarred paper. It measures roughly 14 ft. x 10 ft., it is approximately 8 ft. 4 in. high at the highest point and it tapers away to 7 ft. at the lowest end. It rests on 4 in. x 3 in. timber bearers instead of house blocks. It has been rumoured in Cloncurry that some time ago the Department of Public Works misplaced one of its tool sheds, either by accident or design, and that subsequent inquiries revealed that the present C.I.B. office is that long-lost toolshed. I do not place much credence in rumours but on this occasion one would be pardoned for doing so because the building is very similar to the toolsheds used in the district by building contractors and others in the building trade. However, I think that even the Department of Public Works would be somewhat embarrassed if it was called upon to acknowledge this remarkable piece of property as their long-lost toolshed.

The accommodation for single men could best be described as being little better than the doss-house of the depression years. Eleven men are accommodated in this poorly ventilated, white-ant-eaten hovel of approximately 30 feet x 22 feet, containing two wardrobes and two small cupboards in which the men hang their clothes. In several places the ceiling is paper thin and has burst open to allow wood rot or white-ant dirt to dribble down onto the floor, and the square of latticed wood across the opening of one old-time ventilator in the ceiling is sagging at a drunken angle. The front and side verandas of these quarters have been converted for use as offices for the Inspector and the clerical staff, but as there are no partitions, other than those separating the

sleeping quarters from these so-called offices, there is no privacy whatsoever for the Inspector or any citizen who wishes to interview him.

The blocks supporting this structure are white-ant eaten, and in some cases the stump caps have been pushed up on one side by the pressure of the dirt thrown up by the white ants.

The residence occupied by the Inspector is also in need of repairs. The stairs are worn and rickety and leakages through the roof have watermarked the woodwork and floors, while the stove recess is more like the galleys to be seen in fettlers' camps along the railway than something that should add to the living conditions within these homes.

Finally, the waste closet at this residence has been so badly ravaged by white ants that the walls are a mere shell and the whole structure is tied down with a wire rope to prevent its being blown over. If it had not been tied down by this wire rope during the "Bedourie" that recently struck the Cloncurry and Mt. Isa districts, the Cloncurry police force would have had the somewhat dubious honour of having launched the first satellite in the western district.

The next matter I wish to mention is Government aid to assist gougers in every way to prospect and develop the mineral fields in the western areas and the Gulf. These men are faced with many problems and suffer many hardships in their efforts to develop the potential of these fields. Hard rations and short supplies are their usual lot and, to climax that, when they do get to payable ore they are handicapped and frustrated by lack of facilities for treating it.

Some time ago Mt. Isa Mines Ltd. treated a fair percentage of the ore produced by those gougers, but increased production over the last few years has forced the company to reduce the intake of gougers' ore. This has resulted in many of the gougers having to leave their claims and take other employment to get sufficient finance to carry on. They have also had to look to other avenues to get their ore treated.

Negotiations have been going on for some time between Japanese interests and representatives of the Ore Producers' Association in the West for the proposed instalment of a concentrating plant and for the sale of ore to Japanese interests. At this stage it appears that, though some of the gougers are in favour of co-operating with the Japanese in the installation of this plant and in the sale of their ore, many of them are not firmly convinced that the proposal placed before them would be in their best interests or in the interests of the State.

The wealth produced from mineral fields, in the same way as wealth produced from wool, wheat, beef and timber, constitutes part of the national heritage of the people, and these fields should be exploited in the interests of the people, not in the interests

of overseas shareholders and foreign capital. It is therefore the duty of this Government to install the necessary plant to treat these ores—in the interests of the gougers, to maintain them in employment for which they are fitted, and also as a means to improve the economy of the State. Previous Labour Governments adopted this policy, as evidenced by the State treatment works at Irvinebank and also the State battery at Charters Towers.

The provision of mining access roads is also a vital necessity in the development and exploitation of these mineral fields, and that work should not be left to individual prospectors or small syndicates. It should be an integral part of the overall plan of any Government, by the construction of such roads, to assist these men in their efforts to develop the mineral potential of the State.

Although some roads of this nature have been constructed by the Government, anomalies do exist whereby prospectors who have pioneered roads in the mining areas and have maintained them at their own expense now find themselves in the position of having to pay one-third of a penny per ton-mile tax to the Government for the privilege of hauling their ore over roads that they originally built and have maintained.

As a sample of this I should like to cite the case of the Silver King Mining Syndicate, which operates out from Mt. Isa. The road I refer to is the Camooweal-Lawn Hills road, which passes through Gallipoli station. Mr. George Sanderson, a well known prospector in the mining field, is a member of this syndicate. The road to which I refer was originally pioneered by Mr. Sanderson while prospecting through that area, and the only work done on the road since then, apart from the necessary maintenance work carried out by the syndicate to keep it open for the haulage of their ore, stores and other things required by a mining syndicate such as that, was done by the Barkly Shire Council. It put a grader over the road once, from Camooweal to Rocklands Station, a distance of approximate 4 miles.

The maintenance cost on trucks used by the syndicate over this road are so heavy that these expenses plus the time and money expended on the upkeep of the road and the imposition of one-third of a penny per ton mile tax for the use of a road that is being repaired by the syndicate, are causing grave concern and the thought as to whether it will be economical to carry on with the mine. That is the position at the present time. These people are battling to make a go of the mine. They construct the roads and maintain them and do everything possible in their own interests, but the next thing they find is that they are called on to pay this tax of one-third of a penny a ton-mile.

To cap it all, I understand that a summons will be issued in respect of the tax for the

ore hauled over this road—a road, I repeat, that the syndicate has endeavoured to maintain in its effort to open up another mineral field, and so add to the wealth of the State. How can any Government justify such an action as that, especially to persons who are doing everything they possibly can to produce mineral wealth? Their work will improve the economy of the State and, should the field turn out to be really worth while, will provide employment for a number of men. Yet we find that the Government are going to hit them with this tax of one-third of a penny per ton-mile. I should like to know if the Minister for Mines and the Minister for Transport will allow this syndicate of hard-working miners to be driven to the wall because of this anomaly, or if they are prepared to investigate the case and afford some relief by waiving the imposition of this tax.

While on the subject of miners, I wish to refer briefly to the Order in Council brought down by the Minister for Labour and Industry rescinding the authority of mines check inspectors to act as industrial inspectors. I agree entirely with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Brisbane on this subject. I believe that this measure was introduced at the instigation of powerful mining interests in Queensland. It is useless for the Minister to deny it, because what possible gain could the Government or anyone else get from it?

Mr. Hanlon: Do you think they may have "rolled" down to Parliament House?

Mr. INCH: Yes, they may have. Don't make any error about that.

The authority of the industrial inspector did not carry any extra emolument. It was purely and simply an honorary job, so the Government would not be saving anything by introducing this measure. Why introduce it? It was an honorary position and gave check inspectors authority to act as industrial inspectors and check on industrial conditions. It also gave them the right to prosecute in cases where industrial Acts were breached.

When the hon. member for Brisbane was speaking the Minister interjected and said, "You know they never acted as industrial inspectors." Either the Minister is unaware of the authority that was vested in the check inspectors, which I doubt, because the mining interests would have "livened" him on that score, or he is a stranger to the true facts. Inspector O'Brien of Mt. Isa prosecuted Mt. Isa Mines Ltd. on 30 March of this year. That clearly indicates that he, for one, acted as an industrial inspector. The prosecution must have been valid because it was heard and determined in the Magistrates Court at Mt. Isa. The vesting of authority in check inspectors to act as industrial inspectors has been in vogue for a good

many years, and it gave the check inspectors the right to police the working conditions of employees, both on the surface and underground. It also maintained industrial peace in the industry, which could have been torn asunder by disputes over temperatures, working conditions and various other matters.

Mr. Hanlon: And safety, in particular.

Mr. INCH: Yes, particularly safety.

They had authority to act for the miners at all times and check the various working places and recommend six-hour jobs where temperatures were high and the ventilation inadequate. They also checked the purity of the air in the mine. Some indication of when a six-hour job would be applicable can be gained from this information: where there is no ventilation in a mine, or when the ventilation is inadequate—that is, when the circulation of air drops below 150 cubic feet of air per man per minute—a temperature reading is taken at the working face in the mine, and if a reading of 83 degrees Fahrenheit is shown on the wet bulb, and 85 degrees on the dry bulb, the job must be classified or declared a six-hour job. The men then work only for six hours and receive payment for eight hours. Similarly, men working on contract rates in such temperature would receive six hours' payment at contract rates, and two hours at wage rates. It will readily be seen that, by divesting these men of their authority to act as industrial inspectors and thereby debarring them from recommending six-hour jobs where temperatures are high and restricting their supervision of general working conditions, the Minister for Labour and Industry has shown that he is prepared to go to great lengths to bow to the demands of big business and industrial undertakings. That is further evidenced by the recent invoking of the emergency regulations in connection with the Commonwealth Engineering works. The withdrawal of the authority from the inspectors has given rise to a great deal of discontent at Mt. Isa and Mary Kathleen and a petition protesting against the Minister's action and asking for the restoration of the authority has received 100 per cent. approval from the men working in those two mining areas. The Minister's action was taken without consultation with the powerful union that has thousands of its members employed in those mines. The action was wrong—the authority should never have been withdrawn—and the effects of it will most likely be seen before very long in industrial unrest on the two fields.

Hon. K. J. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Labour and Industry (3.22 p.m.): Since 1957, when this Government were elected to power in Queensland, there has been a change in policy with departmental Estimates. When I was in Opposition we did not know from one day to the next which would be the next Estimates to be debated, and it was difficult to make a forecast. Early in our term of office the Premier initiated

the system now in use whereby members of the Government and the Opposition know well ahead not only which departments' Estimates will be debated in detail but also in which order they will be taken. The Premier has also arranged that the Estimates of each department shall be debated at least every second year. Previously several years elapsed without certain Estimates being debated. That can no longer occur and the new system is proving very satisfactory to members of the Government and, I am sure, helpful to members of the Opposition.

I am rather sorry that my department's Estimates will not be debated this year because I am very proud of the work being done by my officers and all those associated with the department. At the same time, I realise the importance of having each department take its turn. So I take this opportunity to answer a few points that have been raised, earlier in the session and again today, on the activities of my department.

I am rather sorry that I could not hear all that the hon. member for Burke was saying. I know he spoke of the check inspectors who were also authorised to act as industrial inspectors at Mt. Isa. The hon. member for Brisbane also referred to the subject in a different way. When he was speaking, I interjected that these men had never actually done any work as industrial inspectors for my department, and the hon. member for Brisbane replied, "There is no need to tell lies about it." He also alleged quite clearly that the appointments were cancelled as a result of some action by the management of Mt. Isa Mines Ltd.

I deny that statement completely. It is not true. The management of Mt. Isa Mines had nothing to do with the cancellation of those appointments, and I propose now to give the history of the matter. In doing so, I shall be using the file on the subject, and I will gladly make it available to the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Brisbane, and the hon. member for Burke. They will then be able to check whether the facts that I state are strictly in accordance with the circumstances.

Action on this matter was initiated by a letter of 12 April received in my office—not by me, but in my office—from Mr. Edgar Williams, Branch Secretary of the Australian Workers' Union. It was addressed to the Chief Industrial Inspector, Department of Labour and Industry, and Mr. Williams asked, because one James O'Brien, a mines check officer, who also held appointment as an industrial inspector, had, by failing to report a matter in his capacity as an industrial inspector, rendered himself liable to a fine of £50, for clarification of the duties of these dual appointees so that he would know what the situation was. It was quite proper and natural for Mr. Williams to do that.

On receipt of that letter, the Chief Inspector took certain action. He sent a

memo to the Under-Secretary of my department, and after referring to the letter of Mr. Williams, he said—

"I desire to inform you that I have never received any report from Mr. O'Brien in his capacity as Industrial Inspector for the mining fields in the Northern Division. In fact, in as far as this section of the department is concerned, he is non-existent, and his appointment has not served any useful purpose in the past and the continuance of the appointment is not likely to serve any useful purpose to our department in the future."

Bear in mind that he was a mines check inspector and also an industrial inspector. The Chief Inspector went on to say—

"I have checked with our accountant, who informs me that the department has made no contribution towards the salary of this man."

He also indicated that he was not anxious to keep people on the books who were not responsible to him as Chief Inspector, and it is a perfectly natural attitude for him to adopt.

That went to the Under-Secretary, who then asked, "How many mines check inspectors do hold appointments as industrial inspectors?" He asked the Chief Inspector, "Do you recommend that their appointments as industrial inspectors should be cancelled?" That was purely a routine departmental matter. The Chief Inspector then sent a memo to the Under-Secretary stating that there were three and that they were not under his control or under the control of the Department of Labour and Industry. He said, "As far as I am concerned, they do not exist officially. Therefore their appointments might as well be cancelled." The Under-Secretary then sent a memo to the Department of Mines in which he said, "Here is the situation. We are not officially using these officers. They are mines check inspectors. Have you any interest in whether we cancel their appointments as industrial inspectors?" Correspondence followed that memo, and the Department of Mines said, "We do not mind a bit as long as it does not mean that we will have to pay more of the salaries." That part was satisfactorily covered. All this was the subject of departmental correspondence. Having finally cleared up that aspect a memo was sent through my Assistant Under-Secretary and the matter came to me on 14 July. It was merely a recommendation that these appointments be cancelled.

The recommendation made to me was—"The reason for the appointments from 1933 at least has never been clear, but as far as our department is concerned they are of no value to us. I suggest a submission be made for Cabinet approval to cancel their appointment." Again this was a perfectly natural departmental procedure.

Mr. Lloyd: There were very good reasons for the appointments originally. I think you will agree that the reasons were very sound.

Mr. MORRIS: What was that?

Mr. Lloyd: The reasons why they were given the powers of industrial inspectors in the first place were quite sound.

Mr. MORRIS: Let me point out that the history of their appointments goes back into antiquity. I can find no record of the original appointments. The whole file is here, and I have already promised to make it available to the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Brisbane. I am not questioning whether the original appointment was sound or not. As far as I am concerned there is nothing controversial in it.

The whole matter followed normal procedure. It was recommended that their appointments should be cancelled. Having received that recommendation I asked a few questions and on 15 July I approved. The action I took was perfectly normal. Following my approval on 15 July a letter from Mr. Edgar Williams was received on 29 July and in it he said he had had brought to his attention the fact that the appointments had been cancelled. He said, "I desire to inform you that I strongly protest against the cancellation without any reference or consultation . . . It appears to me that representations or pressure from Mt. Isa Mines Ltd. has been made." I repeat that there had been no pressure from Mt. Isa Mines Ltd., nor had the matter been discussed with them in any way. This letter from Mr. Edgar Williams, dated 28 July, was received in my office on 29 July while I was in Collinsville opening the Collinsville show. On my return it was referred to me, but because of a very tight schedule I could not possibly make an appointment with Mr. Williams. I told my private secretary that as I was not able to make an appointment with him for three weeks I should like him to arrange for Mr. Williams to see the Under-Secretary of my department, Mr. Hoare, to discuss the matter. I have a memo here that shows that that action was taken. My office phoned Mr. Williams's office. Mr. Williams was not spoken to, but somebody in his office was. They were asked, in view of the fact that Mr. Williams was out, would he ring Mr. Hoare direct to make an appointment to discuss the matter. I would be quite prepared to accept completely that that message was not passed on to Mr. Williams. I have not any doubt that that could quite easily have been the case and consequently the appointment did not take place. The last action having been taken by us, the matter rests there.

When the hon. member for Brisbane raised the matter in this Chamber I thought, "I will have a look at it," and I did. I found that the phone call from Mr. Williams did not come and I immediately took a note so that I could give a full explanation of the matter to the Committee.

Before I had an opportunity of speaking today another letter arrived from Mr. Williams in which he says that he would

still like to discuss the matter with me. Since receiving that letter I have spoken to the Under Secretary. I said, "Mr. Williams would like to discuss the matter and I intend to do so," and I asked him his opinion about it. He said, "I do not mind; we have no feelings against it. We would be quite happy to have a discussion."

In view of the fact that there had been some feeling on the matter I thought that I should take the appointment personally rather than ask anyone else to do so. I made an appointment with Mr. Williams and, as a matter of fact, he will be seeing me during the next few days. Those are the complete facts on the matter, neither more nor less. There is nothing in it other than what I have explained.

I believe that in every step that was taken by officers of my department they acted completely correctly in every single respect. Those officers had not been used by my department for years at least since 1933.

Mr. Houston: What about the cases the last speaker gave you?

Mr. MORRIS: The last speaker is quite welcome to look at the file to see if anything I have said is not correct. He will see that since 1933 those officers have made no report to my department at all. In fact, if one likes to take it to the nth degree, the fact that they have not renders them liable, in certain cases, to a fine of £50. It was Mr. Williams's recognition of that fact started the matter off.

If they are reappointed as industrial inspectors in addition to being mines check inspectors they will be required to carry out their duties in accordance with their appointments. That is the crux of the whole matter and I sincerely welcome its being raised by the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Brisbane. Immediately afterwards, I raised it in the Cabinet room.

I will see Mr. Williams of the A.W.U. later this week and I have not the slightest doubt that the matter will be resolved amicably one way or the other.

I now move to another Mt. Isa matter on which I again feel it is incumbent on me to report in this Chamber. It will be remembered that the hon. member for Bundaberg made a statement in this Chamber and it was reported in the "Telegraph" of 29 September as follows:—

"The former Treasurer, Mr. Walsh, said today he received a letter claiming alleged graft among members of the Police Force in a country area."

The article goes on to publish the fact that Mr. Walsh said—

"I have received a letter from a Mt. Isa resident who is completely unknown to me. The letter contains a statement of alleged graft among members of the Police Force in a country area. The writer of the letter indicates that at least seven people

would be prepared to come forward as witnesses apparently to support the allegations made."

It goes on, and some pretty bad allegations are contained in the statement, which I have no doubt hon. members have read. The hon. member for Bundaberg made that statement in the Chamber and subsequently, as he said he would, he passed on to me the letter that he said he had received—and that I have no doubt he did receive—with a covering letter of his own. The covering letter clearly said that he had no knowledge of the name of the writer. He said—

"You will note that serious charges have been made by the writer against members of the Police Force at Mt. Isa.

"The writer of the communication is completely unknown to me. I think it is right and proper that his communication should be brought to your notice to enable a full investigation to be made into the matter.

"I will be advising the writer of the letter accordingly."

The hon. member for Bundaberg was quite right in forwarding the letter to me. Immediately I received it I did what I have always done since I assumed ministerial responsibility for the Police Force; I initiated an investigation into the charges that had been made. The investigation has thrown a few points into sharp relief. It was stated in the letter that the hon. member for Burke would be able to give the names of several people who could support the allegations.

Mr. Walsh: I do not think it quite said that.

Mr. MORRIS: I will read the letter. It states—

"Several enterprising youngsters in the traffic squad have been introducing to Mt. Isa an American racketeering method which consists of failing drivers who apply for renewal of their licences—over 620 lately, unless they pay a favour of say a tenner or a fiver. To get corroboration you would have only to ask Mr. Inch the local member to seek witnesses in the paper. At least seven witnesses will come forward."

Mr. Walsh: That is different from what you said.

Mr. MORRIS: My real point is that the charge was investigated in the same way as every other charge since I assumed ministerial responsibility for the Police Force, and, in the same way as 99 per cent. of the charges that are made in such extravagant language, this charge proved to be completely untrue.

First of all, the writer of the letter was a person who gave the name of W. H. Irwinne and an address that apparently does not exist. The police at Mt. Isa could not find anyone with that name in the area and

no resident had any knowledge of a person using such a name. It is quite obvious that the letter was written by someone who was trying to hide his identity. I do not know who it was.

Every charge contained in that letter was proved to be completely untrue. They were contained in an anonymous letter because the writer could be traced. It was said that 620 people had been refused renewal of their driving licences. The fact of the matter is that only four people in that period had even applied for a renewal of their driving licences, and not one had been refused. The true position is altogether different from the allegation—the rest of the letter is just as empty and as stupid as the example I have given.

I have here a five-page personal report from the police in the area covering the charge. I should like hon. members to note this paragraph from it—

“Mr. Inch, the State member for Burke, informed me that the person Irwinne, the writer of the attached letter, is unknown to him and further that he has received no complaint whatsoever relating to the conduct of any member of the Police Force attached to Mt. Isa station.”

There is much more in it, but I know the hon. member for Burke would be happy to tell the Committee that he completely upholds the integrity of the police in that area. I ask him to say if that is so.

Mr. Inch: Yes.

Mr. MORRIS: I conclude by saying that this whole business was proved to be completely without any foundation in fact. This is typical of dozens and dozens of letters we receive that cannot be traced to the writer—letters that contain extremely extravagant and lying statements. That is the only way I can truly describe them—lying statements about members of the Police Force, and I resent them.

I have some criticism of the hon. member for Bundaberg on this matter. My criticism is not that he did not pass the letter on; he did pass it on, and he passed it on to me very promptly. But he has been a Minister of the Crown for many years, and, doubtless there have been probably hundreds of occasions when he, too, has had the opportunity to prove that most of these poison-pen types of letters are completely false. If he has had that experience, he has done no good to anyone by making his statement publicly. It is necessary that such charges should be followed up, but there have been publications of the statement that he made. Some people read the newspapers very loosely, and there may be quite a number who, having read that, would feel seriously that there had been a criticism of the Police Force when in fact, the whole criticism is absolutely without foundation.

Mr. Walsh: Did you get another letter?

Mr. MORRIS: From him?

Mr. Walsh: No, from another party.

Mr. MORRIS: Through you, or someone else?

Mr. Walsh: From me, for another party.

Mr. MORRIS: I do not remember, but I say very seriously that if any hon. member receives information that is a charge against the Police Force, it will be investigated.

Mr. Bennett: By whom?

Mr. MORRIS: By capable people; by people in whom I have the utmost trust and confidence.

Mr. Bennett: I certainly would not appoint anybody in the Police Force to investigate a police officer. I think that is ridiculous.

Mr. MORRIS: We as a Government have a Police Force, as has every other State in Australia. At the head of the Police Force there is a Commissioner, or he may be called something else in some other place. There is a commanding officer of the Force, if I may use that phrase. He is there because he is trusted implicitly. You know, Mr. Taylor, from your Army experience—and many of us know—that when a report is made about a member of a unit that is detrimental to the person or to the unit, it is investigated by the commanding officer. That is a natural procedure. I am shocked to hear from the hon. member for South Brisbane that he questions the integrity of the senior officers of the Police Force, because that can be the only inference to be drawn from his statement.

Mr. Hanlon: There is a vast difference between the Army and the Police Force—an important difference—as you know.

Mr. MORRIS: There is quite a big difference but there is not a great deal of difference in principle. The principle is that the person in charge of an organisation is also responsible for it.

Mr. Bennett: Why should he investigate his subjects, for whom he is responsible?

Mr. MORRIS: We have again one of the most stupid interjections we could possibly hear. Let me take it a little further. If the Commissioner of Police is not to be trusted to investigate any charges against officers of the Police Force, who would there be to whom I could refer such a complaint? Is the hon. member so silly that he would expect me to make the investigation personally?

Mr. Bennett: That would be worse!

Mr. MORRIS: Or that we should appoint him to make the investigation? There is no-one in Queensland in whom I have less confidence for making such an investigation than the hon. member for South Brisbane. But I have complete confidence and faith in the

officers of the Queensland Police Force. And I am shocked to realise that a person who is an officer of the courts of Queensland can by inference make such a damning indictment against officers who are trusted by most of the people of the State.

Mr. Burrows: We will put it to you this way: if you have so much confidence in the Police Force, do you fear an investigation by anybody else?

Mr. MORRIS: If I ever felt that an investigation by anybody else was necessary, I would not hesitate; but the most capable people to make investigations of charges are those who do that task—the Commissioner and his senior officers. I must repeat that I am disgusted to think that any hon. member of this Assembly, and particularly one who is also a member of the legal profession, should by inference suggest that these officers cannot be trusted to do the task before them. It ill behoves any hon. member, particularly a member of the legal profession, to make charges against a Police Force in a sweeping indictment unless he is prepared to go further and, to some appropriate authority, name the people he believes to be breaking their oath of office or any of the requirements that go with their office.

Mr. Houston: What would you call an appropriate authority?

Mr. MORRIS: There are at least two and probably three. Anybody who suspects wrongdoing by any police officer is quite entitled to report it, first of all, if he wishes, to the Commissioner of Police, or to one of the senior police officers—the assistant Commissioner, the Chief Inspector, or the Commissioner's Inspector. Those four officers occupy their position because of the trust and faith the people have in them. That is one. Secondly, if a person does not want to go to an officer of the Police Force, he is perfectly entitled to report the matter to the Premier of the State. He will do exactly what I do; he will make quite sure that it is thoroughly investigated.

Mr. Bennett: When Mr. Muller reported to the Premier, the Premier did not set any investigation in train.

Mr. MORRIS: You see, Mr. Taylor, these people have so little depth to their thinking that they cannot follow an examination of these matters to its logical conclusion and appreciate the situation.

Mr. Duggan: Mr. Minister—

Mr. MORRIS: I have not finished yet. I want to go one step further and then I will listen to what the hon. gentleman has to say. I am still answering the question already asked. I repeat that the matter could be reported to the senior police officers; it could be reported to the Premier; it could be reported to the Minister in charge.

Mr. Houston: But they are not authorities! You said "authorities."

Mr. MORRIS: If they are not authorities, I fail to understand what the hon. member means by "authorities."

Mr. Duggan: You must have had some qualms about the Police Force yourself at one stage when the vacancy in the office of Commissioner came up and you wanted to bring a person into that office from outside the Queensland Police Force.

Mr. Houston: You tried very hard.

Mr. MORRIS: Who said I did?

Mr. Duggan: You tried very hard to get somebody from outside, or your Cabinet colleagues did.

Mr. MORRIS: The hon. gentleman knows that is not true. Let me tell hon. members the story about that.

Mr. Duggan: You were very upset when Mr. Bischof was appointed.

Mr. Bennett: You were opposed to his appointment, as a matter of fact.

Mr. MORRIS: I was not, but I was opposed to the hon. member's entering this House because he is such a scatterbrain and a larrikin.

Let me answer the Leader of the Opposition. When the position became vacant, I asked my Cabinet colleagues to approve of the insertion of an advertisement in the papers of Australia, not only of Queensland, calling for a Police Commissioner. I opened the door as wide as I could to get as many applications as I could. We received many applications, and from them we chose the present Commissioner. It was a unanimous Cabinet decision.

I am not sure how long the present Commissioner has been in office—I think it is about two years—but never a month has passed without my gaining more confidence in his capacity and ability and, what is more, his integrity.

Mr. Duggan: You opened the door very wide to call applications, but you closed it very tightly against Mr. Bischof when they were being considered.

Mr. MORRIS: At least I can say this: our whole procedure on this matter was completely above board. I will take no more notice of interjections.

The hon. member for Barooka made some stupid comments a few days ago to the effect that the organisation known as S.M.O.L.A.C. is a secret organisation. He said he knew nothing of its operation and nothing of its personnel. If he knows nothing of it, it is his own fault, because in this Chamber I made quite a long speech about the organisation known as S.M.O.L.A.C. Every major union in

Queensland was invited to join it. In fact every major union had representatives at the meetings that were held to lay down a charter. Even one of his own bosses, Mr. Egerton, was there. The organisation known as S.M.O.L.A.C. is composed of representatives from industries and representatives from unions, and its purpose is to bring the two sides in industry a little closer together. At the meetings that were held to lay down a charter, representatives were present from the A.W.U., the Trades and Labour Council, and all the rest of them, and the charter under which that organisation operates was laid down with their approval. Mr. Egerton had this to say about the organisation—

“I think we might get straight into it. The Trades and Labour Council is in this position: we have agreed in principle with the formation of this Committee, and I do not think any of us has changed his view that such a Committee, if it functioned properly, could be of great value to the citizens of Queensland.”

Mr. Hanlon: If it functioned properly.

Mr. MORRIS: Mr. Taylor, do you know why it did not function properly? Although Mr. Egerton and other members of the Trades and Labour Council had much to do with the formation of its charter, as soon as the first meeting was called, at the behest of somebody—I do not know who—they were ordered to withdraw. They did not attend even the first meeting.

Mr. Hanlon: Who ordered Edgar Williams to withdraw?

Mr. MORRIS: I make this statement about Edgar Williams: that he attended every meeting or had a representative there. Before he took over the position that he now occupies, Mr. Bukowski attended the meetings, but Mr. Williams attended thereafter. At the last meeting he handed me a letter and said he could not continue to act while the situation of the Mt. Isa industrial inspectors was so unsatisfactory. He attended meetings until then.

By no stretch of the imagination could anybody call Mr. Williams and I “political buddies”. Everybody who reads “The Worker”—I must confess I do—would agree that he attacks me solidly. But I am happy to know that he attacks the Communists a great deal more than he attacks me. I have a great deal of confidence in Mr. Williams; I only wish that other union leaders in Queensland were as much anti-Communist as he is. I have been very dissatisfied with some of the leaders of union life in Queensland.

Since I made my speech in the Address-in-Reply debate I have been continuously attacked by hon. members opposite. But if they think they will frighten me that way they are making a very big mistake. I remind them that what I said in my speech was no

worse than what Mr. Duggan said in March, 1948, as quoted in the Chamber by the hon. member for Townsville South a few weeks ago. Unfortunately that was in 1948; since then the Leader of the Opposition has been strangely quiet about this problem.

I was very distressed that the last report on industrial trouble in Australia revealed that Queensland shares with New South Wales the unhappy record of having the highest percentage of industrial disputes in the whole of Australia. Why? The reason for it is that we are seeing the development in Queensland, within certain unions, of the policies that are dictated by the Communist Party itself. Let me give examples. We have had one-day stoppages, rolling strikes, and every other sort of strike in recent months. We have seen violent attacks on the Industrial Court, even on arbitration itself. Never in the history of the State have these attacks been so continuous. Has one hon. member opposite, in the course of this Parliamentary session, raised his voice in defence of arbitration?

Mr. Houston: Of course we have.

Mr. MORRIS: No. They have had plenty of opportunities to defend arbitration, but they have been strangely silent. They are silent because of the background reason for the strikes.

As we look back over the last two decades in Queensland we see how some industries have committed suicide. We see, for example, how the coastal shipping industry committed suicide through industrial trouble. At a time when there is an urgent need to keep meat-works operating, we see a walk-off from Lakes Creek. This pattern is being developed all over Queensland.

Mr. Houston: Tell us why.

Mr. MORRIS: Yes, I will tell hon. members why.

Mr. Houston: Because—

Mr. MORRIS: Will the hon. member listen? He asked a question and I am giving him an answer. It is because these people are carrying out a policy dictated by the Communist Party in Australia.

I am very disturbed at the reactions of visiting industrialists to industrial trouble in this country, but I am happy to say that even with all that we are still getting industries. Today I am happy to announce that Rothmans of Pall Mall will be opening in Queensland in the near future. The hon. member for Ipswich East, Mr. Donald, has had quite a bit to do with the opening of this industry. A statement will be made in Sydney today that they will be opening in Queensland. They will start work on their factory site on 12 October and they intend to spend approximately £225,000 exclusive of the cost of plant. So we are beginning to get a few industries, but too many industrialists are frightened away by the industrial position in Queensland.

Before we really have a look at the problem I want to say that the overwhelming number of unionists, according to a Gallup poll which was taken quite recently—I have a copy of it here—say they do not like strikes; they like arbitration. I believe that is the character of most of the people in Australia and yet willy-nilly, we are being led into this industrial trouble. I am now going to tell hon. members why I think that is.

There was published some time ago a book by a person well known to everybody in Australia by the name of Sharkey. He is the general secretary of the Communist Party of Australia and he says, quite rightly, that there are two types of strike—the economic strike and the political strike. I agree with him, and I am prepared to say that there have been times when the economic strike has been necessary—I do not think anybody would deny that—but there is no excuse whatsoever in this country for a political strike.

I will now quote from the booklet "The Trade Unions", which was written by Sharkey and brought up to date in November of last year.

Mr. Houston: None of our party members got one. How did you get one?

Mr. MORRIS: The hon. member just gave it to me. I did not know where it was. On page 4 of this booklet Mr. Sharkey writes, and it is very important that people should realise it—

"Marxism and Leninism thus places a fundamental task for us in regard to the trade unions, the defeat of reformism and their transformation into revolutionary bodies fighting for the proletarian dictatorship.

"Strikes properly led and conducted and properly timed are a revolutionary weapon . . . Political strikes are a higher form of struggle than economic strikes."

He goes on and says—

"Strikes are the main weapon to attack the capitalist class in the community."

Then he goes on to talk about the need for unity tickets between the Communists and the A.L.P. Only a little while ago Mr. Calwell, speaking in the Federal House, said—

"I regard the Communist Party as only Enemy No. 2; Capitalism is Enemy No. 1."

And one of his associates in the Federal House said that he would rather give—mark this—his vote to a Communist than to either the Liberal Party or the D.L.P. From statements such as those one can see the real pattern of the thinking of Communists today. They are opposed to rule by law and order; they are opposed to arbitration, and that very theme is being developed within the trade unions of Queensland.

Three or four weeks ago I had to show how the unity ticket was operating in the disputes committee in Queensland. That is the fundamental reason why the Communist Party, though small in number, is gaining such a grip on the industrial life of Queensland. It is simply because people such as the man who makes so much noise and does not do the decent thing or follow the correct procedure in reporting police matters have not the courage to fight the Communists. That fellow is afraid of them. He is afraid of the Communists because he knows that if they take a strong line he will be on the outer and looking for a job.

Mr. Houston: Are the employees of Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. getting wage justice?

Mr. MORRIS: There it is again!

Mr. Houston: I am asking for your opinion.

Mr. MORRIS: There it is—criticism of the Industrial Court all the time. They never miss an opportunity. We have an Industrial Court and an industrial system in Queensland better than that in any other part of the world, but the hon. members opposite are doing their best to break it down.

Mr. Houston: The Court did not say whether they were getting wage justice or not. All the Court said was that there must be an overall case.

Mr. MORRIS: The hon. member can argue that out with himself. I repeat that it is of vital importance that the people of Queensland should know that Mr. Calwell, the Labour Leader in the Federal House, has said that capitalism is a greater enemy of him and his fellows than is Communism, and not one hon. member opposite can deny it. That is the crucial test. They are not going to deny it.

Mr. Duggan: If you are going to pick out particular spokesmen and say we should accept them, what about Mr. Muller's statement that he has no confidence in you?

Mr. MORRIS: There are many people who have no confidence in me, but there are many more people who have no confidence in the hon. member, as he knows only too well. And as a matter of fact, I do not think the people of Queensland will continue to have much confidence in the hon. member for South Brisbane, because, when I announced the building by Rothmans of a factory, which incidentally will give employment to a large number of Queenslanders, the hon. member for South Brisbane sneeringly asked, "Is it an essential industry?" If he had his way, the industry would not be here at all. As a matter of fact if he and his political associates were on this side of the Chamber, Rothmans would not have come here. They would have been too afraid

of the developments that would take place in Queensland under the administration of hon. members opposite.

I believe it is known far and wide that the Communist influence in many of our unions has never been as strong as it is today.

Mr. Houston: What is the Liberal Party doing to try to overcome the problem that you are talking about?

Mr. MORRIS: We are doing a great deal more than hon. members opposite: we are openly fighting Communism.

Mr. Houston: How?

Mr. MORRIS: About 12 months ago I introduced a Bill making possible secret ballots in trade-union elections. That is one thing we have done, and many more will use that machinery in the future than have used it in the past.

Mr. Houston: That is only wishful thinking.

Mr. MORRIS: That may be the hon. member's opinion.

I am asked by hon. members opposite what we have done to fight Communism. One of the things has been to reveal the strength of the Communist Party within the industrial movement today. I can show hon. members hundreds of letters from people who have said to me, "Thank heaven that you have revealed the Communists in the community in Queensland, because it leads us to realise just how strong they are getting in our industrial life. When the next opportunity comes for election of officers of our union we are going to see that these Communists are defeated." There is the final answer and that is what hon. members opposite should have done long ago, as they would have done if they had not been afraid of the Communists.

Mr. Bennett: Would it be correct to say that they were never stronger than since your Government took office?

Mr. MORRIS: The correct thing to say is that they have never been so much in fear as they are today. These Communists know that they are developing to their utmost satisfaction the unity-ticket system within themselves and the Labour Party. They know they are growing constantly stronger and stronger. If hon. members read any Communist publication at all they will see the proof of it.

I think I can do no better than quote the Prime Minister on this matter. He said—

"We have reaped the harvest of this fantasy . . ."

He was referring there to the apathy within the Labour Party. He said—

"We have reaped the harvest of this fantasy in the form of some widespread strikes organised and carried through by Communist-led unions. For example . . ."

He gives a few examples, and then continues—

"The A.L.P. ought to be proud of the results of its work, for that party has, in its anxiety to please the Communists, put itself in a position of ambiguity which is the major reason for its continued existence in opposition. It has indeed developed a strange sense of national values. Even Mr. Calwell himself, who must personally have no sympathy whatever with the atheistic materialism of the Communist creed, was reported only a few years back as telling the New South Wales Labour Conference that 'Capitalism was the No. 1 enemy in Australia and Communism only No. 2.' If this means anything (and of course it may not) it means that he would regard the overthrow of capitalism and the institution of State socialism as a more important task than the defeat of our greatest external and internal enemy.

"Some of his parliamentary followers have made even more astonishing remarks. Early this year a Labour Senator admitted that he would much rather support the Communists than support the D.L.P., while only in June the secretary of the Melbourne Trades Hall Council told the Victorian State A.L.P. Conference 'that he would choose the Communist in front of the D.L.P. or Liberal.'"

There is the answer. I believe we have done a lot to help the unions in this fight against Communism, and they can be sure that in the years and months ahead they will get from us even greater help to fight this menace—the greatest menace that Australia knows today.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (4.19 p.m.): When the Deputy Premier entered the debate today I listened with some interest, because it is unusual for a Minister to enter this general Budget debate in such a fashion. I expected that he had something worth while to tell us, but after I listened for a while I realised that the reason for his entering the debate was to try to re-establish himself in the front ranks of the Government parties. We know that of recent days the Deputy Premier has found himself in a very embarrassing position. He was obliged to accept back a member of his Caucus, who openly stated that he had never had any confidence in the Deputy Premier. We know the difficulties he has in maintaining his status. We know the Premier was very anxious to keep him out of the debate. That is why he is not bringing the Estimates of the Labour and Industry Department forward for debate.

Mr. Morris: How low can you get!

Mr. HANLON: He has beaten the Premier by sneaking into this debate.

Mr. MORRIS: I rise to a point of order. I do not care what people say about me if

they tell the truth. The hon. member knows that he is as far away from the truth as it is possible to get, because I have given him the reason why the Estimates of my department will not come on, and he is trying to twist it. I think it reveals the type he is.

Mr. HANLON: I am not going to waste any more time on the Deputy Premier. We are here not to discuss his ramblings of the last half-hour or so but to debate the Budget that was introduced by the Treasurer. I want to refer to my remarks at the beginning of the Budget debate last year when I said—

“The feature of the third Budget presented by the Treasurer is that the Country-Liberal Government suggest for the first time—and I emphasise the word suggest—that Queensland in this financial year will have a surplus of approximately £15,000. The possibility of a surplus, as suggested by the Treasurer, has already been questioned by a number of hon. members on this side of the Chamber. It would be grave and serious for any Government to suggest that there will be a surplus merely because of a forthcoming election, particularly for a Government whose term of office has been characterised by two rather substantial deficits.”

We now have the official result, if I may call it that, for 1959-1960, and instead of the expected surplus that the Treasurer mentioned last year, of £15,000-odd, we have “his” deficit of £164,675. He is budgeting for another deficit this year. The deficit for 1959-1960 brings the accumulated, or total, deficits of this Government for the past three years to £2,869,000-odd. That is if we accept the deficits shown by the Treasurer as being the true result over the last few years. I think, as was claimed by my leader and by other speakers on this side of the Chamber at this time last year, that the actual deficit this year is greater than the figure given by the Treasurer. We pointed out to him last year that it would be almost impossible for him to have a surplus of £15,00 if he were going to maintain a reasonably high level of employment for the financial year ended 30 June, 1960. We were not hoping for a deficit, as perhaps some hon. members opposite will suggest, but we did point out to him that we did not think he would end the year with a surplus and he did not. I think the actual deficit is indeed much greater than appears in the results for the year—both for this year and over the term of the present Government. For a start, £1,588,407 has been brought in from the Succession and Stamp Duties Suspense Account. Of that amount the Treasurer used £1,190,857 to extinguish the deficit from 1958-1959, so obviously the remainder of the amount that was brought in from the Succession and Stamp Duties Suspense Account—£397,550—must be accounted as extinguishing part of the deficit this year. It is no good the Treasurer bringing in nearly £400,000 from the Suspense Account and then saying he has a

deficit of only £164,675. If he brings in the other £1,000,00 and uses that to extinguish the deficit from 1958-1959, whether he says he is putting the rest of it to revenue or no matter how he terms it, the fact remains that he is extinguishing this year £400,000 of this year's deficit in the same way as he extinguished the deficit by using £1,190,000 from the previous year. He cannot have it both ways. If we add to his £164,675 deficit the amount of nearly £400,000 that was transferred from what previously was the Succession and Stamp Duties Suspense Account, the deficit immediately becomes £562,000.

Then we have this terrific excess over the estimate of receipts from stamp duty and succession and probate duty. Last financial year the Treasurer received £1,387,000 in excess of his estimated receipts for stamp duty and succession and probate duty. I must confess, with all the charity in the world, that I always view receipts from stamp duty and succession and probate duty with a good deal of suspicion because they seem to fluctuate very violently over the years to suit the wishes of the Treasurer. In 1957-58 the excess of receipts over the estimates was £419,000, in 1958-59 it was £126,000, and in 1959-60 it was £1,387,312. While it might be true to say that some of the additional stamp duty imposed by the Treasurer during the year had something to do with that, there is no way of establishing to my satisfaction how this tremendous increase came about. There must be something wrong with the methods used by the Treasurer and the officers of the Stamp Duties Office and the Succession and Probate Duties Office if they are almost £1,000,000 out in their estimates. We have little chance of finding out how these figures are juggled about from year to year.

Mr. Walsh: They are certainly juggled.

Mr. HANLON: I think that is recognised. It does not only apply to the present Treasurer.

Mr. Walsh: We never juggled them like that.

Mr. HANLON: I am not saying that the hon. member for Bundaberg juggled the figures. What I am saying is that a Treasurer who finds himself a long way out in his estimates, having a big deficit instead of a surplus, certainly has a good deal of scope, by manipulating the Succession and Probate and Stamp Duties, to bring something in for this year that might otherwise be carried on till next year, and vice versa.

We know that the Treasurer used the actual balance of the Succession and Probate Duties Suspense Account to balance a previous deficit. He has also used it against this year's deficit, and he has to acknowledge that, unlike former Labour Governments, in the future he will be using a certain amount of money that previously was held in the Suspense Account to balance what

would be a deficit. In addition, earnings on funds that previously were credited to various Trust and Special Funds—this is something that has been altered by this Government—are now credited direct to Consolidated Revenue.

On page 6 of the Estimates of the Probable Ways and Means the item "Public Balances, Advances from Loan Fund, Investments, etc.", appears. In the year 1958-1959 the figure was £1,961,781; this year, 1960, it is £2,467,000. If we go back to the time of Labour Governments, that item was only about £900,000, so in three years it has increased from under £1,000,000 to £2,467,000 as a credit to Consolidated Revenue. That increase has taken place to a great extent because money that previously was credited to various Trust Funds is now being credited direct to Consolidated Revenue.

Mr. Herbert: Skilful handling of our resources on the short-term money market.

Mr. HANLON: That has nothing to do with it. Where money was previously paid into Trust Funds, it now goes straight to Consolidated Revenue. When the Treasurer attacked former Labour Governments for drawing on Trust Funds to minimise their deficits and enable them to show surpluses, he gave no consideration to this type of entry. When moneys earned on these funds were credited to Trust and Special Funds he said that that money really never could have gone to Consolidated Revenue, as he has done with it. He used to charge us with having used reserves to bolster up a deficit and make out that it was a surplus. But instead of putting that money into Trust and Special Funds he now puts it all into Consolidated Revenue. The Treasurer has to face up to the fact that by transferring money into the Consolidated Revenue Fund he is doing what he used to criticise us for when he accused us of hiding deficits.

Mr. Walsh: On a much more extensive scale, too.

Mr. HANLON: Yes. No matter how he twists and turns he cannot get away from the fact that many of the arguments he used in previous years from this side of the Chamber are very much against him now. All these little things add up to give a completely different picture from the one the Treasurer would present to us if we were prepared to sit and take it.

We see the transfer to Consolidated Revenue of money that previously was set aside for the Liquor Act Trust Fund. Of the receipts from hotel and wine saloons, one-sixteenth previously had to be put into the Liquor Act Trust Fund, but now it goes into Consolidated Revenue. There is the saving provision that the Governor in Council makes sure that the Trust Fund stays at a minimum of £300,000. There again money is being paid by this

Government into the Consolidated Revenue Fund that used to go into a special Trust Fund. It all helps to build up the Government's revenue against expenditure. It is not that there is any more money available but it increases the amount of money in the Consolidated Revenue Account, money that the previous Government did not show under that heading. Consequently it makes it much easier for the Treasurer to suggest that he has not as large a deficit as he would have if he presented his accounts on the same basis as that adopted by the previous Government.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out how the confusion is being made greater. Not only is money being paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund that previously went into Trust and Special Funds, but the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out that it has not been a completely one-way traffic. The Treasurer has also diverted money from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to Loan Funds. I think forestry receipts were mentioned. The whole thing becomes so confused that it is rather laughable when we think of all the ballyhoo and the Hollywood atmosphere when the Treasurer presented his really original Budget in 1958. At that time he said he was going to make his accounts so simple that anybody could follow them. All he has done is create far more confusion.

If we go back to 1958, before some of the new members entered Parliament, we remember that the balance in the Hospital, Motherhood and Child Welfare Fund at 1 July, 1958, was £680,901. That money was transferred to the Consolidated Revenue Fund in 1958-1959. I do not say that the Treasurer should not have done it—he used the money the way he wanted to—but when a Labour Treasurer did that sort of thing he was accused of trying to hide something, of trying to use Trust Funds to make it appear that the Government had a surplus when there was really a deficit. Labour Treasurers could not win because when they put money into Trust Funds they were accused of trying to hide surpluses. When we take all these matters into consideration, particularly the Hospital, Motherhood and Child Welfare Fund we realise that if this Government had presented their accounts the way the previous Government did, their accumulated deficits over the last three years would have been close to £5,000,000. Not that I would want to argue on it because, as I pointed out, there has been so much chopping and changing between Revenue Funds, Loan Funds and Trust and Special Funds under the present Treasurer that one would need a skilled and experienced staff and a much more intimate knowledge of the State accounts—which can be gained only from the Treasurer's chair—than we have on this side of the Chamber to ascertain what the real deficit has been over the last few years. I am not attempting to analyse the Treasurer's deficit

of £164,000. He has confused it to such a degree that no ordinary member can work out just what has happened.

Mr. Houghton: You would not agree with the Financial Statement?

Mr. HANLON: I am only saying that the Treasurer himself has not really explained just how he arrived at the deficit of £164,000. If hon. members really want to look at the Budget as the Treasurer himself used to, and if they want to use the arguments he used from the Opposition on previous Budgets, they will find that the deficit of £164,000 is just a figure that has been plucked out of the air by transferring money from Succession Duties Suspense Account, and so on. He could have made it £364,000 if he had liked to. All he had to do was to ring up and say, "Make the stamp duties a bit less because we want a deficit of £364,000." It is not that, at 12 midnight on 30 June, the Budget worked out to this figure of £164,000 or whatever it is. If we think that that is what this imaginary figure is, we are not showing much understanding of how these things work.

If we were to try to argue—and that is why I am not going to waste time arguing—what the exact deficit of the Government has been—and it has been a substantial amount—the first thing we should do would be to arrive at some definite criteria between the Government and the Opposition as to what really constitutes revenue. Judging by the arguments that have been advanced in this Chamber over the years between the present Treasurer and previous Treasurers, it would be almost impossible. We could say that the Treasurer's "mucking about" with the figures over the past three years has made it difficult to compare this Budget with those of previous Treasurers or even those past Budgets of the Treasurer himself.

We can best describe the position the Treasurer has brought about by quoting his own remarks as they appear in Volume 214 of "Hansard" for 1956-1957 at page 734. This is what he said—

"When the Government start monkeying with figures for last year they lose a reliable target as to prospects for this year. That is one of the greatest dangers in our practice. There has been a taking out of reserves and so we cannot get a clear picture."

The Treasurer himself, in his term of office has not only been taking out of reserves but taking out of reserves and putting into revenue and taking out of revenue funds and putting into loan funds, and so on. As I say, on his own words, he has "monkeyed about" so much with the figures in the Budget that we more or less waste our time arguing over what is the real deficit or surplus.

Not only has this "monkeying" not been explained, but it has, in a way, misled members of this Chamber. If they look at the

Auditor-General's report for 1958-1959 they will find that as from 1 July, 1958, for example, the Auditor-General mentions—and I am still not quite clear what this involves; perhaps the Treasurer will explain it some time—that the purchase of drugs for Government institutions and hospital boards, which previously had been charged to "Surgery and Dispensary" and offset by receipts from sales, is now charged to Manufacturing Dispensary. Whether that means that we used to have a net charge for purchases offset by sales and that that has now been replaced by purchases on one side and sales on the other, as it would appear to read, I do not know, but it can be seen that that could make quite a substantial difference to anybody reading the expenditure side of the Department of Health and Home Affairs Accounts. For the year 1959-1960 the Budget revealed £693,031 for the purchase of drugs and so on for Government institutions and various hospital boards. The corresponding figure for receipts from sales of drugs is £726,874. That appears to me to be different from the position in previous years, in that the sales of drugs to various hospital boards and so on amount to substantially more than the cost of purchasing the drugs, whereas previously the position was the other way round.

Mr. Herbert: It could have been a clearing-out of stock.

Mr. HANLON: That could be so, but these are things we want to know.

Mr. Duggan: If it was, that makes the financial position worse.

Mr. HANLON: Yes, more reserves eaten away. Instead of a net debit of, say, £50,000 as an expenditure in the Budget, to find a credit for receipts of £650,000 and a debit somewhere else of £700,000 completely distorts the picture for anyone looking quickly at the Budget.

In 1958-1959 the same thing can be seen in relation to hospital boards. The average member of Parliament and the average member of the public would look at the summary of expenditure for the Department of Health and Home Affairs in an effort to find out what we were spending on hospitals. For 1957-1958 the appropriation was £7,130,000, while the amount expended was £6,351,672. The amount required for 1958-1959 was given as £8,837,748. The average Government member would go to his electors and say, "We are spending tremendously more money on hospitals. In 1957-1958 we expended £6,351,000, and Doc. Noble is going to spend £8,837,748 this year, an increase of £2,000,000." But that is not so. That was not the position in 1958-1959, because on page 20 of those Estimates in 1959 we find that whereas previously contributions by the Commonwealth for hospital benefits, pharmaceutical benefits and for maintenance of tuberculosis sanatoria and so on used to be offset to get a net amount, they are now credited direct to Consolidated Revenue. So

you find that there is not an increase from £6,351,000 to £8,837,000 at all. The effective figure should be £6,512,000, or an increase of about £150,000, rather than an increase of £2,000,000.

Those things are important, and that is why I say it is just so much ballyhoo for the Treasurer to be telling us, and the Liberal Party to be putting out propaganda to the effect, that we are shown everything in the Budget and that the Budget is presented in such a way that we can completely understand it. These things can make a tremendous difference, and the Budget figures should be broken down to a much greater degree for the information of all hon. members. I do not think they have been broken down sufficiently to enable anyone to get the information in going through the document quickly, as hon. members have to do at this stage of the session. They have not the time to sort through too much material.

As the figures are presented they do not give hon. members sufficient insight into the operations of the various departments. Patients' payments and other collections are estimated for this financial year at £1,893,000, compared with £1,496,000 last year. There is no doubt that increased charges for intermediate, and to a very minor extent private, accommodation and pensioner medical benefits have a bearing on the increase, but we do not know how much bearing they have. We do not know whether the public beds are being cut down and people are being forced into intermediate accommodation.

Mr. Pizzey: Can you produce evidence of one person being forced into intermediate accommodation?

Mr. HANLON: I am not going into that, because we have been assured that the Estimates of the Department of Health and Home Affairs will be discussed. I do not propose at this stage to go into the matter in detail. I can say that the daily average of occupied public beds has certainly fallen under this Government. That is something that the Minister can "put in his pipe and smoke" for a couple of days waiting for them to come on. I feel that while some of this information can be gathered by ferreting through a lot of reports if hon. members have the time to do so, there could be a better dissection of the Budget. Some of these generalised Votes such as patients' fees and general collections amounting to almost £2,000,000, all lumped together in one Vote with very little indication as to their real make-up, could be broken down for much closer examination by hon. members during the debate on the Estimates.

Mr. Walsh: They are getting a good hand-out from the State Government Insurance Office.

Mr. HANLON: That could be so. The hon. gentleman could deal with that himself.

The conversion of a net charge to a widely-separated debit and credit Vote can

create an apparent £500,000 addition in relation to these drugs and so on, which could be very misleading to anybody reading the Budget.

Where the Treasurer "monkeys about" with the figures, as there is no doubt he has done, I appeal to him, for the benefit of hon. members, to indicate clearly and completely what he has done. When he makes an alteration, even if it is a good alteration, I suggest to him also that he should be careful to tidy up behind him as he goes along. I refer particularly to the decision, as at 1 January, 1959, for the Housing Commission to carry the home builders' insurance risk which was introduced by a Labour Government under the State Housing Act, rather than paying a premium of over £100,000 a year to the State Government Insurance Office for life assurance sufficient to liquidate the indebtedness of the Commissioner if the various people who are borrowing money should die before they complete their repayments. I agree with that decision. Probably an untrue picture has been created by the Government paying up to £100,000 every year to the Insurance Commissioner for a liability that does not seem to be anywhere near as big as that. I remind the Treasurer—and I think this should be taken notice of—that the Auditor-General pointed out in his report a year ago—and after all, the Auditor-General is somebody of importance; he is an auditor, and a very important one as the auditor of the State's finances—that this change required validating legislation. That was 12 months ago. If hon. members read his report for the year 1959-1960 they will find in it on page 70 the same thing under the heading, "Home Builders' Insurance. This change requires validating legislation."

That validating legislation has not been forthcoming although it is 12 months since the Auditor-General asked for it. We have no indication that it will be forthcoming this year. I ask the Treasurer whether we can expect this request from the Auditor-General to be carried out during this session, or does he treat that statement by the Auditor-General as somewhat of a joke that he need not worry about? I make it clear that I think the practice of discontinuing the payment of the premium to the Insurance Commissioner is quite a good idea. I should like to see some small charge from revenue made each year to a special fund for this purpose, even if it is not being paid to the Insurance Commissioner, but certainly nothing in the nature of £100,000 a year. The Auditor-General has pointed out consistently for the last two years that the Treasurer has not tidied up behind him when he made this alteration, and that he should do something about it and bring down validating legislation to legalise the alteration in terms of the home builders' insurance. The Treasurer cannot continue—and I do not think he should continue—to "thumb his nose" at the Auditor-General and take no notice of what he says. I should like some indication from the Treasurer as to whether he is going to do something about it.

As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, the Treasurer has displayed a certain amount of frankness—and, I suppose, commendable frankness—in his Budget speech, but not in the way he has “monkeyed about” with the treatment of revenue and trust funds and so on.

My Leader also pointed out that, despite the Treasurer’s frankness, his Budget is not lacking in apologies or covers for that frankness. I cannot help feeling that the frankness came only from a political shrewdness. He knew full well that, if he did not get to the clothes line first with his washing, the Opposition certainly was going to hang it out. And, as they have been hanging it out, they have revealed quite a number of rather tattered “undies.” So he decided to be quite frank and to get in ahead of us with a little self-criticism.

Mr. Windsor: You will admit he is shrewd, though?

Mr. HANLON: I will come to that because I think it is an important interjection. We have had the example in the past few weeks of a considerable amount of similar shrewdness by this Government. If it is a shrewdness that the hon. member for Ithaca takes any pleasure in, I do not think he is paying much of a compliment to his Cabinet Minister, even if he thinks he is.

In his financial policy the Treasurer has more or less passed the point of no return, and inevitably, whether we as an Opposition like it or not, the State has had to go along with him. He openly admitted to us in 1958 that he was going to take the calculated risk of deliberately exhausting reserves held by the State and getting finances down to a very thin red line where he hoped vastly improved Commonwealth taxation reimbursements would enable us to move along at the somewhat increased speed that the potential of the State warrants. It may be true that he has partly succeeded by getting a little more tax reimbursement though not decisively more than any other State. If his tactics have been successful in getting what he at one stage considered to be an improved formula, then the same has happened in all other States; all have got increases. Indeed, South Australia, if anything, despite its withdrawal from the Commonwealth Grants Commission, came out much better than Queensland in the readjustment.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out that the real benefit of this new taxation reimbursement formula would only be felt, under the escalator clause, with costs and wages stabilised; in other words, we could never get the benefit of it until we came to a year in which costs and wages were stabilised and the escalator clause brought us up to date. Under this Government in Queensland and under the Menzies Government in Australia—if they remain—that does not look like happening for some time; we will never get up to date; we

are always dragging 12 months behind. If the Treasurer has gambled by being completely bold, he certainly has not won us any great financial advantage. At the moment all we can say is that our finances are in a most unhealthy orbit. As he told us, if we settle back down to a lower level we can continue in that orbit temporarily, but we cannot go on indefinitely in the present orbit of expenditure because the bold, calculated approach—the ballyhoo of 1958—is coming apart at the seams. The spending spree is over. That has been recognised by the Treasurer in this Budget and he has to concede that added educational facilities to cope with the multiplying enrolments at our schools can be provided only by robbing another department. The hon. member for Gympie and the hon. member for Fassifern, I think, both pointed that out. The hon. member for Fassifern said it was all right for the Minister for Education to be running up and down the State skiting about all the high schools he was providing. It is very good to see them going up—they are needed because of the increased enrolments—but, as the hon. member for Fassifern pointed out, that can only be done, and has only been done by this Government, by robbing the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply of its allocation, whether from loan funds or from any other fund. Labour Treasurers managed to meet the reasonable requirements of education and irrigation but now the very requirements of one—not the luxuries—can be met only by robbing the other.

Mr. Ramsden: Twenty years behind the times.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member for Merthyr says, “Twenty years behind the times.” What is he talking about—education?

Mr. Ramsden: Yes.

Mr. HANLON: The main increase in the Education Vote over the last couple of years has been a matter of necessity because of the big increase in enrolments. It has been Australia-wide. When Mr. Renshaw, the New South Wales Labour Treasurer, brought down his Budget, “The Sydney Morning Herald” published this report—

“Record Education Vote Provided in State Budget

“A record education vote of £54,000,778—an increase of £5,258,333 on last year—is provided in the 1960-1961 State Budget.”

Mr. Pizzey: What is he spending on irrigation?

Mr. HANLON: If the Minister for Education is going to say that he has worked miracles in education in this State over the last three years, there are five other miracle-workers in the Commonwealth—in the other States.

The hopes that a modest improvement in services would be forthcoming from the Hiley

plan have not been fulfilled, and the tempo of development, as the Leader of the Opposition said, must slow down. The Treasurer has gone further. He has admitted that he cannot now carry the subsidies to local authorities, Harbour Boards, and so on, that Labour Treasurers managed to provide in the past. He has given notice that in 1961 local bodies will lose their subsidies, despite the fact that the Government now have this wonderful new formula. The Treasurer said when he came back from Canberra a year ago that the star of Federation was in the ascendancy; but despite all these alleged marvellous improvements he has effected, the Government are unable to maintain the subsidies to local bodies.

Where will this lead? It will lead to an even slower tempo. If the Treasurer, with all his worries—and he has many—cannot manage to provide subsidies, it is difficult to see how local bodies, with their limited sources of revenue, are going to make up the leeway for him. What opportunities have local bodies of boosting their revenue when the Treasurer says, "We are going to cut you down, boys."? Obviously there will be a continual slowing-down of development in the State.

As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out, these subsidies to local bodies in the past have been a cheap way of encouraging them to do things that in most other States in Australia have to be done by the Government. If the Treasurer thinks that he is automatically going to profit to any great degree in the long run by withdrawing them, sooner or later the work will have to be done by the State. Local authorities, harbour boards, and so on, will not be able to maintain the same tempo, and the responsibility will be thrown more and more on to the Treasurer.

How slow can the tempo get before the Treasurer is forced to go down the very last laneway that he has open to him? The only laneway left open to him as the additional deficits roll off the stocks is the laneway to the Commonwealth Grants Commission. I think he would concede that if he cannot make a success of things over the next couple of years, he will have to head down the laneway to the Commonwealth Grants Commission.

Mr. Sullivan: What is wrong with that?

Mr. HANLON: I am going to tell the hon. member. For all the Treasurer's frankness, I wonder, as did the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, whether there is something phoney in this whole "beg-for-bankruptcy" approach over the last few years. Recently in this Chamber the Treasurer has emerged as a self-confessed political cover-up merchant, and when we look down that laneway to the Commonwealth Grants Commission, we cannot help wondering whether there is another set of artificial props down there just as

plausible as the rejected portfolio, or the retirement on medical advice, to which the Treasurer was willing to be a party in the transactions that happened in the last six months in the Government parties. I do not say that because I want to drag that matter up again. However, I think it has a very strong bearing on this matter, because at the end of that laneway to the Commonwealth Grants Commission is something that the Liberal Party have been looking for ever since they came into office. Anybody in Queensland can tell you that that is the death-knell of free hospitalisation. That is the background to much of the Treasurer's frankness. There is a great deal of phoney frankness about him. He is walking towards that laneway to the Commonwealth Grants Commission, pretending that he is being forced there all the time, but knowing that at the end of the laneway is the destruction of free hospitalisation as we know it.

Mr. Walsh: Under the new agreement the Treasurer has surrendered his rights to go to the Commonwealth Grants Commission.

Mr. HANLON: I do not agree with that. He has said that he will not go to the Commonwealth Grants Commission unless he is absolutely desperate. That is what he told us when he came back from Canberra. He has not surrendered his right to go there, but he abandoned the approach he made a year or so ago in return for the little bit they threw him. However, he is getting desperate, and he will get more desperate if the Government go on the way they have been. They cannot go on indefinitely in that way. He has acknowledged that now. He says in his Financial Statement, "We can't go on like this. Local bodies, watch out, I will have to chop you off a bit in 1961. Irrigation will have to be chopped down a bit," and so on.

Mr. Hiley: In other words we cannot keep on breaking records every year.

Mr. HANLON: It depends on what sort of records the Treasurer is going to break. I am not one who wants to hark back to the Moore Government. After all, we have the Nicklin Government now, we do not need the Moore Government! Nevertheless the Moore Government set a lot of records, but they are not records of which anybody could be proud.

An approach to the Commonwealth Grants Commission could result only in the replacing of free hospitalisation in Queensland with a scheme of hospital insurance, which has already been introduced on a minor scale for pensioner-inmates of Eventide homes and chronic patients in hospitals, and thus allow millions of pounds at present devoted to hospitalisation to be diverted to other activities that will warm the hearts of the Liberal Party, and even the Country Party.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. HANLON: Probably that is another thing that is coming. We are told that the quarterly adjustment of the basic wage will not take effect until 31 October. It is the longest period I can remember that we have had to wait for an adjustment to become effective. I will deal with that subject later on.

The Treasurer knows that no application to the Commonwealth Grants Commission can be sustained by Queensland while we maintain free hospitalisation, which is unknown in any other State.

Mr. Hiley: That would not be right, you know.

Mr. HANLON: The Treasurer can point that out later on.

Mr. Hiley: I have done that two or three times already.

Mr. HANLON: The basis of an application to the Commonwealth Grants Commission is to enable the State to provide for its own people services equal to those of other States. I am speaking in lay language. How can the Treasurer say to the Commonwealth Grants Commission, "I want some money because I can't provide the people in my State with the things they get in other States"? The first thing the Commonwealth Grants Commission would say would be, "The people in your State get free hospitalisation. Why don't you do away with that for a start?"

Mr. Hiley: You can provide extra on some services and less on others. There is a favourable and an unfavourable adjustment.

Mr. HANLON: There might be a favourable and an unfavourable adjustment, but all I have noticed about the Commonwealth Grants Commission in that respect is that it is very favourable to South Australia and very unfavourable to Queensland. An example of that is contained in the Budget speech of the Premier of South Australia.

Mr. Duggan: They wrote off his deficits.

Mr. HANLON: As the Leader of the Opposition interjects, they wrote off his deficits.

Sir Thomas Playford said—

"During the last three months also, the effects of the Government's most careful efficiency and economy efforts became increasingly manifest. On top of this the Government was delighted that the Commonwealth Grants Commission recommended, in view of the responsible conduct of the State's finances over a long period of years, that the whole of the outstanding deficit of 1958-59 be made good by the Commonwealth."

How very nice for Sir Thomas Playford! When the Treasurer talks of favourable and unfavourable allowances and so on, all I can find on free hospitalisation in relation to the Commonwealth Grants Commission is that it

is ever ready to be favourable to South Australia and never ready to be favourable to Queensland. That applies to the Commonwealth generally, apart altogether from the Commonwealth Grants Commission. The Treasurer is reluctantly forced down this laneway. He will go to the Commonwealth Grants Commission and reluctantly he will agree that he has to do something with the growing hospital Vote—and it is a growing Vote; it was up to £16,000,000 last financial year—the heaviest non-trading departmental Vote in the Budget.

There is some indication of Government thinking on the matter from a report of a statement made by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs at Toowoomba on 25 September, in which he said he favoured compulsory hospital insurance. According to "The Courier-Mail"—

"The Health Minister, Dr. Noble, said yesterday that he favoured compulsory hospital insurance,"

and so on. The hon. member for Norman asked him to explain that statement in Parliament and he said—

"I have on numerous occasions stated, and I now repeat, that the policy of the Government is to provide free hospital services for public patients as is now being done."

Very well, but he said further—

"I would also state that I propose to obtain the maximum possible contribution from the Commonwealth Government towards the maintaining of State hospitals, and would support any proposal designed to serve that purpose."

Senator Spooner, Federal Minister for National Development, when interviewed on television a short while ago, was asked why the Commonwealth was not helping more with the Channel roads scheme and he said, "You people up here spend a lot of money on hospitals. Why don't you spend some of that on Channel roads?" He does not seem to be as much concerned as Dr. Noble allegedly is with free hospitals because he told the interviewing panel on television, "Spend the money you spend on hospitals on Channel roads. Don't come to the Commonwealth for money for Channel roads when you are spending all that money on hospitals. Spend a bit of that."

I suggest that that will be the Commonwealth Grants Commission's attitude. We will have the atmosphere created to sell to the public this unwholesome decision to destroy free hospitalisation and replace it with a hospital insurance scheme. The Government will pretend it has been forced on them, whereas, in my opinion, the Government, through their Budgets, have been steadily driving towards that end. They will go to the Commonwealth Grants Commission and be "knocked back". They will be told they have to destroy the free hospitalisation scheme. They will come away as happy as can be and replace it with the hospital insurance that the

Minister talks about. They will then have balanced Budgets—that is, if the Government can sell the idea to the public and remain in office.

We will also have less land tax and we will have no transfer-of-Crown-lease taxation. That will be repealed and many other concessions will be given to supporters of the Government one way and another at the expense of people who now receive genuinely free hospitalisation, which they will not receive under an insurance scheme as suggested by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs.

Mr. Ramsden: Will the hon. member answer a question?

Mr. HANLON: I am sorry, I have not the time.

I feel that that underlying purpose to sell out free hospitals dominated this Budget, and not the margins, which the Treasurer chooses to blame. The Treasurer managed to have quite a large deficit last year, without the full effects of the margins being felt until the current financial year. He believes that the extension of the margins decision to all grades of employment was a serious mistake. After saying that—in much the same way as the Prime Minister—he quite openly pleaded guilty to being a party to it by extending what should have been a special benefit to the skilled tradesman to officers of the State Service right through to Under Secretaries. He criticised the approach as being radically wrong, yet he quite openly pleaded guilty to doing the same thing.

Mr. Hiley: When you say we did that, I point out that the Industrial Court did that. We did not do it voluntarily.

Mr. HANLON: I suppose the Court also will be giving increases to judges and so on, as time goes on, but surely the Treasurer does not suggest that what he described as a well-merited improvement for the skilled tradesman must be sandbagged because private enterprise, the Federal Government, and the Treasurer, have given proportionate effect to it, even up to Under Secretaries. All I can say is that the Treasurer showed a devil of a lot more fight in dealing with the dockers and employees of Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. than he did when dealing with Under Secretaries.

It is always the worker who is called upon to bear the burden when costs are going up and we are fighting an inflationary trend. I mentioned some aspects of the matter in the private members' motion I moved a week or two ago. Another matter is coming up, I think, and the worker is again going to be taken for a ride if we are not very careful. I suspect we are about to witness the perpetration of another major fraud on the basic-wage earner, and I refer to the propaganda that is already being issued. I draw the attention of hon. members to an article that appeared in "The

Sunday Mail" of 23 October under the heading, "Once And For All—Figures Do Lie," by Harold Cox. It reads—

"The Commonwealth Statistician (Mr. S. R. Carver) last week exploded for good and all the myth that figures cannot lie."

"With delicate timing he produced a cost of living index which showed that the burden on John Citizen's purse increased by 1.2 per cent. in the last quarter. Twenty-four hours later, out came another finding by Mr. Carver announcing that the increase had been 2.4 per cent."

As most hon. members realise, he was referring to the fact that the Statistician is issuing the new consumer index, which takes into account much information not considered under the "C"-series index, and makes allowance for such things as home-ownership and so on. As the new index shows in southern States a smaller increase over the last quarter than the "C"-series index, we are hearing the cry from the Press and various vested interests that the "C"-series index should be replaced by the new index. This attempt to switch suddenly from one index to another is all right, and I would have no objection if the Court replaced the "C"-series index and took the new index as a guide in its deliberations—provided, of course, that the Court went back to 1939, and considered matters in their proper proportion. While the "C"-series index may over-estimate the increase in the cost of living at the moment, for a number of years it under-estimated it, and, if the consumer index had been used in the years following 1939 and in the post-war years, it would have shown a much bigger increase than the "C"-series index.

I refer hon. members to a letter in "The Courier Mail" of 16 August, 1960, from J. K. Gifford, Professor of Economics, University of Queensland, and in particular to the following passage:—

"I join Mr. R. G. Palmer, Senior Lecturer in Economic Statistics of the University of Queensland (C.M. 15/8/60), in welcoming the new retail prices index number produced by the Commonwealth Statistician."

"The new index number, however, does not go far enough back."

That is the key to the whole matter. While it is true that the new index shows a smaller increase than "C"-series index at present, if it had been applied back in the post-war years it would have shown a much bigger increase than the "C"-series index.

I have not the time to read the letter in full, but we find in the letter of G. R. Palmer, Senior Lecturer in Economic Statistics, University of Queensland, the following passage:—

"However, the suggestion that the 'C'-series has 'overestimated the cost of living' is one which requires considerable qualification if a completely erroneous impression is not to be obtained."

"Up to about 1952 the rent component of the 'C'-series had shown little change as compared with pre-war."

"The rents of the types of houses included were, of course, subject to stringent controls."

"Other prices in the index had increased, on the average, to about 2½ times the pre-war figure."

"Since 1952, with the relaxation of controls, rents included in the 'C'-series have increased more markedly than the prices of other items."

That has been our experience in Queensland over the last couple of years. In Victoria this year, when the rent controls were lifted, naturally the "C"-series index, which relies almost exclusively on house rent-control, showed a sudden increase. The consumer index has taken into account these things when they were actually taking place, some years ago. For this reason, in my opinion it will be a complete fraud if the "C"-series index is now to be replaced by the new index without bringing it up to date. In other words, if they want to use the new index, well and good but let them go right back to 1939 and bring the basic wage up to date as reflected by the new index for the whole post-war period, not only for the last three months. It is rather like the punter who goes to the races this Saturday and backs a horse at 10 to 1, and when he goes to the bookmaker and tries to collect, the bookmaker says, "I cannot pay you now, I will pay you next Saturday." If he trusts him, he goes along to the races the following Saturday, and that horse is racing again and it wins at even money, and, when the punter goes to collect the winnings from the previous Saturday, the bookmaker tries to pay him at even money, the price the horse started that day rather than the week before. That is analagous with these two indexes. The people who are pressing for the new index have no consideration for the fact that it showed a terrific increase in previous years that the "C"-series index did not. These people who want it are trying to perpetrate the same fraud. They want to put us under this new index without taking into account the history in previous years when we were using the "C"-series index. I have no doubt we will find the Chamber of Commerce, and so on, and all the newspapers pressing for the use of the new index, without any adjustment to cover past years.

Elgin Reid of "The Courier-Mail" said—

"Courts to pick their own index on pay

"CANBERRA.—It will be for courts and States wages tribunals to decide whether the "C"-series index or the new consumer price index will be used in future to determine wage variations.

"But if the Commonwealth Statistician were willing to give advice—which he is not—there is no doubt he would plump for the new consumer price index.

"The Statistics Bureau people are treating the poor old 'C'-series index like a worn-out old shoe."

That is quite true. It is a worn-out old shoe we have been forced to wear when the new index would have got us much better shoes that we ever got. Now we are to be given another wornout shoe.

I think the court in Queensland will have more responsibility than to switch over automatically to the new consumer index. If they are going to be fair they have to say "The consumer index in the last quarter, instead of showing an increase of 3s., showed an increase of only 1s. We have, however, to make an adjustment to take into account that over the last 15 years the "C"-series index has shown an increase of only £7 when the consumer index has shown an increase of £8 or £8 10s." The unions will have to watch this matter. I know they will, because they realise that much propaganda will be directed against them on this matter. Nobody likes to see this continual inflation going on and if the people behind this move try to convert us to the new consumer index and are able to say, as they are saying, "Well, this new index proves the basic wage has been increased too much," they may get the people to fall for it.

(Time expired.)

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) (5.19 p.m.): I should like to reply very briefly to some of the allegations against the railway men and to say a few words on Rockhampton as a whole. The hon. member for Condamine entered this Chamber as a new member with a fairly inflated ego because he defeated Mr. Sparkes, and he apparently thinks that that entitles him to make very rash statements about railway men, and in relation to the 35-hour week, which is our ultimate goal. We believe that sooner or later a 35-hour week will be worked by every Queensland, irrespective of who he may be—whether he be a ringer on a station or a worker in the Public Service. Ultimately a 35-hour week will come into operation in Queensland. It has been spearheaded in New South Wales, where moves have already been made by the Sydney City Council to introduce a 35-hour week for its workers.

It is sheer audacity for the hon. member to come into the Chamber and speak against a 35-hour week, which is the goal of all workers in Queensland. If he were only to read the published statements on mechanisation and automation, he would learn that, with increased productivity, the working hours must be decreased and not increased, but, remembering the old adage which they

can never forget, he and his colleagues believe in exploiting the workers from daylight to dark and paying little in return, and no overtime.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I rise to a point of order. I should like to point out to the hon. member for Rockhampton North that I will have no objection to a 35-hour week when this country is developed, but its economy at the present time cannot afford it.

Mr. Davies: That's no point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member for Maryborough that the Chairman, not a private hon. member, decides whether it is a point of order.

Mr. THACKERAY: The trend in the world today is towards the 35-hour week and if the hon. member for Condamine were to devote a little of his time to reading some of the books in the Library he would know that a 35-hour working week is our ultimate objective; it is out policy, as always with Labour Party policies, which are framed to bring about the best conditions for the State of Queensland.

In reply to the suggestion that railway workers are loafers and that one-third of them should be sacked, let me say that if any move is made to sack one in three, they should start with the tall poppies at the top and sack Mr. Moriarty or the secretary, Mr. Lingard, or the general manager of the Southern Division. If the Minister for Transport endorses the remarks of the hon. member, let him adopt my suggestion and sack one of the three from the top instead of starting with the poor humble workers and work from the bottom up. That is how I feel about it. To think that an hon. member dares to come into the Chamber and honestly advocate taking bread and butter away from the wives and children of the railway workers!

Mr. SULLIVAN: I rise to a point of order. I did not make that statement. It is objectionable to me—quite understandably, coming from the hon. member for Rockhampton North—and I ask him to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the hon. member for Rockhampton North said that the hon. member for Condamine made that statement. He was assuming that that was the interpretation of the remarks of the hon. member for Condamine. When any hon. member directly makes a statement against another hon. member, I shall be quick to take action.

Mr. THACKERAY: Many previous Government speakers have said that the Budget is a very good one from the Government's point of view; but it is not a good Budget from our point of view. The Treasurer has had experience with deficits three times. But my bank manager always says

from the accountancy point of view that he likes to see the balance on the credit side and not on the O/D side. We in Queensland have been on the O/D side for three years and, with the fourth year coming up, it looks like we will be there again.

Let me say something now about the 28-per cent. increase in margins. Everyone has had a "go" at that. It is mentioned about 15 times in the Financial Statement. Earlier we had the margins and the drought but, now that the drought has broken, I suppose we will hear anything but margins. The 28-per cent. margin was formulated in accordance with the desire of the trade-union movement in Queensland and in Australia as a whole to give the workers the fair and just wage they are entitled to against the vested interests and the monopolies that hon. members opposite support.

What do we find in regard to this 28 per cent? The trade-union movement has been forced to fight for a fair wage. Did the public servants or those in the teaching profession have to go to the Industrial Court to get their increases? No, sir! They were handed out on a silver platter. This flowed from the Richardson report through to the judges and the public servants, and they did not have to go to the Industrial Court to get their increases. The Government say to the trade-union movement, "You go to the Industrial Court, but we will give the good boys an increase." I know a man who goes to meetings of the Queensland Teachers' Union regularly, and when inquiries were made about an increase they were told, "Don't embarrass the Government. Wait till after the elections and we will give you the increase." Those words came true. They were given an increase after the elections—a straight-out grant.

Mr. Pizzey: They went to the court.

Mr. THACKERAY: I am not saying they were not entitled to it, but why give one section of the community a 28-per cent. increase without giving justice to all sections of the community? The trade-union movement knows that the workers are entitled to 28 per cent., and the tradesmen and the semi-skilled employees in the railways are not receiving the increases to which they are entitled. Are the department or the Government prepared to meet them in conciliation? No. I suggest that some hon. members opposite should go into the Library and read, not "Power Without Glory" but "Glory Without Power", which was written by an English member of Parliament, on conciliation and increased harmony between employers and employees.

The Minister for Labour and Industry, when speaking about industrial unrest, quoted some figures. The figures in Queensland for the June quarter 1960 were the second highest in the Commonwealth. They showed that 36,537 working days were lost, and of

those the railwaymen lost most—20,564—fighting for the fair and just wage to which they are entitled.

The Leader of the Opposition, when he was Minister for Transport, met the unions in conciliation time and time again. He may not have been able to give them the exact amount for which they asked, but he gave them something without forcing them into the court. This Government say, "We do not believe in conciliation. We believe in arbitration."

During this session the Barristers Act of 1956 Repeal Bill was put through this Chamber, and a committee of which Mr. Connolly, former member for Kurilpa, is a member, was set up to streamline the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. The trade unions will not be able to go to the court and put up a case for their own members. Barristers will appear, and the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt will probably make a nice profit out of it, although I doubt whether anybody will brief him at 100 guineas a day. The big, fat fees paid to barristers will drain the resources of the unions. That is going on now, and we know that the Government are trying to drain the resources of the whole trade-union movement.

When the Deputy Premier talks about Communism I remind him of Senator McCarthy who, like the hon. gentleman, was small in mind, small in stature, and small in outlook. Senator McCarthy was the man who went very close to wrecking the United States of America, on the very issue that the Deputy Premier has raised ever since he has sat on the Government side—the smear of Communism. He has smeared Frank Nolan and other union leaders, men without a taint of Communism about them. If one of his special security police officers saw a man with 20 Rhode Island Red roosters they would accuse him of being a Communist.

The Deputy Premier said that there would be complete harmony between employers and employees, but there is far from complete harmony today because the Government are opposed to the working classes and men on the lower-income bracket receiving their fair and just wage.

The hon. member for Brisbane spoke about the dockers' dispute. The Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Baroona, and others who represent the workers in Queensland, have spoken about employer-employee relationships, but we are no closer to the solution of the problem.

When the Minister for Transport was in Opposition he spoke very viciously about the management of the railways. He attacked the then Minister for Transport and said that the railways must pay. The hon. member for Tablelands said that the railways must pay, and so say most other hon. members on that side. The railway lines were laid

down so that Queensland's primary industries could be developed. A lot of fat Country Party members know that.

Mr. WHARTON: I rise to a point of order. I object to being called fat.

The CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member please repeat the words he objects to?

Mr. WHARTON: I object to the hon. member saying that there are a lot of fat men on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. THACKERAY: The railway system was constructed to develop Queensland. We have the largest system in Australia, and New South Wales has the second largest. I should say that three-quarters of the Country Party members would not be in the Chamber today but for the State's railway system because they would not have been able to get out to the west. It was the Railway Department that opened up the West. We heard the hon. member for Gregory say, "I always use the railways because they are my bread and butter. If I were defeated in Parliament I would be prepared to go back to the railways." They have done a very good job in peace-time and in war-time. Railwaymen rendered valuable service to their country by keeping the supply line to the North open on a single track. Nobody can deny that the railways played their part during the war, but rolling stock suffered because there were insufficient men in the workshops to undertake all the repairs that were necessary.

Many things are said about the railways, and they will continue to be said. It is a pet hobby horse for hon. members opposite; no matter who stands up to speak, he attacks the railways. The Minister for Transport himself said that an independent committee should be set up, but during the last fortnight in this Chamber many Country Party members have directed questions without notice to the Minister seeking starving-stock rebates. Everybody want the railways to pay, to be the sucker for everyone else in Queensland, and yet still balance their budget. How can it be done?

If I was Minister for Transport I would not give one starving-stock rebate to any grazier irrespective of whom he might be unless he fully supported the railways in good times.

When the worker is unemployed he goes to the corner store, and that store assists him during periods of unemployment. When times improve for him he is loyal to the store that tided him over. But how many graziers look at things in that light? I should say very few do. If they go to the corner store and get "tick" for three or four months, as soon as things improve they rush off to the chain stores and "wipe" the grocer on the corner.

The extent to which graziers supported the Queensland railways during the past 12 months is evident from a glance at the

Auditor-General's Report, which shows that for 1957-1958 earnings from the carriage of livestock were £4,208,689; for 1958-1959 they were £4,554,394, and for last year £3,763,120, a drop of almost £750,000 from the previous year. That is indicative of the graziers' support of the railways during the past 12 months, yet during the past fortnight there has been a hue and cry for starving-stock rebates. The railways buy on the open market and have to pay their employees according to the awards of the Industrial Court; they give the best service possible and graziers should loyally support the service when times are good. But they do not.

I suggest that flat freight rates should operate in Queensland; there should be no disparity. A few months ago I saw printed in the "Sydney Morning Herald" a full page railway advertisement, "We will cart anything in New South Wales for 1d. per ton-mile." I have no reason to believe that those rates do not still operate. That is a flat rate throughout the whole State. Why should there be any difference in freight, say, between Rockhampton and Emerald where, for instance there is a difference of 6d. on a bottle between the freight on soft drink and beer; both commodities are of virtually the same bulk and weight and take up similar space in a wagon, so why should there be any disparity in the freight rates? Why should there be any difference in freight on articles, between say, Brisbane and Townsville, or Rockhampton and Townsville? I suggest it is matters of that sort that account for the railways not paying.

The earnings from goods, according to the Auditor-General's Report, show a slight increase this year over the two previous years. I put forward the idea that they would further increase if a door-to-door service was instituted. Goods could be picked up and delivered. It is a service that I think the people would appreciate. We can get the traffic if we go out looking for it. Let the graziers go to the road-transport interests and find out whether they will get the same consideration from them as they get from the railways. Of course they would not.

Railway passenger traffic has decreased in every division. We read in today's "Courier-Mail" that the Lord Mayor, Alderman Groom, has said that within 10 to 15 years no trams will be operating in Brisbane. I think the Treasurer would have read that article.

Mr. Hiley: He did not say that. It was said by an American.

Mr. THACKERAY: The Lord Mayor was commenting on the statement. Whether it was made by the Lord Mayor or an American business man, the statement was that in 10 to 15 years trams will disappear from the streets of Brisbane. I think every hon. member would be of the same opinion. We only have to go to the Valley or the busy intersections of Queen Street to see the traffic tangles caused by trams. We must look to the

future. We should make every effort to recapture passenger traffic for the railways. If the department did not book off station masters and ticket inspectors on week-ends, thus allowing 50 per cent. of the rail passengers to travel for nothing, the Government would be more than compensated for the wages of these men by the extra revenue they would receive. Throughout Queensland we find that those officers are booked off at week-ends. If travellers go into any railway refreshment room from Cairns to Brisbane and ask for sandwiches, they get sandwiches that are turned up at the ends and so damned old that they cannot be eaten. The customers walk out in disgust. The meals in railway refreshment rooms are a disgrace. On the "Sunlander" meal prices have been increased, but the quantity and quality of the meals have decreased. That is what is happening throughout the service.

I pass now to freights and goods carried by the railways. We are losing at Rockhampton alone the cartage of 100 cars a month from Brisbane. Those cars are being taken to Rockhampton by road.

Mr. Sullivan: Why?

Mr. THACKERAY: Because the Government cannot guarantee any garage proprietor in Rockhampton that a car will be delivered within three or four days. They are side-tracked along the line. Recently I flew down to Brisbane with two members of a large motor firm. I asked these two garage proprietors if they were going on holidays and they said, "No, we are going down to pick up two cars, to be delivered in Rockhampton tomorrow." I said, "What is wrong with the railways? Why can't you send them up by rail?" They said, "If they could guarantee we would get them in even seven days, we would send all our cars by rail, but we cannot even get that guarantee. We have buyers waiting in Rockhampton to take delivery of them." You would admit, Mr. Taylor, if you were waiting for a car and had promised your wife that you would have it in the garage on Saturday morning, that you would be disappointed if you could not get it until the following Saturday morning.

Mr. Rae: Tell us the reason.

Mr. THACKERAY: The railways need a complete clean-up from the top down, not from the bottom up. The hon. member for Gregory knows all about rule from the top down—he is a party to it—but we believe in rule from the bottom up. We represent the masses and in our opinion that is the best way. The Railway Department is not advertising enough. Hon. members have only to pick up a Victorian journal and see the information put out by the Railway Department in Victoria. I have here what is called a "News Letter" that gives the whole of the news of the Victorian railways for the month. It is a very comprehensive journal. If hon. members opposite could read and understand railway matters, instead of sheep matters,

they would be interested in this journal, but I know their unfortunate stand. No doubt they are not interested in the transport of cars, or many other things about which they know nothing.

Mr. Duggan: Do not encourage the Government to produce any more journals. They have produced 500 per cent. more than we ever did.

Mr. THACKERAY: What the Leader of the Opposition has said is true. There are more sub-committees and paraphernalia than anything else.

I should like to revert to Rockhampton and look at the local scene. As hon. members know, the Deputy Premier is very good at presenting leis. In case hon. members on the Government side do not know what that means, it is putting a nice little floral decoration around some girl's neck. He is also very good at jiving. He should jive around Rockhampton and we might get some more new industries. He has not been there for a long time. We have had only infrequent visits by the Treasurer with very secret duck-shooting expedition. I could give hon. members a story about that, too, but I do not wish to take up the time of the Chamber.

There have been many statements about Rockhampton and what the Government intend to do there. I listened this morning to the hon. member for Rockhampton South, and I noticed he had his master, Mr. Hinchliffe, up in the gallery. The hon. member was very subdued; he did not say anything on the introduction of new industries, or about Mt. Morgan. He said a lot about Ampol and Port Alma. The hon. member for Rockhampton South should have a very confidential talk with the Premier and ask him whether the Ampol terminal is going to be at Pinkenba or Port Alma. A strong move is afoot to have it at Pinkenba. I believe the Treasurer knows a little about that and I should like to know if he favours Rockhampton or Pinkenba for the oil terminal.

The other day I asked the Premier, who is smiling over there—it is very unusual these days for the Premier to smile because he has been through a pretty rough campaign during the last fortnight, thanks to the Opposition—a question concerning Mt. Morgan and the fertiliser works there. He said negotiations were still in progress. If hon. members read the annual report of Mt. Morgan Ltd., they will see that Mr. Sheil said that negotiations on that subject are finished.

I should like to say something about the establishment of a cement works in Rockhampton. I asked a question on this matter the other day. Peculiarly enough, on the very day I asked the question there was a round-table conference between the Minister for Transport, the Deputy Premier and the "big wigs" of the two cement companies, and they decided there and then that they

must develop a cement works at Rockhampton. These companies have not one ounce of lime in Rockhampton, and they are putting in only clinker. The clinker will be sent from Brisbane to Rockhampton and the only other ingredient that will be added in Rockhampton is gypsum. That is all that the manufacture of cement entails. The move behind this is to kill the other cement company, which has an option on the limestone lease at The Caves. They have everything that is required—all the lime and other necessary material—for 5,000 years.

Moves are being made to keep out this other company. Already moves have been made on the Brisbane Stock Exchange, and through various brokers in the South, to stop this company, in which some very important men were interested. The Deputy Premier said that one of the gentlemen involved made wild statements. I know the man he was referring to, but he is not involved in the company. I sincerely hope that the moves to stop it are not successful because I understand it can manufacture cement for £7 to £8 a ton in Rockhampton, and it is a very good move to have another industry established.

The hon. member for Rockhampton South was on his feet this morning talking about the great potential of Central Queensland, with irrigation, for cattle-fattening. I sincerely hope that he supports the local abattoirs, which the senior party of his Government owes allegiance to. But he has not chosen to come out here and say he supports it, because he is tied to the vested interests of the Vestey empire.

Mr. PILBEAM: I rise to a point of order. I object to that remark. I dealt with that matter in my maiden speech in the Address-in-Reply debate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Rockhampton North has made a remark that is offensive to the hon. member for Rockhampton South and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. THACKERAY: I withdraw it but the main thing is this: he has never ever come out—

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

Mr. THACKERAY: I will accept his apology.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement without adding comments, and to proceed with his speech.

Mr. THACKERAY: In deference to the Chair, Mr. Taylor, I will withdraw it. Anyhow, the people in Rockhampton have their own views on the matter and they shall give judgment when the time is right.

Much has been said about the appointment of Mr. Hansen as development officer for the North and there has been a lot of controversy about whether we in Rockhampton are

getting a fair deal. Frankly, I do not think we are. We heard a great fanfare of trumpets and promises of what we were to be given but we have not yet seen one new industry established there. I suggest that the first step must be the return of an Australian Labour Party Government in Canberra to give Queensland its just rights. That is borne out by the statements made by hon. members of this Parliament attacking their own blood-brothers in the Commonwealth Parliament in Canberra. Out of 18 members in the House of Representatives, 15 should have tombstones at their head reading "Rest in Peace for Queensland." We never hear of them and we never will. They have done nothing for this State. The hon. member for Capricornia, Mr. Pearce, should be top of the list. In Central Queensland we have been given exactly nil in the way of industries.

I have here the unemployment figures for Capricornia, and I hope the Deputy Premier will peruse them. They are the latest released by the Minister for Labour and National Service in Canberra. They show for Rockhampton the number of persons registered for unemployment as: males, 850; females, 186, a total of 1,036. The figures of people receiving unemployment benefit are: males 449; females 72, a total of 521. Those figures take in Gladstone, Rockhampton and surrounding districts.

Mr. Wharton: That is a fairly big area.

Mr. THACKERAY: If the hon. member cared to make the comparison he would find that, in proportion to population, Rockhampton has the highest unemployment figure of any town or city in Queensland. When I said in an interjection that the hon. member was telling an untruth, I meant it, because his figures were not those given by one of his own blood-brothers in Canberra in answer to a question asked by Senator Benn. This Government have been in office for three years.

Mr. Wharton: They have a good record.

Mr. THACKERAY: They have not a good record so far as Rockhampton is concerned. Three years ago the Government promised us a new station in place of the "Rockhampton pergola", or whatever it is called, and the hon. member for Rockhampton South was right behind the cheer squad.

Mr. Pilbeam: We were promised it 43 years ago.

Mr. THACKERAY: Since the hon. member for Rockhampton South has been mayor of Rockhampton, the city has slipped from the second city to the fourth city in Queensland, and under his regime we will soon be the fifth city. It is the same old cry—"Don't do as I do, do as I say." I have often heard it said, "If you attack me, you are a knocker." I certainly hope that when the Minister for Labour and Industry has finished doing this jazz out on Hayman

Island he will jazz down to Rockhampton and provide something concrete for the people. We have heard too much about the great potential of Central Queensland. We have heard all about the Fitzroy Basin, the cotton industry, and the fertiliser industry, and I certainly hope that at least one rooster—the Ampol refinery—comes home to roost. The people of Rockhampton are fed up with all these promises of which nothing ever comes.

I hope that what I have said this afternoon has not offended hon. members opposite, but they must realise that Rockhampton should be the second city of the State, not the fourth city. If this Government cannot do anything about it, they should cross the Chamber and allow a progressive party to take over and enable Queensland to march forward.

Mr. HERBERT (Sherwood) (7.15 p.m.): At the closing session of the last Parliament I made a few comments on the aboriginal problem. I should like to devote part of my time tonight to further consideration of that matter. Most of my previous remarks dealt with the natives in the primitive area in the Gulf. The Department of Native Affairs has three sections to handle, first of all, the Torres Strait Islanders, a distinct group on its own, which I have no intention of discussing tonight. The second group includes the natives in Government settlements near large centres of white population, including the natives in the fringe areas around some of Queensland's country towns. The third group includes the primitive natives of the Gulf a long way away from large groups of white civilisation, and far behind the development required in a white civilisation.

I shall deal first with the group in Government settlements. The Minister for Health and Home Affairs has taken a significant step forward for this group by the closure of Yarrabah, which was previously controlled by the Church of England. That means that today the State controls all the aboriginal settlements in Queensland within easy reach of large centres of population, with the exception of Mona Mona, which is controlled by the Seventh Day Adventist Church. This settlement, on the hinterland behind Cairns, will be closed in the very near future, firstly because the Seventh Day Adventist Church is not very happy about its present operation, and secondly, because the settlement will be under water when Flagg Creek Dam is completed. When Mona Mona is either taken over or shifted, there will be no church missions within easy reach of large centres of population.

That is the first step forward because, although the church missions have done very valuable work in attracting aboriginals into an area and teaching them to change from nomadic to static conditions, they have extreme difficulty in contributing any further, and it needs the resources of the State to take the native population along the further steps towards assimilation. Yarrabah, with a population of 628, was a classic example

of a settlement that had been brought by the church to a stage where the State had to step in to make possible the further advances that are necessary. The church had neither the trained personnel nor the finances to handle a mission station of that size under the conditions at present existing at Yarrabah.

There is only one State station out of reach of civilisation, that is Bamaga, on the extreme tip of Cape York. It is an excellent station but it has the same trouble as all the Gulf stations. They send a man out to work but after a short period he gets homesick and wants to come home to his family. Natives go out as fethlers on the railway or as stockmen on stations, but eventually they come back to the mission settlement. The children remain there and the problem is perpetuated. The church mission stations will gradually disappear and be taken over by State-run settlements.

The transfer of people from places in the Gulf, where there are no opportunities of employment, to coastal areas will become mandatory. At the moment that cannot be done with most of the primitives in the Gulf area because they live in tribal areas, and they would resist violently if it were suggested that they be moved. The very first move has already been taken for Mapoon, run by the Presbyterian Church. It is slightly different from the others in that the natives there are not indigenous; it is not on tribal ground and in the main they are mixed bloods. They have island and mainland people, and quite a few crosses between the three races.

The natives there are a pretty shrewd lot. There are many bush lawyers on this mission settlement of the Presbyterian Church and many problems arise in relation to them in that area. I believe that the co-operation they are now giving to the Department of Native Affairs will result in Mapoon either being taken over by the State or the residents transferred, some to Bamaga and some to Weipa. Mapoon settlement is probably the worst settlement of its type in Queensland and the Presbyterian Church and the State will both be happy to see it cleaned up.

The position is not the fault of the present administration. There have been mistakes in the past, and I do not think the inhabitants there have ever had a real chance to progress. It is only a small place. There are only 250 natives in the area and its closure will be of distinct benefit to the native morale in the area.

Weipa is a station with an altogether different problem. There are only 183 natives there. Some of them have a chance of employment on the bauxite fields. The future of that settlement is still in doubt but, if some of the Mapoon people move into Weipa, we may see Weipa organised so that the employable natives may be transferred from other settlements into the Gulf provided they can overcome their tribal objections to transfer.

These problems in relation to primitive natives do not occur in the aboriginal settlements on the coast, the big ones being Cherbourg, Palm Island, Woorabinda and Yarrabah. At Cherbourg there are 1,200 natives, mostly mixed-bloods, and there is a distinct problem there that will have to be faced by the State soon. A native who is not a full aboriginal blood is treated as a half-caste and, in actual fact, they have often been shown to be near European on the settlement and the position is that a girl on the settlement may go out to work outside. Some of them go out with a great fanfare of trumpets because they have done well scholastically and have obtained clerical positions. It is not long after some of these girls have gone out into the wide world that they are back at Cherbourg and have babies. The children may be of half-caste mothers and white fathers. Those children are frequently only part aboriginal but they are brought up in Cherbourg as aboriginals and, if the baby happens to be a girl the same story may be repeated later on when she, in turn goes outside.

I am not going to suggest a concrete answer to this problem because it involves family ties. Any Parliamentarian who would suggest separating a mother from her child would be asking for serious trouble, but I suggest we will have to give serious consideration to placing these children, and possibly their mothers, somewhere else than on aboriginal mission stations so that the children may grow up in European surroundings.

At Cherbourg itself there is no differentiation. So far as the people there are concerned there is no such thing as an illegitimate child, and that is a good thing. Even in a white community it is often said that there are no illegitimate children—that there are only illegitimate parents—but the fact remains that we will have to prevent these mixed-blooded children, who are predominantly European, from growing up as aboriginals and living under the conditions I have mentioned for the rest of their lives. If the chain is not broken somewhere the position will remain as it is at present. At Cherbourg there are some children who, if living in a European community, would never be thought to be aboriginals.

Mr. Hughes: Are there many?

Mr. HERBERT: There are 1,200 at Cherbourg, approximately 800 of them being castes, and of the 800 a proportion would be near-Europeans. At the present stage they are still accepted. If a girl brought up at the settlement—even if she is only to a small extent aboriginal—leaves it and comes back with a child, the child is treated as an aboriginal even if it has a white father. The problem is getting greater because Cherbourg is expanding.

The same problem exists to a lesser degree at Palm Island, which is an even bigger

settlement with a population of 1,527. Some of the people at both stations are quite competent to leave and look after themselves in normal society but many do not want to take their exemption under the Act because quite frankly they are better off on a State settlement. Any man at Cherbourg who can obtain outside employment can have his full wages and also have the State care for his family and children at Cherbourg. Anyone who applied for exemption from the Act under those circumstances would be merely signing over several pounds a week he receives from the State to look after his children.

The position in Queensland is vastly different from that in any other State except Western Australia. We have nearly 50,000 coloured people in the State, with 10,284 full-bloods all under the department, and 1,080 exempt full-bloods. In other words, virtually every full-blood aboriginal in the State is paid for by the State or looked after by the State. The total of half-bloods under the department is 7,922, and 19,700 are not controlled. It is from that number of not-controlled half-bloods or part-bloods that we get the fringe dwellers in the cities and country towns who now and again get a splash of notoriety in the Press because they have been found camping somewhere under shanty conditions.

The important thing to remember is that many of these people prefer to live in those conditions. I have seen in the Gulf of Carpentaria area new homes built by missions—good homes that anyone would be proud to have in a city such as Brisbane—and the natives either live under them or in trees around them. They will not live in the houses, mainly because of native superstitions about evil spirits and things of that nature. If such people are brought to the city and behave in that way, others who are not used to aboriginal behaviour will immediately think that someone is to blame for the poor conditions under which they live.

The Torres Strait Islanders number 7,250, but, as I mentioned earlier, the problem in regard to them is slightly different.

Many of the aboriginals in settlements are the last remnants of tribes from all over Queensland. In the past no attempt has been made to record their history or customs. As a matter of fact, most of our work has been aimed at stamping out their history, their customs and many of their practices. If we do not move very quickly, many of these records will be lost for all time. I suggest that the Minister acquire the services preferably of an Arts graduate, who can spend 12 months going around Queensland with a tape recorder interviewing these people and recording not only their languages but also their legends, songs and customs, because in years to come the record will be of value to anthropologists and highly important from the viewpoint of tradition and Queensland's history.

At Cherbourg at the moment many stories could be obtained from the old aboriginals about the Cherbourg area and other areas they have come from, but in the very near future those old people will be gone and their customs will be gone with them. The position is not as bad in the Gulf area, because many of the missionaries there have done valuable work in recording native customs and superstitions. In many other parts of the State they will pass with the present generation of old aboriginals. The services of an Arts graduate to undertake a year's post-graduate work in this field with a tape recorder could be obtained for possibly £2,000. It would be £2,000 very well spent in making a record of the aboriginal history of many of the tribes that are in the last stages of dying out.

This problem of the primitive stations in the Gulf has to be handled, and handled very quickly, because not only is the native population in this area increasing but costs are increasing and so far we have found no outlet. It is true that the mission stations, in conjunction with the department, take every child who can possibly be absorbed and give him a secondary education at a church school at Charters Towers or Mt. Isa. However, they take only the extreme cream of the people in the area. This practice does not cater for most of the people, who have no chance of getting past a 4th grade standard of education. They live on the settlement and have large families who will, in turn, live on the settlement and be quite happy to be kept by the State. It is a problem that must be solved.

I extracted these figures of the numbers living in these settlements—

Settlement	Number
Edward River	252
Mitchell River	529
Aurukun	560
Mornington Island	450
Doomadgee	393
Hope Vale	384
Bloomfield	136

For the 450 people on Mornington Island the prospect of employment is almost hopeless. Occasionally there are one or two oil derricks in the area, but the only way they can be employed gainfully is to send them to the mainland. As soon as that is done they quite naturally become homesick because their families stay behind. At Mornington Island are the people who were moved from Bentinck Island and they have now accepted it as their home. When they had the chance to go back to Bentinck Island they returned very quickly to Mornington Island because they had already become addicted to tobacco. However, if they could be moved once I think they could be moved again, and I think they should be moved because the chance of assimilation is extremely difficult in the area. I certainly do not mean that we should uproot everyone on Mornington Island and take him out to Acacia Ridge. I think they

should be brought to a settlement where they have some chance of observing and meeting the white community, and where there would be some prospect of the more intelligent members joining the white community.

Mr. Windsor: Working in the community?

Mr. HERBERT: They would have to work in the community in jobs they are capable of doing. At present they can handle only labouring jobs, but at Mornington Island or Aurukun they have no chance of doing work even of that nature. If they are at Yarrabah they can do work in the Cairns area and if they fall by the wayside, as many of them do at Bessie Point, they have to be taken into the care of the department. We have to consider their children, and the only way they can be cared for is to get them into a European environment so that we will not have this continuing problem of children being brought up on aboriginal settlements and being too old to change when they get to the age that they can leave the settlement.

I realise the Minister has this matter under very careful consideration. I also realise what it is going to cost. It costs us approximately £750,000 now for the Department of Native Affairs. The average aboriginal inhabitant of this State has more money spent on him than the average white inhabitant, yet we still have the "do-gooders" who accuse the State of all sorts of malpractices in relation to our aboriginal population. As a rule the people who make these charges have seen only an occasional aboriginal down at Boyd's Bay or perhaps one somewhere around Murgon, and they base their entire consideration of the Department of Native Affairs on their knowledge of one or two such examples of a race of which we have approximately 50,000 in the State. If these "do-gooders" would see the conditions under which the natives live, and like to live, in the Gulf country, they might change their ideas. The natives there have not learned hygiene and, with their tribal beliefs, it is impossible to teach it to them. It might be all right for a tribal nomad in the open air to live in that way but it certainly is not good for a man settled in one place in a European community. The problem calls for very careful consideration at Cabinet level and for heavy expenditure.

Fortunately we in Queensland have nothing like the recently-publicised Armidale settlement. We can rightly claim that none of our native population lives in such circumstances. The conditions at Armidale are woeful and a reflection on those charged with the responsibility of caring for the natives there.

Mr. Rae: A Labour Government!

Mr. HERBERT: The hon. member for Gregory knows a great deal about aboriginals and, as he says, it is a Labour Government down there.

Mr. Rae: They never looked after them.

Mr. HERBERT: They do not consider them at all. They let them live on the town dump and, until some of them die, there is no protest.

Recently we had Mr. Bryant up from Victoria attempting to tell us how to look after our aboriginal population. All Victoria succeeded in doing was in killing theirs off. That is not happening in Queensland, but the policy of assimilation must be stepped up. It cannot be done in a few years; it will take many generations.

Mr. Dufficy: What is your definition of assimilation?

Mr. HERBERT: I do not mean biological assimilation.

Mr. Dufficy: Inter-marriage?

Mr. HERBERT: That is a very wrong meaning many people read into it. Inter-marriage is not necessary. Assimilation means bringing an aboriginal up to such a standard that he can live in a European community and be accepted by that community as an equal member.

Mr. Lloyd: In other words, integration?

Mr. HERBERT: When he has reached that standard, he is assimilated; but there are two sides to that. The aboriginal must not only be brought up to the standard of the white; the white has to be prepared to accept him. Too many people in the community take one look at a man's colour and decide not to have anything to do with him. Some people in all communities are like that. The main need is to bring the aboriginals of the country up to a standard where they can live in the community. When they reach that standard, they will have been assimilated.

Mr. Dufficy: If he marries into your family and mine.

Mr. HERBERT: We hope he will marry his own kind. Naturally inter-marriage will happen; at the same time, assimilation does not necessarily mean inter-marriage between the two races.

Mr. Dufficy: But it will eventually lead to that.

Mr. HERBERT: It would naturally happen with a group of 50,000 or so in a white population of many millions. Final assimilation biologically will happen, but it certainly is not the intention of the Government to foster inter-marriage between the two races. The departmental intention is to keep the aboriginals as a separate race as far as possible. The figures I have already given for mixed blood and pure blood speak for themselves—10,000-odd full bloods and 26,000 or 27,000 part bloods. They tell the sorry story of what is already happening to the aboriginal population of the State.

Mr. Rae: Possibly four generations of assimilation through marriage and there would be no native problem whatever.

Mr. HERBERT: Yes, in four generations intermarriage would possibly complete the picture, but fortunately in this State we have not reached the stage of directing who shall marry whom. That is something over which we have no control at this stage, and I do not think we should have any control over it.

That raises an interesting point. One finds a part aboriginal woman marrying a white husband and then the white husband demanding to be accepted into the aboriginal settlement as a member of the family and to be carried by the State. That has happened on all the near-city stations, and the superintendents have had a very difficult job in keeping those men out. They think they have a right to be there. Fortunately, a percentage of aboriginal blood is necessary before a person can be admitted to one of those stations, but that is a pointer to the changing conditions that exist on them. Once upon a time men would have given anything to get out of the settlements; now the position is reversed. Yarrabah was recently taken over by the State, and men who got out and were exempted under the Act are now applying to get back. They know that they are being very well looked after in the settlements, and a man who has no ambition and no desire to better himself lives very well on a Government settlement.

The recent incidents involving fringe dwellers in the various cities have always been found to involve people who are not under the care of the State and who cannot be controlled by the State. They are exempt under the Act and, as free citizens, nothing can be done to them. If they want to go and camp under a piece of hessian or an old tank, in this free society they can do it. Very many of them have blood other than aboriginal blood. Some of them have South Sea Island blood, and a percentage have Indian blood, and because they are a little on the dark side, they are immediately taken as aboriginals. Because they have dark skin and are living under poor conditions, it is said to be the State's fault. That is not correct, because even if you give these people good housing they will not accept it. I had particular experience of this with one family that has had a fair amount of publicity recently. In the old days of the Wacol temporary housing camp they lived there, and they were evicted because of their unhygienic habits. They ruined the hut in which they lived. It could not be cleaned, and it had to be destroyed. There has been talk of them living out in Carole Park without a roof over their heads, and there have been demands from certain "do-gooders" in the community that they be provided with a Housing Commission house. If they got into a place such as that, it would be ruined inside 24 hours and the department would have to meet the cost of a new home.

People like that cannot be taken under the care of the Department of Native Affairs

without their consent. If they are exempt under the Act, the department can do nothing about them. If people are of aboriginal blood, they can apply to go back onto a station. Unfortunately, many of them are addicted to drink or other vices and do not feel inclined to accept the supervision of the department, and they continue to live under poor conditions.

There are one or two other stations apart from the Gulf fringe stations, and I should like to refer to Doomadgee in particular. There are 393 natives there, and it is run by the Plymouth Brethren on very strict lines. It is in terrible country—in fact, it has been moved twice because of the poor nature of the country—and I believe that if the natives at Doomadgee could be persuaded to move elsewhere it would be for their own good. The country there has very little chance of supporting a population of 393 natives under any circumstances; anyone who has seen it will agree with that. If hon. members representing that part of the State have been to that area on the Northern Territory border, I am sure they will agree with me that the sooner the people from Doomadgee are persuaded to live elsewhere, the better it will be for them.

These natives in the area around the Gulf in many cases live there because they were members of the weaker tribes who were driven out by the coastal tribes, who were themselves subsequently killed by the white men. Consequently, the native stock out there is not very good. These people would not measure up in any way to the aboriginals from coastal tribes. That is where one of the problems lies, because people who have seen only coastal natives have no idea of the difficulties involved in handling the natives from the Gulf of Carpentaria.

On the subject of aboriginal assimilation, I point out to the Committee that the Australian aboriginal's characteristics are genetically weak. The aboriginal strain can be bred out much quicker than a negro strain, for example. The negro influence will remain for many generations, but the aboriginal strain can be bred out in as few as three generations. Children of a third generation would not be distinguishable from Europeans, and there is no likelihood of the type of throw-back that can often occur in a marriage between two people with negro grandparents or negro ancestors at some other stage in the family tree. With the assimilated native there is virtually no possibility of a native child being produced in succeeding generations, which is one of the problems that has to be faced in other mixed marriages.

Mr. Hughes: Would the department give any help with the shifting of the Plymouth Brethren station?

Mr. HERBERT: This is what has happened at Yarrabah. The church does very good work, but once it has come to the end of its job the department steps in and takes

over the mission as a Government station. Once it does that it can move the people from one Government station to another and, if necessary, close a Government station down. If the Presbyterian Church decides to close Mapoon, or to hand it over to the State under some sort of financial arrangement, the State will be able to move the people to Weipa, Yarrabah or Palm Island. At the present time when natives misbehave and are not accepted by the mission, the State has to take them over. Most of them end up at Palm Island, only to cause a lot of trouble there.

I congratulate the Minister for Health and Home Affairs for his personal interest in the aboriginal problem. He has taken a very deep interest in the matter, and we look forward, when finances permit, to very big steps forward in the problem of native affairs. The assimilation of the Australian native peoples is not a political matter; most responsible members will agree that it is one completely outside the scope of politics.

I wish now to make a few comments on the motion moved by the hon. member for Baroona on 13 October last.

Mr. Lloyd: You can't talk about that. What about the Standing Orders?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member would be out of order.

Mr. HERBERT: I was afraid that was going to happen, but it was worth a try. Unfortunately, over the years the moving of motions on private members' day has developed into purely and simply a method of hon. members airing their political views, and an attempt to get as much propaganda as they can into their speeches. It gives them an extra opportunity to present something to this Chamber without any real consideration of what would happen if the motion was passed. I think that is very much to be regretted.

Mr. Dufficy: Do you think you should still be discussing it in view of the Chairman's ruling?

Mr. HERBERT: I am not discussing it; I am simply discussing the general problem of private members' motions. I am quite within my rights in doing that, I should think.

The CHAIRMAN: Can the hon. member discuss it without referring in any particular to any previous motion?

Mr. HERBERT: I should like to make some remarks on banks and their hire-purchase subsidiaries. That is not related to anything that the hon. member for Baroona said.

It is a clear misconception in debates in this Chamber that a bank manager can refuse to lend money at 6 per cent. and then send a client to the other end of the counter and lend him the money at 12 per cent. The actual fact is that if a person approaches

a bank manager for a loan and the manager has to refuse him—and very often he does under the present restrictions placed on lending by banks—he will, after having to turn down the business, then attempt to assist his client to get the money somewhere else. It very often happens in banking circles that one bank is restricted on lending but another has had a windfall in its accounts which enables it to lend a little more. In those circumstances, the manager will suggest to the client that he cannot accommodate him but he could try, say, the Bank of New South Wales or the National Bank across the road. If that approach is not successful, he may suggest other avenues in which his client can get the assistance he desires.

Some banks own hire-purchase subsidiaries, either wholly or partly, but those funds have no relationship whatever to the funds of the bank proper. The bank as such is unable to lend money but it has a subsidiary that it owns, either wholly or partly. Those hire-purchase companies borrow from outside people and pay upwards of 10 per cent. for the money held by them, and they can lend it under hire-purchase conditions.

The bank manager, when he lends money under a hire-purchase arrangement, is not acting as a bank manager. He is then acting as an agent for a hire-purchase company. It is the same man, but he explains to the client first that the bank cannot help him but the hire-purchase subsidiary can and that subsidiary hire-purchase company pays the bank management a fee for the services of its staff.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. HERBERT: I am not attempting to champion them. As a matter of fact, in my opinion this matter could have been handled a long time ago through capital-issues control. I am now emphasising that it is definitely not that the bank manager refuses to lend at 6 per cent. and then lends the same money at hire-purchase rates.

Mr. Lloyd: An amendment of the 1945 Commonwealth Bank Act allowed banks to go into the field of hire purchase.

Mr. HERBERT: Capital-issues control would be able to limit these hire-purchase companies and divert capital to the basic industries. If a man has a couple of hundred pounds to invest he will put it where he can get the best return and, if he can put it into a subsidiary of a bank where his money is safe, he will put it in at the higher rate of interest. That lessens the money available for Government and semi-Government borrowings. It is not controlled through a State department. It must be controlled through the Federal Government and, unless they bring in these controls, there is very little chance of stopping the present trend of lending to hire-purchase firms. As a matter of fact, if it was stopped there would be very definite reactions in the field of employment, particularly in industries manufacturing luxury lines, such as television sets and similar appliances that are sold almost entirely through hire-purchase companies.

Admittedly in some way this leads to inflation in the community, but we have to consider other factors, two of them being full employment and migration. As at 30 September there were 42,515 unfilled vacancies as against 35,623 persons registered as unemployed. That state of affairs leads to over-award payments and all sorts of problems. For most of the post-war period the number of vacancies has been greater than the number of persons registered for employment. Admittedly, many of those persons could not fill the jobs that are vacant, most of the unemployed persons being unskilled. Full employment must always result in a certain measure of inflation.

Migration, of course, is inflationary in itself. Every migrant who enters the country causes certain inflationary tendencies. For instance, there is an immediate extra demand for consumer goods and capital expenditure to provide work for him. Migrants also add to the demand for housing.

Margins in themselves are inflationary. I do not think for a moment that it is the wrong sort of inflation. I think the margins problem should have been dealt with years ago. The problem is that margins lagged so far behind that when they were picked up in a lump, at a disastrous stage, they tended to increase the rate of inflation.

Mr. Dufficy: Do you think they should pick them up further?

Mr. HERBERT: I leave it to the Industrial Court to decide whether margins should go up any more. That is peculiarly the problem of the court. Before I entered Parliament in 1953, I attended as a representative of my union a conference in Sydney on the margins problem, so I am fairly well acquainted with it and its relation to employees.

The intake of migrants has an effect on housing. If we took notice of some of the speeches of hon. members opposite, we would think that the housing shortage is growing. That, of course, is not the case. These are the figures for the number of dwellings in Queensland, both commenced and completed—

Year	Dwellings Commenced	Dwellings Completed
1955-1956	7,460	7,660
1956-1957	7,888	7,455
1957-1958	7,376	7,716
1958-1959	8,929	8,899
1959-1960	10,324	9,951

1957-1958 was the last year that could be related to the Labour Government. The figures for 1958-1959, the first year that really could be related to the present Government, show the first lift of any consequence in three years, and the figures for 1959-1960 reveal a big lift. It is a commendable effort. Much more money is now being directed into

housing, and to a great extent that can be attributed to the good sense of the Treasurer in introducing very quickly legislation covering co-operative building societies. The money that has been channelled into that facility runs into millions and every penny that has gone in has been put into homes for families in this State. This is capital that used to go south to build homes for co-operative societies down there.

An Opposition Member: How much of that comes from hire purchase?

Mr. HERBERT: Not very much of that money comes from hire-purchase companies.

I have very nearly exhausted my time, and I should like to conclude by congratulating the Treasurer on a very finely presented Budget. The hon. member for Baroona commented on how difficult it was to follow the Budget and the corners the Minister had gone round. He should have had no difficulty in following the Budget. I do not think he could possibly have understood previous Budgets because anyone with average intelligence could follow this one quite easily. The hon. member for Baroona demonstrated that by picking out various figures from it so easily. He seemed to complain that the Minister was not tucking away money in trust funds and various other accounts as was done previously. This Budget presents a very clear picture of the State's finances, and for the first time for many years this Government have presented to the people a Budget that can be understood by anyone with even only the elements of accountancy behind him. We owe a lot to the Treasurer for the excellent job he has done for the State, and it is hoped that he will be long spared to continue the job.

Mr. BAXTER (Hawthorne) (8.2 p.m.): I have listened very closely to the debate, and it has amused me very much how hon. members on the Government side have said, "We, the Government, have eliminated all the temporary housing accommodation." All they had to do was to clean up one small section of temporary housing accommodation that was brought into operation by the Labour Government. The Labour Government had to eliminate the stress placed on people who wanted accommodation for themselves and their families, and they had to supply temporary accommodation. Let me clear this point up immediately for the hon. member who preceded me and the hon. member for Greenslopes who spoke the other night. All that this Government had to do was to close down one temporary Housing Commission area. We in the Australian Labour Party had been closing them down for the previous 10 years. We closed down six or seven temporary Housing Commission areas. Of course, hon. members opposite would have no conception of that. We were doing the right thing for the people of the State. That is sufficient on that subject.

I have listened to many arguments advanced by the Country Party and Liberal Party members of the Government. I was struck by the difference of opinion expressed by the coalition Government members. On the one hand the hon. member for Gregory was ably supported by the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, and on the other hand the hon. member for Gympie was very strong in his condemnation of the attitude of the coalition Government. Those hon. members who come from the Country Party side of the coalition Government placed before this Chamber a line of thought that everybody should be properly cognisant of. It should be accepted as a very important current event and a very important prospective event because it dealt with what was very vital to Queensland. It does not really matter to the hon. member who now represents Somerset who, for a period of time, was the chairman of the Country Party, because he is smug in his complacency in his seat on the Government. He is very complacent and he smiles to think that somebody is going to bring forward an argument against his line of thought.

Mr. Richter: Is that me?

Mr. BAXTER: Yes, you. You are the man on the end of the stick here, because you do not appreciate, as a former president of the Country Party—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must remember he is to address the Chair and not a private hon. member.

Mr. BAXTER: Through you, Mr. Taylor, I say to the hon. member for Somerset that he does not really appreciate the fact. He is tied up in a little controversy that is going on now among those on the Government benches. He just does not realise the truth, regardless of what he said in the Chamber the other day, when he spoke with his tongue in his cheek about the respective projects going on in Queensland. He attempted to prove that the Federal Government were doing the right thing for Queensland. He spoke with two tongues.

Mr. Richter: Tell us what you are talking about.

Mr. Lloyd: He said the Federal Government would not give us enough money.

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. member for Kedron has answered the question asked by the hon. member for Somerset. The other day the hon. member for Somerset did his best to prove that the Federal Government had been doing everything possible for Queensland; but they have not done anything about giving us the extra finance we want. Queensland is the greatest primary-producing State in Australia, and no country member sitting on these benches can deny it.

Mr. Newton: The Liberals wouldn't know.

Mr. BAXTER: I'll pay that, too, because they are on a line of thought that is absolutely detrimental to the Country Party and to the Australian Labour Party, which does everything possible in the best interests of everybody in Queensland. The Liberals are tied up with monopolies and they are tied up with only one particular line of thought—finance and everything connected with it.

Mr. Sullivan: You're the one who is tied up.

Mr. BAXTER: Never fear, I will not get tied up. And I will not try to take away from the people in the railways their livelihood with lies and scandals. We all heard the statements the hon. member for Condamine made on the floor of this Chamber recently. I will meet him half-way along the track. We have something to guide us in Queensland. We have a heritage that is ours to deliver! Food! And if we are not big enough to realise that Queensland depends on the productivity of the primary producer, there is something wrong with every one of us. Even today there are people in Australia—people sitting here in this Chamber—who have the stupidity to express the opinion that it does not really matter what happens to Queensland as long as we concentrate on primary production and supply for Australia two-thirds of the primary production to export to build up overseas credit. Those people are a little off the track. Queensland has been recognised for many years as the greatest primary-producing State in Australia and not one hon. member in the Chamber tonight can deny that. We provide two-thirds of the primary products that go overseas.

Mr. Hiley: You must be out of your mind. Two-thirds?

Mr. BAXTER: I am not out of my mind, no.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: Now there he is, with all his knowledge and everything else, and his sublime characteristics. He might be the greatest actor of all time—I am not interested in that. We know by the records—and I am not quoting my own but the records of the Federal House. Take Solomon's; they are the ones to work on. Incidentally, the hon. member who just interjected has only recently become a member of this Assembly; he should not be beguiled into thinking that the little statistics that may be passed on to him by Government departments mean anything. Those departments in Queensland have been educated by the Country-Liberal Government to give new hon. members the ideas that the Government want them to form. I say to those new hon. members, "Be very careful. Have a look at the facts, and don't let them twist you around their fingers. When you quote figures, quote only the figures of Solomon and you can't go wrong." Solomon was said to be the wisest man of all time.

In this case the Solomon to whom I refer is the Government Statistician, and we must accept his figures.

Mr. Low interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. member who just interjected is more interested in building a little empire for himself on the North Coast than in doing anything for the benefit of Queensland as a whole. He is acting as the mouthpiece of the Treasurer, who is whispering to him now. The hon. members representing the South Coast are not even in the Chamber to hear what is happening in the rest of Queensland. There is no doubt about it. Hon. members opposite are fighting among themselves.

We are now experiencing a drought.

Mr. Sullivan: The drought has broken, according to the hon. member for Rockhampton North.

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. member for Rockhampton North said the drought had broken. I am quite prepared to accept his statement. However, he does not mean anything to me. I have been elected to this Chamber to represent my constituents in the Hawthorne electorate and the people of Queensland as a whole, and I say that the drought has not broken. I know that there is an area in the south-west of Queensland where no rain has fallen, and so does the hon. member for Condamine. The people in that area are the people in whom I am most interested at the moment. I represent the people in Queensland who want this State to be the leading State in Australia, and I believe that our primary production will enable us to become the leading State. Over a period of years Queensland has provided the majority of our primary products for export overseas, and this has helped Australia to build up its overseas credit. Unfortunately for the people of Queensland, the benefit of that has gone largely to New South Wales.

Mr. Low: You are a margarine expert. That is what you are!

Mr. BAXTER: The poor unfortunate member for Cooroora says I support the margarine industry. Only butter is bought in my home. I believe that we should all buy butter and support the Queensland dairying industry.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member again that he is speaking to the Chair, not to another hon. member.

Mr. BAXTER: To the hon. member through you, Mr. Taylor, I say: let him look after the dairy farmers in his area, and forget for a while that peculiar substitute for butter that he was talking about. Let him not be a fool. If he uses the substitute, let me point out to him that we of the Australian Labour Party do not use it because we believe in the best of everything for Queensland. We believe that Queensland

has been built on the backs of the primary producer. But what is happening? There is no way in the world that anybody on the Government benches can deny what I am about to say. We have sent our production overseas but the credit that we have earned for Australia overseas has not come back in the right proportion. We have sent our raw materials overseas but the manufactured product and raw material purchased by the credit we have gained comes back to the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. We have had to spend our money a second time to buy back to Queensland that which we are justly entitled to. There is not a farmer sitting opposite me who can deny that we have to buy back what we produce in the first instance. Because we have to pay twice for our product, Queensland has never been able to move ahead as fast as it should have done. We have all the potential; we have everything that it is possible for a State to have.

Mr. Ewan: We haven't got any oil.

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. member is talking about oil. That is not concerning me at the moment, but it might later. We have to bring about a state of industrial activity in Queensland so that we will be in a position to gain the greatest benefit from what we produce. That is only plain logic. If we could receive the full sale value of what we produce off the land in Queensland, no other State could compete with us. Let us be big enough to do the job. Let us spend; let us do everything we can to assist the people who are doing the job. Over a period of years the Australian Labour Party in government did assist and endeavoured in no small measure to give the people a chance to bring about the industrialisation in Queensland that is necessary if we are to make the most of the State's land production. Until we do that we are not in the race in competition with the big monopolies in the South which are now extending to Queensland in a big way. If hon. members think this State is not advancing, I point out that we are on the eve of greatest advance of all times.

Mr. Sullivan: Of course we are advancing.

Mr. BAXTER: Only because the Government are now reaping the benefit of what was done by the Australian Labour Party Government over many years. People in the South are beginning to realise the potential of Queensland. It has taken them a long time to wake up.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: I will deal with the hon. member for Condamine later. People in the South are now beginning to realise that they have reached the limit of their expansion and they are looking for pastures new. Of course, their eyes are naturally on Queensland.

Mr. Houghton interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. member for Redcliffe would not know. He finished up here because he was mayor of a little municipality. He will find that he cannot do what he likes here. Queensland, not the small Redcliffe peninsula, is controlled from here. He would not know what he is talking about. I suppose we all have to go through our "A.B.C." period; he is just in the "A" period now.

As I say, Queensland is on the eve of great expansion. Large monopolies are shifting in from the South and absorbing Queensland companies in a manner that is reminiscent of what has happened in America, where monopolies have control of virtually every avenue of production. Hon. members on the Government side of the Chamber will undoubtedly be expanding these views in the not-far-distant future. If something is not done very soon to stop these southern and overseas monopolies from taking control of the destiny of this country, we will be in a very bad way. (Government laughter.) It is all very well for hon. members opposite to laugh. This is a very serious matter. Queenslanders are finding it difficult now—and will find it impossible in the near future—to gain any benefit from their own productivity.

Hon. members will probably know the position that exists in South Australia. The very centre of Adelaide is controlled by people resident in England. Their earnings are in the vicinity of £272,000 a year, all of which is going out of the country.

Fifty-two per cent. of the shares in Mt. Isa Limited are held by American capitalists. We are reconstructing the railway line to Mt. Isa, and I do not disagree with that. However, I do disagree with all the benefit from the building of such developmental undertakings going out of Queensland. Anything that is earned in Queensland should be used to expand the State so that, after a period of time, we in Queensland can enjoy some benefit from it.

Mr. Ewan: Do you reckon we should have more woollen mills?

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. member comes in again. He is really and truly a jack-in-the-box. He proves by his interjections that the people of his electorate are not getting good representation. He recently admitted to me that I knew as much about the cattle country as he did. He was out there for a short time only, but I was there for many years. The Government are playing ducks and drakes on these matters. I listened to the speech of the hon. member for Gregory about the whole of Western Queensland, from the Gulf of Carpentaria to the border.

Mr. Ewan: He is only a young fellow.

Mr. BAXTER: He may be a young fellow, but he has his two feet on the ground. He knows what he is talking about and he gives concrete facts. He dealt with the Channel

Country, an area that will prove of great benefit to Queensland, and Australia, in the years to come. It is our job to force, or entice, the Federal Government to regard the development of the Channel Country as a national undertaking for the benefit of Australia. There is no way in the world that that area of the State, under correct administration, would not prove to be of immense benefit.

Mr. Sullivan: Don't you think this Government are doing something about it?

Mr. BAXTER: At the moment I am not discussing whether or not this Government are doing something about it, but I am anxious to know whether they have the "nous" or the ability to make the Federal Government do something about it. It cannot be denied that during the last decade the Commonwealth Government have done nothing to assist Queensland. Hon. members opposite cannot kid themselves that the opposite is the case. It is useless for them to try to tell me that the Federal Government have done anything for Queensland.

Mr. Low interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: Do not try to tell me that. The hon. member could not even kid his shadow with that statement. I advise him to jump off that bandwagon. What we have to do is to unite, and I make an appeal to Government members.

Mr. Herbert: Unity tickets.

Mr. BAXTER: How small is the mind of the intellectual who represents Sherwood! How small and contemptible can he be, when we on this side of the Chamber are trying to get honest members of the Government to join with us in this effort. I should say the Country Party members are the honest men of the Government. We are trying to do something for the benefit of Queensland. We are asking them to unite with us in an effort to get the Federal Government to make money available for development of the Channel Country so that we can reap the benefit of the tremendous productivity of that area, to which we are justly entitled.

I am pleased to see that the hon. member for Gregory has now entered the Chamber. He is one of the most forthright exponents of this view. He had the courage to rise and advance it, although probably he was rapped over the knuckles by his own party. I do not think that a rap on the knuckles would stop the hon. member. He has been through the Channel Country, and he knows it and realises its potential. To my knowledge the Australian Labour Party has been advocating this since 1950. Mr. Casey came up here in his aeroplane, and all he did while flying his aeroplane and looking down on the countryside was to hit an unfortunate eagle that got such a shock when it realised a Federal Minister was visiting Queensland that it could not get out of the way. He had

trouble in the vicinity of Longreach. If he had been travelling by motor-car it is probable that he would have hit a lot of pedestrians who were shocked by Federal people coming to Queensland to look at what we in Queensland have been trying to prove for many years we are entitled to.

Mr. Sullivan: There were no roads for him to drive on.

Mr. Rae: Your party was not interested in those days.

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. member for Gregory, who made such a glowing speech in the Chamber and spoke so very strongly about improving the Channel Country, has now come forward and said the Australian Labour Party Government did not have any interest in the matter. Surely he would not be so stupid as to try to push down our throats that we of the A.L.P. did not try to do something for the Channel Country. If the hon. member for Condamine, who ran second to him by the slightest fraction of a second, would only listen! He made a statement that we did not do anything to assist the Channel Country. I am not talking about today. I am referring to a few years back—but not so very long ago. There are four roads involved in the Channel Country that I could mention were built by the Labour Party: Yaraka-Windorah-Currawilla, 215 miles; Quilpie-Eromanga-Coonaberry Creek, 125 miles; Cunnamulla-Barrington, 75 miles; Cunnamulla-Thargomindah, 123 miles, and these are but a few. Where were these people while we were trying to do something for the Channel Country and got no assistance from the Federal Government who were having a Rip Van Winkle sleep? There is no doubt that they are completely off the beam. We have them in shining armour, on steeds of white and waving swords and everything else, saying, "Let us do something for the Channel Country."

Mr. Low: You are not on television tonight.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not have to be on television tonight. I suppose if I was photogenic I would get more money on television than I do here. I do not worry about television. It is my job to prove on the records that hon. members sitting on the Government benches are telling lies to the people of Queensland.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member was in the Chamber a few days ago when I told the Committee that the words "liar" and "lies" are unparliamentary expressions and should not be used.

Mr. BAXTER: I realise that, Mr. Taylor. I was simply being a plain, ordinary, Australian human being. Now I will be one of the cultured Australians and I will say their expressions are really most untruthful. Let

us get down to taintacks again. The other day we listened very keenly here to some hon. members—

Mr. Ewan: Keenly?

Mr. BAXTER: Oh yes, some of the hon. member's colleagues, too.

Mr. Wharton: Shame!

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. member for Burnett the other day, if he had only expounded his views a little more, was on very sound ground on the subject of transport. Queensland is really and truly—there is no way it can be denied; I do not care what anyone says—a primary-producing State. We produce all the primary requisites that give us the greatest percentage of profit for Australia overseas, and we need transport. I listened to the hon. member for Burnett expound the view that in the Channel Country we must have roads to bring the stock forward and to bring it down by road. Did he really go into the actual costs of building roads? Did he consider what the upkeep of those roads would be on the particular soil in that area, where it is moving and getting away all the time, where we would be uphill trying to hold particular sections?

In the backblocks, in the Channel Country, the most important thing—to use the expression of the hon. member for Gympie, the "lifestream of Queensland"—is water.

Mr. Rae: I thought we were talking about the transport system.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BAXTER: Isn't it marvellous, Mr. Taylor, how they cannot wait one minute, these impetuous little boys who come in overnight?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BAXTER: Yes, Mr. Taylor, we are dealing now with trying to soothe down the impetuous little boys.

Water is our greatest asset. Having got the water, how are we to get the stock out? The best way to get them out is to build more railways, harder and stronger throughout.

The hon. member for Gregory is not in agreement with me. He was, but now he is not because I have the audacity, as an Opposition member, to query a man who moved a private member's motion from the Government side of the Chamber. According to him, it is much cheaper to build roads and tie the railways up. Let us build up our northern, central and southern railway sections and link them up, and let us do the right thing. If we are to do something for Australia, let us break up our big land holdings and send the people out there to populate the areas. Let us put them there on an equitable allocation of land. Let us give them the where-withal so that they may quickly get the productivity from their land to the ports and

markets. That is what we have to do, and we have to build railways and build them up, and build them right through longitudinally and latitudinally because we have not got the transportation from the motorised side at this stage to accommodate any scheme that would be big enough to control and handle that which should come forward from the Channel Country and other areas of the West, and all Australia would be beholden to the Channel Country as it came forward in its productivity.

We must modernise our transport system so that the cattle can be brought out quickly, and the best way of doing that is improving our railways. Costs have risen far above the figure of £30,000,000 that was mentioned some years ago, but it would still be cheaper to build railways to shift stock from breeding areas to fattening areas than it would be to build roads. No matter what hon. members on the Government benches tell you, Mr. Taylor, you could not keep a road used by heavy transports in trafficable condition as cheaply as you could maintain a railway line.

Mr. Herbert: Are you the Minister for Transport?

Mr. BAXTER: No, I am not the Minister for Transport. I wish I were the Minister for Labour and Industry, in charge of the police.

I repeat that today we must look to the railways if we are to solve our problems. The cry is that the railways do not pay. If hon. members opposite read "Hansard" of 1860 to 1866 they would find that many sections of our present railway system are now paying although they were brought into operation against the better judgment of a Government of a similar political colour to that now occupying the Treasury benches.

Mr. Ewan: Which ones?

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. member for Roma is waiving his hand about like a little boy who wants to go out.

Mr. Ewan: Do you think we should have meatworks in country areas?

Mr. BAXTER: I think so. That is the first time the hon. member for Roma has made a sensible interjection. As we bring our beef to the Channel Country and fatten it there, I think we should kill it there. The beef would then reach the market in a much better condition than it does at present. I am prepared to agree with the hon. member for Roma on that point. He has a knowledge of cattle, and so have I, and I think there is much merit in his suggestion. Steak from cattle killed in the country is much more palatable than steak from cattle that have been buffeted in a train, held at Cannon Hill for many days and then killed, following which it is placed in cold storage

before being put on the market. We talk about the Channel Country and the hon. member for Cooroora talks about—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member is repeating himself.

Mr. BAXTER: I am not repeating myself in any manner, shape or form. I am dealing with the Channel Country and the various motions dealt with in the Chamber. In the debate on the Financial Statement I am justly entitled to speak on the Channel Country, or any other subject. At the moment I am speaking about water. This is not repetition because I am answering a question. I do not want to step on your corns, Mr. Taylor—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the hon. member that it is part of the duty of the Chair to draw it to the attention of hon. members when it is considered that they are repeating expressions in their speeches. I have just tried to warn the hon. member that he is verging on the stage of tedious repetition. I now ask him to proceed with his speech.

Mr. BAXTER: Well, Mr. Taylor, you have ruled tedious repetition—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have not ruled tedious repetition. Would the hon. member please be seated! I have warned the hon. member that he is verging on tedious repetition. Now, will he please proceed?

Mr. BAXTER: Thank you, Mr. Taylor.

I should like to place on record a very interesting piece of information. Therefore I crave the indulgence of the Committee while I refer to something that happened 20 or 25 years ago. I refer to a scheme that was put forward by Dr. Bradfield to get water to the Channel Country. How many of us are asking today why effect was not given to that scheme?

Mr. Low interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: I have insufficient time to answer the interjection of the hon. member for Cooroora, but I shall answer it very effectively if he wants me to.

I should like to place on record that more than 20 years ago Queensland tried to institute a £30,000,000 scheme to bring water to the Channel Country. What would have happened had we got water to the Channel Country then? On three occasions it would have saved us vast sums of money—a loss of £320,000 to the graziers, followed by another £257,000, followed by today's losses, which I could not estimate. Had water been made available in that area we would not be experiencing the present stock losses and Australia probably would have been saved £400,000 or £500,000. But nothing was done, only because the Government of the day were not big enough.

Government Members: A Labour Government.

Mr. BAXTER: I am not saying "State Government". I am merely saying "the Government" because it is a national matter. If we can get assistance on a national basis, that is what we want; we have to get it from there. I would not care if we were indebted for years to come, because we have to be big. We are on the eve of great progress in Queensland. Let us build today so that tomorrow we shall be able to say, "We have overcome the scourge of drought that afflicts us every three, four, five or six years."

Let us overcome that. We have the wherewithal. Let us stick together and do everything in our power, as Queenslanders, to feed the nation. In that way we will best serve the interests of Queensland today and lay the foundation for the future. We are sitting on top of the world in Queensland if we use the wherewithal and know how we have and, to use the Australian vernacular, have the "guts" to do it. We can go ahead and lay a foundation that will make Queensland the future predominating State of Australia.

I suggest to hon. members opposite that parochialism should be laid aside and that all parties in this Chamber should present a united front in fighting for Queensland's needs today and to protect her future. Queensland is the doorway to the Asiatic nations to the north who, in most cases, are clamouring for food. It is only by doing everything we possibly can to encourage our primary production and our secondary industries that we can supply these needs and hold what we have. It is only in that manner that Queensland can show the southern States, which have been bleeding her for many years, that we can hold our own. But to do that we must present a united front.

Mr. Sullivan: Would you agree that, with this Government, you have a chance of achieving those things?

Mr. BAXTER: I can remember Mr. Casey coming up here within the last 10 years and saying that Queensland had the greatest potential of all the Australian States, and that he would see that we got the money to undertake the Tully Falls and Burdekin River projects. But what happened? He went back and the man exalted by the hon. member for Somerset the other day, Sir Arthur Fadden, soon convinced him that he must not assist Queensland. Queensland naturally got no assistance from that quarter for those projects, or the other big project at that time, Peak Downs. If hon. members in this Chamber were big enough to get together and present a united front in the South, we might get somewhere. That is my personal view. I believe in Queensland and I think it has the greatest potential of any State in Australia. We should do everything we possibly can to develop it. The only way that can be done is to take action on a non-party basis. Let us get together and fight for what we want—water in the back blocks, water in the Channel Country, and improved transport facilities. I prefer railway transport, although the hon. member for Gregory

prefers road transport. We must control the destiny of Queensland and protect our heritage. I believe in Queensland and shall strive to make it the best State of the Commonwealth.

We recently read lengthy articles in the Press on increased railway fares and freights. I asked the Minister for Transport if the department intended to increase freights and fares, and in reply he said, "It will not happen." Within a week of his reply fares and freight were increased. I do not know how the increases were arrived at. Perhaps the Treasurer or the Minister for Transport will be able to supply the information, but many anomalies have been created. They will be understood very well by the hon. member for Cooroora, who was at one time an officer in the department. I checked on the new and old rates for various tickets from Morningside, and these are the figures—

Tickets	Old Rate		New Rate		Increase		Increase per cent.
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	
Weekly	0	5 9	0	8 0	0	2 3	39
Monthly	1	4 0	1	16 0	0	12 0	50
Quarterly	3	8 6	5	2 9	1	14 3	50
Half-yearly	6	6 0	9	9 6	3	3 6	49
Yearly	11	10 6	17	5 9	5	15 3	50

Mr. Ewan: Are these wages?

Mr. BAXTER: These are the amounts the unfortunate worker has to pay to travel to work each day. The hon. member for Roma would not know anything about the railways or the unfortunate people who go to work every morning. Anyone who has worked in a ticket office would realise that it takes just as long to sell a man a weekly ticket as it does to sell him a yearly ticket, but in the case of the man who buys a yearly ticket no further work has to be performed for a year by the ticket-seller.

Instead of giving the yearly-ticket buyer a concession to which he is justly entitled, the department has unduly burdened him. That proves how haywire the committee was that brought forward these railway freight and fare increases. There is an increase of 39 per cent for a weekly ticket, and the yearly ticket and other tickets are increased by 50 per cent. That is quite out of line.

I have not the time to go fully into this subject of the rising freights and fares. If it is true that the Government had a committee going into the whys and wherefores of freights and fares, I would say none of its members knew the first thing about them. Their conception is quite wrong on the subject. Somewhere in the very near future, we will have to look at our system of freights and fares. I say that as a man who had a lot of experience of the railway.

(Time expired.)

Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) (9.2 p.m.): It has been the privilege of members of the Committee to listen to the Budget debate and it may be said that, irrespective of what we may think of the Budget as presented by the Treasurer, there is one aspect of it

we must agree with, that is the frankness of the Treasurer in his presentation of Queensland's financial position. One must be somewhat concerned at the different story that has been told in the 1960-1961 Budget compared with the story told in previous Budgets by the same person. At least the Treasurer in this Budget has admitted that we are approaching a position of financial stringency. He has referred in many stages of the Budget to the difficulties the Government are facing up to and will have to face up to in the next year, and in the next three years, on finance for Queensland.

I believe that all the difficulties that are arising and have arisen are due to the inefficiency and maladministration of the present Government. So much so that the Treasurer has to admit that things are not just as they should be.

Mr. Ewan: How are things in Mackay?

Mr. GRAHAM: Mackay, like the rest of Queensland, is feeling the effects of a Tory Government. For three years of the Nicklin-Morris Government we have had accumulated deficits of over £5,000,000.

Mr. Hiley: Are you sure of that?

Mr. GRAHAM: In 1957-1958 we had a deficit of £1,514,000.

Mr. Hiley: You say we had accumulated deficits. Are you sure of that?

Mr. GRAHAM: What would the Treasurer say? Let me put it this way: We had a deficit of £1,514,000 in 1957-1958, a deficit of £1,190,000 in 1958-1959, a deficit of £164,000 last year and the Treasurer is budgeting for a probable deficit of £250,000 this year. That proves, in the Treasurer's own words, that because of the Government's financial policy we have an empty Treasury. Things are not as they should be. I know revenue is coming in; we all know that. The Treasurer by his own admission has said that we have to cut our coat according to our cloth, and therefore we have some restrictions on governmental activities.

It could be said that the main reason for reaching the present position is that in their first term of office the Government followed a policy of appeasement. They deliberately set out to avoid offending anybody. Any demands that were made were granted. The Government's sole intention was to consolidate their position—to ingratiate themselves—so that when they went before the public in 1960 they could point to what they had done and say, "We have given increases to the various departments of the Public Service—the police, the railways, and so on." As the Premier said in his policy speech at Maroochydore, it was the intention of the Government to keep Queensland in top gear. That was a very worthy endeavour, but how long did it take them to change from top gear into low? Today, while they

would like to convince the public that they are in top gear, the Treasurer's own admission proves beyond question that they are right down into low gear. In all probability, before the year is out they will be in extra low.

The Treasurer has advanced many reasons for the present state of affairs. On page 2 of the Financial Statement he gave the railway deficit as one. Further on in the Financial Statement he blamed the margins.

Unless the Government take some more definite action to try to balance the Budget, Queensland will suffer from a period of depression. I do not believe it will be as serious as the 1929-1932 depression, but, unless they are able to control the inflationary spiral, there will be a recession. The State Government have just as much responsibility in that as the Commonwealth Government. Let me quote the following extract from the "Insurance News & Views" about the responsibility of Governments on inflation:—

"Governments have a responsibility to give real leadership in combating inflation.

"They have a duty to restrain their spending to what the economy can afford. If taxes are too high the incentive to produce is seriously weakened, and so is the ability to save.

"The Government must follow wise economic policies. The Government sets the tempo of activity through the economy.

"It must constantly guard against the temptation to try to make the economy do more than we have resources to do it with.

"It must match its plans to the resources available.

"If the economy is moving dangerously fast, it must not hesitate to apply the brakes.

"The people want and will support statesmanlike action."

That sets out what this Government have failed to do. They have not attempted to control the economy, thanks to their unrealistic planning and their unwise approach to problems. So they are forced, at a time when there is relative prosperity in the country—

Mr. Hiley: Your argument is that we should spend less?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, if need be. We cannot carry on showing a deficit year after year. The Treasurer, as a man with extensive business practice as a company director, must know the ultimate result of showing a loss year after year. It cannot be said that what happens to companies cannot be applied to Governments. It must be admitted that, unless the Government at some time or another control their finances to prevent deficits, they must eventually have an effect on the economy of the country. Will the Treasurer admit that effect?

Mr. Hiley: I do not admit your premises.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does the Treasurer contend that the Government can carry on with unwise spending and irresponsible governing—in other words, doing what they have been doing in the last three years—and still maintain a sound economy? If that is so, why has the Treasurer admitted that it will be necessary for him to restrict certain governmental activities during the next 12 months? He has admitted that there is a likelihood that he will have to withdraw subsidies from local authorities and that, because of the position in the Railway Department, there will have to be a thorough investigation of the administration of the railways. As the hon. member for Hawthorne said, railway freights and fares have been increased, and I think that proves my point that the Government eventually will have to draw a tighter rein on their spending or the State will be in an even worse position than it is today.

If the Government could get Queensland into top gear, as the Premier said in his policy speech, we would support them. But unless they adopt a different approach to the economic problems confronting Queensland, things will get worse. The Premier said—

“We have brought a new outlook, a fresh approach to the Government of Queensland, and its problems of development, and under the stimulus, incentive, and drive we have imparted the State's progress in all its phases has been accelerated to top gear.”

I have been through the Treasurer's Financial Statement. I may be a bit dull, but I cannot find anything in it that is in conformity with that Statement by the Premier about development and stimulus and incentive.

What is the position in Queensland today? I know that the Minister for Labour and Industry has denied on numerous occasions that the number of unemployed is very great, but there are many ways of refuting that statement. During his three years in office, the Treasurer has been able to spend excessively because he was able to draw on reserve funds that were built up by Labour before this Government took office in 1957. He has admitted that those funds have all been used, and I think he admitted last year that the Government had made full use of them so that he could go to the Federal Government and convince them that it was necessary to accept Queensland as an agent State. That did not eventuate.

Again I refer to the Financial Statement in which the Treasurer said that, despite all the efforts and approaches that he, in collaboration with the Premier, has made to the Federal Government, Queensland has received very little, if any, more than it received when Labour Governments were in office. There have been increases in certain funds, but I do not think for one moment

that those increases were nearly as great as the Treasurer expected to receive. It can be accepted that the Nicklin-Morris Government firmly believing that, because of their political affiliations, “Uncle Bob” would open up the purse strings and pour money into Queensland and let them go on their merry way. But the Federal Government did not do that, and Queensland was forced to rely on its own resources and the reserve funds built up by Labour Governments. Today the Treasurer is forced to admit that unless the Federal Government do something more than they have done in the past, the development of Queensland will be hindered.

We know that Queensland has wonderful potential. Every member of this Assembly and every member of Federal Parliament admits that. Great efforts have been made by authorities in North Queensland to encourage the Governments of the day, both State and Federal, to do something for North Queensland, but, unfortunately, it must be admitted that as yet they have not met with much success. In Mackay, Bowen, Townsville and Cairns organisations have been formed with the object of trying to stimulate interest in northern development. It has been proposed that a standing committee be established to develop the North. Delegates from almost every chamber of commerce in North Queensland met in Bowen to develop a plan. On 5 October the Premier said that a seven-point master plan for the development of North Queensland, including suggestions for improvements for the cattle industry's future, had been placed before him. The hon. member for Bowen spoke about the conference that was held at Bowen. A committee was appointed in Mackay to investigate the formation of district organisations to promote the development of the Mackay district.

Concern is being felt and expressed by the people of North Queensland about the future of that great part of the State. Not only do I mention Mackay, Cairns, Townsville and Bowen; I refer also to the following newspaper article concerning Rockhampton—

“State and Federal Parliamentarians next week will make a united appeal for relief work to ease the most serious unemployment problem Central Queensland has faced since the depression.”

The article goes on—

“Points made and unanimously agreed to at today's talks were:

Moves are necessary to meet immediate unemployment;

Rockhampton and Gladstone are facing another two or three years of serious seasonal unemployment;

Long-range plans to cover much of the State are necessary to develop the beef industry and ultimately overcome the problem;

Employment for women displaced from meatworks is an urgent problem.”

I am concerned about the part that the Government are going to play. I have said before that it is easy to say things; it is easy to get on the public platform, as the Premier did at the meeting in Townsville, and lay down a seven-point master plan. My concern is how long it will be before these plans are implemented. Is it possible for the Government to implement any of the items mentioned in these plans? It calls for a much greater effort, not only by the Government. I do not think the Government of the day are capable of implementing industrial development in North Queensland, or in any other part of Queensland.

Mr. Windsor: Why not?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Government do not believe in the creation of industry. They are a private-enterprise Government.

Mr. Ewan: And we are not ashamed of it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Maybe not, but if North Queensland is depending on private enterprise for development it will be another 100 years before it has sufficient industrial development to keep its people in full employment.

Mr. Ewan: How can you say that in view of the experiments you people conducted in socialisation? They set us back 20 years.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the hon. member's opinion. He knows that what he says is not true.

Mr. Ewan: But it is true.

Mr. GRAHAM: Even if it were true, even if State enterprises failed 1,000 times, is that any justification to say that the Government of the day must take no further action?

The hon. member for Rockhampton South is in the Chamber. He knows as well as I that unless private enterprise is forced to undertake the responsibility for the establishment of industry, nothing will be done. Hon. members opposite would not want the Government to do it, but if we are depending on private enterprise to do it we will wait for another hundred years. We have heard recently about the proposal to establish a cement works in Rockhampton; we have for some years heard the proposal to establish a fertiliser works at Mt. Morgan, but how far have those things advanced?

Mr. Hughes: Why do you fellows always "knock"?

Mr. GRAHAM: I know the hon. member comes from the metropolitan area. It is no wonder that the hon. member for Townsville South is always castigating this Government—and he has castigated previous Governments—on their inactivity in North Queensland's development.

Mr. Hughes: Do you think we will get an oil refinery?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is possible that we might, but how many people would an oil

refinery employ? If an oil refinery is to be established at Port Alma, or at Bowen or Mackay, establish it by all means. But the establishment of an oil refinery in the North is in the same category as the establishment of a fertiliser works at Rockhampton or Mt. Morgan, or a cement works at Rockhampton, or an iron and steel works at Bowen, or a sugar refinery at Mackay. Those are things a Government cannot establish and, unless some move is made either to encourage private enterprise to do it or to find ways and means of forcing private enterprise to do it, North Queensland will not be developed as it should be.

Mr. Hughes: The Federal Government should give some financial aid in that direction.

Mr. GRAHAM: Why don't they? I have been in this Parliament for 18 years and have not seen one industry established in North Queensland, with the exception of the cement works, and, more recently, the copper refinery, in Townsville.

Mr. Davies: And the coke works at Bowen.

Mr. GRAHAM: The coke works at Bowen were operating long before I came to Parliament. Not one major industry has been established in North Queensland, and I do not think there ever will be unless some move is made by the Federal Government to force industry to go there.

Mr. Hughes: Give them the incentive.

Mr. GRAHAM: What incentive do they want? The North Australian Cement Company were assisted to establish a works in Townsville. I do not know whether assistance was given also to establish the copper works there. But if the industries assisted by the Government are excepted, as I say, in my 18 years in this Parliament not one major industry has been established in North Queensland to my knowledge.

A move was recently made to have established a cement works at Rockhampton, but it was quickly scotched by the Queensland Cement and Lime Co. and the North Australian Cement Company, which control the whole of the cement production in Queensland. I make the prediction that they will not establish a cement works in Rockhampton. I suggest they will establish there a crushing plant only to add the gypsum to the clinker; the actual cement will be manufactured at Darra.

Mr. Pilbeam: I think I will have the pleasure of proving you wrong.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps I may be wrong.

What is required in North Queensland first of all, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Burdekin the other day, is the establishment of an iron and steel works. As I mentioned in a previous debate, not one sheet of corrugated iron is manufactured in Queensland simply because its manufacture is controlled by Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. in New South Wales.

There are five basic essentials for development in North Queensland, the first being first-class access roads. The cattle industry cannot be developed fully unless such roads are provided. Industry must be given the incentive of reasonable freight rates. Contract rates are now available in the North to rail users. We want cheap power. And I shall have something more to say on that point and the fact that the M.R.E.B. is not doing much to encourage industry by imposing its present excessive rates. Water conservation must be undertaken. The work was started in North Queensland by Labour Governments. The present Government have endeavoured to take all the honour and glory for that work and so steal the limelight, but water-conservation schemes in North Queensland were originally planned and started by Labour Governments. The present Government have carried on the work because they realise the need for extensive water conservation to take advantage of the agricultural potential of North Queensland. I believe it is in the North that Queensland's future lies. Unless we develop the coastal districts from Rockhampton through to Mossman and the far inland areas, we will be falling down on our job.

While speaking of industries in North Queensland, may I ask what has happened about the Comalco undertaking, the great scheme introduced by the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity for the development of the vast Weipa bauxite deposits? By way of interjection in an earlier debate I said, "Weipa is a dead duck." Queensland is not going to reap the benefit of that wonderful mineral deposit. The company that has taken over from Comalco will develop the field to some extent, but owing to the method of development Queensland will not get the benefit it should get from the scheme. I believe it is the intention of the company that has taken over from Comalco—

Mr. Hiley: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is Comalco still operating?

Mr. Hiley: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: The same company as originally started it?

Mr. Hiley: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then another company has taken over the Bell Bay plant at Hobart.

Mr. Hiley: You are mixed up. Comalco has lost one partner, but has got another.

Mr. GRAHAM: In Weipa?

Mr. Hiley: No, the whole show.

Mr. GRAHAM: It has had three and a-half years to do something, but has done nothing, and I do not think it ever intends to do anything. Unless the Government order the Comalco company to honour its agreement, the position will not change.

A Government Member: Time will prove you wrong.

Mr. GRAHAM: I hope it will. Owing to the lack of industry in North Queensland, we are losing population at a fairly heavy rate.

Mr. Hiley: What about Townsville?

Mr. GRAHAM: Townsville is not the whole of North Queensland.

Mr. Solomon, the Government Statistician, said that 2,200 people have left country districts. He said—

"Queensland's permanent rural population of 191,588 at March 31 fell by 2,200. Of the total rural figures at that date 106,430 were males, but the drop from the 1959 figure included 1,234 males and 966 females."

The population of Mackay has increased, but not to the same extent as that of the metropolitan area. The trend is the same in cities throughout Queensland, with concentration of population in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hiley: You realise that mechanisation has swept through rural industries and in some countries the rural population has fallen to half the former figure?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am quite aware of the reason. However, that does not excuse the Government. Merely because mechanisation or automation has caused fewer men to be engaged in industry, the Government cannot sit down and allow people to be thrown on the scrap heap. Because of long periods of unemployment they have to leave country centres and come to the metropolitan area. If this Government, or any other Government, desire to see Queensland developed, more especially the North, they have to do something to keep people in the country areas. They have to find ways and means of keeping people in reasonable employment so that they will be content to live in Mackay or Townsville or the rural areas referred to by Mr. Solomon.

If we look at the population figures for towns in Western Queensland such as Emerald, Longreach and Barcaldine, and out through the North-West, we find that with the exception of Mt. Isa there has been a decrease in population in every area because of the lack of development and the lack of opportunity for parents to place their children in employment. I know that many families have left Mackay, which is considered to be prosperous, to come to Brisbane. That is due to the lack of opportunity for parents and their families during the long periods of unemployment. A couple of days ago in Mackay I was speaking to the social services registrar and he said that when he went there eight years ago the ratio of employment in Mackay was eight months in work and four months out of work. He said that is completely reversed now. The average man engaged in the sugar industry

in Mackay is four months in work and eight months out of work. That is why people are concerned. It is not only my concern. Every responsible body from Rockhampton to Cairns is concerned with the lack of development in North Queensland, and unless this Government and the Federal Government make a joint effort to establish some form of industry in North Queensland we will not make the progress we are entitled to.

Let us ponder on what the Deputy Premier said during his election campaign. This is what he said—

"Private enterprise will invest millions in Queensland within three months of a Liberal-Country Government taking office. Large companies have indicated this.

"Six companies of world repute will invest in Queensland if a Liberal-Country Government is returned."

That was in 1957. I should like to ask the Treasurer if he knows which six companies have invested in Queensland.

The Deputy Premier continued—

"These organisations speak not in thousands, nor in hundreds of thousands, but millions . . . Investing would not be confined to Brisbane, but the money would be spent in Central, Northern and North-western Queensland."

Can the Treasurer tell us of any company that has invested millions, not only in Brisbane but in other parts of Queensland?

Mr. Hiley: I will tell you one. During the period that we will spend £30,000,000 rebuilding the Mt. Isa railway line, Mt. Isa Mines Ltd. will carry out a capital improvement of £40,000,000. That is one company.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will accept that, but that is not what the Deputy Premier said. He said, "Private enterprise will invest millions in Queensland." Then he went on and said that these organisations would invest not hundreds, not thousands, but millions not only in Brisbane, but in North Queensland.

I ask any member of the Government if he can name one company that has invested £1,000,000 in Queensland, more especially outside the metropolitan area. We find that employment in Queensland has not improved. In fact, it is worse than it was in 1957. In spite of the talk by the present Government the employment in Queensland has not increased. We still have the largest percentage of unemployed in Mackay. We have it every year.

The Deputy Premier said in his policy speech that money would be invested in Central Queensland and North Queensland, while the Premier said in his 1957 policy speech that the Government's policy was one of decentralisation.

Let us see what happened about the number of factories between 1957 and 1959, the

last occasion when statistics were taken out. The number of factories in Townsville, Mackay, Bundaberg, Cairns, Maryborough and Rockhampton decreased by 87. In the same period the number of employees in those factories decreased by 995.

Mr. Windsor: I could take you to an area in Pinkenba and show you 56 factories.

Mr. GRAHAM: There may be 56 factories at Pinkenba, but, as I said earlier, my concern is for the North—from Rockhampton north—where we are facing, and have faced over the last three or four years and maybe longer, seasonal unemployment, which is having a very detrimental effect on the State's economy.

Listen to what the hon. member for Rockhampton South is reported as saying—

"Central Queensland was getting a murderously raw deal from both State and Federal Governments. Alderman Pilbeam, whose claim was backed by Rockhampton business and commercial leaders, said that only two State Departments—Health and Education—were giving Rockhampton a fair go."

I could quote dozens of statements that have been made by politicians past and present, and by leaders of the commercial world in North Queensland, in proof of my contention. But the people of the North want more than words from this Government.

On Tuesday, 2 September, the Minister for Labour and National Service in the Federal House, Mr. McMahon, said that nearly 5,000 people were registered as unemployed in five of Queensland's principal centres. I suppose there are many more than five centres in Queensland with unemployed but he quoted only five. If there were only 1,000 unemployed in Queensland, it should concern the Government; but apparently this Government are not concerned about unemployment.

Mr. Windsor: Don't say that.

Mr. GRAHAM: As the hon. member for Ithaca interjects, "Don't say that," let him tell us what the Government are doing to try to overcome the unemployment problem in North Queensland.

Mr. Ramsden: They have done more in their term of office than your Government did.

Mr. GRAHAM: If that is so, why has this position developed? The present position gives the lie direct to the hon. member's assertion. If his Government have done more than any other Government, why does this position now exist? I could point to scores of newspaper cuttings with headlines like—"Proposed Standing Committee," "Premier Presents Master Plan," and "Development Committee Proposed." I could quote a thousand.

Mr. Wharton: You don't believe all you read in the Press, do you?

Mr. GRAHAM: How can we fail to believe it when we know that what we read in the Press is actual fact? Would I have reason to disbelieve the delegates from the Mackay Chamber of Commerce, or Alderman Pilbeam, or all the delegates who attended the conference in North Queensland? What reason have I to disbelieve them in their earnest desire to do something for North Queensland? Does the hon. member suggest they are all a lot of ratbags and irresponsibles? Remember, most of the people on chambers of commerce do not support the Labour Party; they are commercial people who normally support either the Liberal Party or the Country Party, yet the hon. member says, "Don't believe them." Maybe he does not want to believe them, but I do believe them because I am one among many who are vitally concerned about the future of the part of North Queensland that I have the pleasure to represent.

I appeal to the Government to do more than just talk. If they have to create industries, let them have the courage to do it, because private enterprise is too slow to undertake this responsibility.

Mr. Hughes: 5,000 new companies have been registered since 1957.

Mr. GRAHAM: It all depends on what one calls a company. One can register a company with two names. The hon. member for Kurilpa and I could register and call ourselves a type of company. If 5,000 new companies have been registered in Queensland, the State has not received much benefit from them. If it had, we would be in a much better financial position today.

Local authorities are endeavouring to attract new industries to their areas, and they are prepared to give whatever assistance they can in establishing them. The Mackay City Council is no exception, and to enable it to provide an area suitable for the establishment of industries, it approached the Director of Local Government and asked that an area of 400 acres within the Pioneer shire should be acquired and included in the municipality of Mackay. Contrary to expectations, the application was refused, and the Mackay City Council is very disappointed. An approach was made to the Minister for Public Works and Local Government. His attitude has surprised the Mackay City Council. It decided to ask the Minister to—

"Advise the City Council of objections raised by the Pioneer Shire Council.

"Advise how he reconciles his decision to refuse this application with the approval of extension of boundaries of other cities, in particular, Townsville, Ipswich, and Toowoomba."

If we look at the figures relating to those three cities, we find that since this Government took office Ipswich has increased its area from 12½ to 44½ square miles, and the

approval of the Director of Local Government and the Minister was given to that extension. Since 1949 Toowoomba has increased its area to 44 square miles, the last increase being 25 square miles. Townsville has increased its area to 135 square miles and since 1950 an area of 69 square miles has been added. Mackay is just as important as those cities, but because it is restricted to 7½ square miles it cannot provide for the industrial expansion that it is hoped will take place there.

It may be that the position in Mackay is being decided on a political basis. Because the Minister for Public Works and Local Government is the member for Whitsunday and the Pioneer shire is in the Whitsunday electorate, I believe that for purely political reasons he has refused to grant this area to the Mackay City Council. His outlook is not in keeping with a progressive mind. One could understand his attitude, perhaps, if he had made some investigation of the council's request for this extra land, but he just "wiped" them off. He is reported as saying—

"With the Mackay City Council making an application to take over an area and the Pioneer Shire Council, on the other hand, objecting he did not consider the position was sufficiently acute to make such an important decision when the two local authorities concerned were so directly opposed to each other."

He did not even have the courtesy to investigate the proposal; he merely rejected it on the basis of the opposition by the Pioneer Shire Council. The Mackay City Council has very good grounds for complaining that he refused to grant this area of land to Mackay because, unless the industrial development of any city is planned, considerable confusion and interference can result later. It could be said that the Pioneer Shire Council does not have a town plan, whereas the Mackay City Council has a properly prepared plan providing for the development of the city on a proper basis.

Mr. Wharton: Do you think they put up a good enough case?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think that they put up an exceptionally good case for the acquisition of the land, but my personal belief is that it was rejected, not because of any lack of merit in the request but merely because the Minister, the hon. member for Whitsunday, was quite prepared to over-ride the merit of the Mackay City Council's request in view of his association with the Pioneer shire.

Let me say something now about hospital spending. Again, this is a matter that has not brought any credit to the Government. It was rather humorous to read an article in "Truth" on 23 October referring to the Government's intention to cut back on hospital spending and that a direction had been given about economy being practised in Queensland

hospitals, when on the same day in another article on the same page of "The Courier-Mail" I read—

"The Treasurer, Mr. Hiley, will introduce an amendment to land tax legislation to bring relief to property owners affected by the recent re-valuation on the Gold Coast."

I wonder why the Government are prepared to hand out relief to the owners of Gold Coast land when in the same breath they are prepared to take the bread and butter out of the mouths of the nurses.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose it would be a very small help. The Minister said that he would allow the nurses to have two (2) helpings of pudding. How very generous of him! If this were confined to the Brisbane General Hospital I could understand it, but it is the policy of the Government throughout the State. I have an article here about what they did in Bundaberg. I understand that all hospital boards have been advised to economise—to "cut the painter" as hard as they can. The nursing staff eventually will have to bring their own lunches. It is different from what the Government had to say in 1957—

"The Liberal Party will retain the free hospital system. We know it is a cherished possession of the people of this State and any interference would be fatal to any political party."

In their three years of office there has been serious interference by the Government with the free-hospitalisation scheme. I admit that up to a point the Government have allowed free hospitalisation to continue but I know what they have done to the scheme. I went through the Mackay District Hospital last Saturday. Without any exaggeration I can say that I have never seen fewer patients there.

Government Members: A good thing.

Mr. GRAHAM: I know that it is a good thing. And it is a very good thing for the Government, because by their policy they have forced people to get away from the public hospital system and to patronise private hospitals. That is why we see so much activity in Queensland today in the building of private hospitals. I believe it is because of the paltry policy that has been followed by this Government that that change has occurred.

Let us see what Dr. Noble has said about the privileges enjoyed by the country people of Queensland for many years.

Mr. Wharton: Where are these private hospitals you speak about?

Mr. GRAHAM: A big one is being erected in Mackay.

Mr. Windsor: There are not so many in the Government hospitals because people are healthy.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member may be right, but let us see what the Minister for Health and Home Affairs has said on the issue of passes for specialist treatment. This privilege was enjoyed by country people for many years under Labour administration but, because the Government want to economise they are now depriving them of it. The Minister says that unless the medical superintendent of the local hospital can give a certificate, a pass is not to be issued.

I know of my own knowledge that many people in Mackay have come to Brisbane at their own expense because of the Minister's scheme, and they can ill-afford the expense of coming. Because they desired specialist treatment, which, incidentally, was thought necessary by their private doctors—they have had to obtain it at their own expense.

Mr. Hughes: Are you suggesting that a pass issued on a private doctor's certificate is not acceptable?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am suggesting that this Government have stated in no uncertain terms that no private doctor has a right to say that any person should come to Brisbane for specialist treatment. This Government are not prepared to accept a certificate from a private practitioner. I will read what the Minister said in his letter—

"Before any expense is incurred in regard to the issue of travel passes to patients in country centres to seek medical treatment in Brisbane or at a base hospital the medical superintendent of the hospital in the centre concerned should be given the opportunity of determining whether or not the patient can be given the necessary treatment."

There are no specialists in Mackay so, when specialist treatment is needed it must be obtained in Rockhampton, Townsville, or Brisbane. Most patients feel that Brisbane offers the greatest opportunity for such treatment, so they come here.

I say that the denying to country people of that privilege, which they have enjoyed for so many years is an indictment on this Government. No medical practitioner in Mackay or elsewhere would advise patients that they needed specialist treatment or recommend their coming to Brisbane to get it if he did not believe they needed it. As I say, it is a privilege that has been enjoyed for many years by people in the country, and I think the Government could well afford the expense involved. The taking away of that privilege has not done them credit.

In my speech in the Address-in-Reply debate I intended to deal with the Mackay abattoir but I left my run too late; so I take this opportunity to say something on that subject. It might be interesting to hon. members to know that the Mackay Abattoir Board was formed in 1950 or 1951, and for 10 years it has procrastinated, dilly-dallied, fooled around and had its coat—tails pulled

by listening to politicians, especially the hon. member for Mirani, so that after 10 years Mackay is still waiting for its abattoir.

I asked this question of the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry on 25 August—

“In view of the public concern that exists in Mackay over the failure of the Mackay Abattoir Board to fulfil its purpose, will he give consideration to abolition of the present Board and the immediate creation of a new Board?”

The Minister replied, I suppose, to protect some of his friends on the Board—

“It is known that the Mackay District Abattoir Board has been conducting negotiations concerning the erection of a District Abattoir at Mackay. The Board has recently been requested to advise as to the result of these negotiations. I believe that any delay in the establishment of a District Abattoir has been caused only by the desire of the Mackay District Abattoir Board to do what it considers is in the best interests, both of the Mackay consumers, and of the development of the cattle industry in the Mackay and adjoining areas.”

I do not agree. Mackay has not an abattoir primarily because the board is inefficient and lacks the courage to undertake the job it was appointed to do. It allows anyone to pull its coat-tails. Twelve months ago it endeavoured to hand over direction of the abattoir to Amagraz Ltd., simply because it did not want to have anything to do with the scheme. Continual requests have been made for an abattoir, and articles have appeared in the Mackay local newspaper about the inactivity of the board. On 22 February the health officer, Dr. Chenoweth, complained in these words—

“This scheme was initiated by this council for health reasons 13 years ago and we still have no assurance that it is likely to be brought about within the next 10 years.”

A leading article appeared in “The Daily Mercury” in Mackay on the lack of a central killing works. Further articles appeared on 14 July on “The Old Abattoir Scheme”, and also on 3 August, when it was said that the scheme had come to a dead end. I could refer to a dozen newspaper articles on the subject. I understand that a deputation waited on the Minister recently and that there is now some prospect of establishing a local killing works. I understand the Minister insisted on action by the board. It has the finance, the authority and the mandate for this work. Mackay is entitled to a central killing works and to have its meat killed under hygienic conditions. The demand for meat in Mackay is very heavy. In the year 1958-1959, 16,000 cattle were slaughtered, their value being in the vicinity of £518,000. In addition, 6,000 calves, 17,000 sheep and 4,000 pigs were slaughtered, the total value of killings in the various slaughterhouses throughout Mackay being over £1,000,000.

I cannot understand why the Mackay Abattoir Board has fooled about for 13 years instead of undertaking the work it was created for. I look forward to greater activity in the matter of the Mackay abattoirs.

Under normal circumstances the Government will occupy the Treasury benches for another two years. Unless they do more than they have done, the economic position of Queensland will deteriorate seriously. I do not think the Government are facing up to their financial responsibilities. Unless they are prepared to cut their cloth according to their measure, the economy will be detrimentally affected, unemployment will be created and greater dissension will be caused among those who are dependent for their welfare on the activity of the Government.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (9.59 p.m.): I am amazed that the Treasurer should introduce such a moribund Budget, one that is so lacking in spirit and has no spark of enthusiasm. It is rather significant that Government members who have seen fit to speak to it have not been able to point to one part of it that is of outstanding interest or that will be of benefit to Queensland. In effect it is a Budget that endeavours to make provision for this State to struggle on with a Government that cannot handle the situation. It provides for a Budget deficit and makes no provision for any new or essential works. In effect it is merely a Budget that hopes to pay the salaries of the servants of Queensland so that they may carry on in the way they have carried on in the past. In other words, the Government have presented a Budget that does not meet the situation. One can liken the Government to a flywheel that was impelled with some force prior to 1957, but since then has had no further force to impel it and has slowly but surely run down.

Mr. Pilbeam: It is a record Budget.

Mr. BENNETT: Only a fool would make that interjection.

Mr. PILBEAM: I rise to a point of order. I ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark. I am not a fool.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member for South Brisbane would acknowledge that calling an hon. member a fool is an unfair remark, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. BENNETT: Out of deference to you, Mr. Taylor, I withdraw the remark. I should say that no man with ordinary intelligence or understanding of the Budget would make an unsatisfactory comment of that nature. It would come only from a man who is accustomed to dealing with municipal shire budgets, which do not deal with real money or real projects.

When I entered Parliament I expected that I would be presented with a Budget of some magnitude. When I say “magnitude”, I do

not refer merely to £ s. d. I refer to magnitude in its ambition to develop the prosperity of the State. I find that this Budget is a very barren one. We can look only to the reasons for this Government's failure to measure up to the confidence that the people of Queensland placed in them by electing them to office—in fairly unnatural circumstances, admittedly.

Mr. Tooth: They tell me you have made this speech before.

Mr. Hughes: And in the council chamber.

Mr. BENNETT: It is rather unwise for the hon. member for Kurilpa to interject because I shall be dealing with certain comments he made on the Budget. If he wishes to provoke me any further I will make some further comments about his activities in the council chamber and elsewhere during his term of public life. If he wishes to make these interjections, it is up to him. I hope he does not display the tender susceptibilities of his aldermanic colleague from Rockhampton South and get up and squeal for mercy when he puts his head out.

I have not made comments along these lines before, because when dealing with council budgets I have been well aware that they are presented by the "Pygmy Liberal Party" in Brisbane. No coalition Government exists in the Brisbane City Council. It is controlled purely by the junior colleagues of the Liberal Party in the State Parliament, and they make a mess of the city council budget from year to year.

In this case the reason for the failure is obviously because the State since 1957 has been controlled by a coalition Government. Political scientists and University professors will tell us that no coalition Government has ever been a success in any democratic country in the world. They are simply governments of convenience.

Mr. Tooth: What about the war governments in Great Britain?

Mr. BENNETT: We can deal with the war governments in Great Britain and we can say that even those governments were not successful. However, they did manage to control the country for a limited period during a time when they had to be closely knit because of the hostile attitude of the immediate surrounding countries. They were prepared to sink their differences in the interests of their own personal safety. Even then political scientists will say that they were not successful, and the great Churchill himself can be quoted as saying that no coalition Government in Great Britain during the war was ever really successful and that he longed for the day when he would have a Cabinet composed of one political party, which would have clear thinking on any particular subject.

Mr. Tooth: When did Churchill say that? I don't think he said it.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sure he said it. I read it in the Library today to convince myself that my memory, from my political science days, is still quite accurate. Should the hon. member for Ashgrove care to improve his knowledge of political science, he will find a wealth of literature in the Parliamentary Library that will confirm the submissions I have made.

This Government remind me of a kitten treading on a hot stove. They are uncertain of their future and they do not feel quite confident about their legislation. Not only is this Budget a failure, but I have studied their record during the past three years and I have observed their activities during my presence here in Parliament. They are only trifling with legislation. The legislation that has been introduced has been comparatively fiddling.

Any Government that has a clear-cut policy, whether it be Liberal or Labour, whether it be Conservative or Radical, is a Government best suited to the people—a Government that has the courage and the adventure to put its ideas into operation by venturesome legislation.

This Government are too fearful to adopt any forthright legislation, even to implement their own policies. They are not game. They do not understand. They have no confidence in their own policy. During the last three years, and certainly since the last election, they have not introduced any legislation of real magnitude or moment.

Mr. Davies: They are incapable, being a minority Government.

Mr. BENNETT: They are incapable, being a minority Government, because a coalition has never been successful. It is perfectly obvious that the Country Party here in Government resents its dependence on the Liberal Party, and the Liberal Party in turn resents the fact that it has to act as a cats-paw to the Country-Liberal Government. That is why no real legislation can be introduced. Their attitude and their results have been worsened by the internal dissension within both parties and the animosity of the parties.

Mr. Tooth: Don't believe that.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member does not have to believe me; he has only to believe the hon. member for Fassifern. A party that has clear-cut ideas and that has a conviction in its own policy is prepared to put that policy into operation by practical and appropriate legislation. From what I can see from the business sheet and from what I have observed during my term here, the Government this year do not intend to introduce any legislation of importance. It may be argued that they are going to amend the Companies Acts. That is no credit to them; that is no production of their own ideas or thoughts as a coalition Government. In the ultimate amendment of the Companies Acts they merely intend to follow slavishly the Companies Acts of other States in the Commonwealth. No doubt the measure.

when introduced in its ultimate amended form, will make absolute provision and clear-cut opportunity for the big southern companies to come to Queensland and take over further successful businesses here. Because of the handicap of coalition, the Queensland Government will have to toe the line with their Liberal-Country Party colleagues in the southern States. From the time of Plato history has proved, even in Canada and Great Britain, that coalition government cannot be successful. I quote from Keith's "British Cabinet System"—

"Coalition government is essentially anomalous in Britain, because it contradicts the fundamental principle that a Cabinet represents a party united in principle."

So much for the war-time Cabinets!

The results of the two-party meetings are symptomatic of coalition government. It is obvious that the Country Party meets in one section, the Liberal Party in another section, and that they then have a common party meeting. The results of that common meeting are always and definitely a series of compromises. We get no pure Liberal Party legislation and no pure Country Party legislation; we get only a series of compromises.

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: As the hon. member for Baroona said, the Deputy Premier suffered the abject ignominy of receiving into his bosom and into his arms the man who told him in effect that he was the worst Deputy Premier Queensland had ever had. He had to sit with that man in a joint party meeting and say to him, "Hail fellow, well met! We are glad to have you back." He had to do that because the Premier told him, "We, as a Country Party Government, have to preserve our supremacy." The parties were told, "Whether you like it or not, we have to have Muller in here to keep our numbers up."

It is perfectly obvious that all chance of any rapid and clear-cut decisions are gone. Mark you, Mr. Taylor, as a man who ardently supports our democratic form of Government, I fully expect to see, and am anxious to see, legislation introduced in keeping with the policy of the party in power. We go to the people and offer them our respective policies, and when the people make their decision they are entitled to have those policies implemented. After a Government have been in office three years, the people can then determine whether their confidence has been misplaced or otherwise. Unfortunately, the people of Queensland will never see the policy that has been put to them at the last two elections given statutory effect because of the compromises that are arrived at between these two jelly-boned parties. There is no chance of clear-cut decisions being reached. The meetings at which this legislation is discussed degenerate into attempts by each party to placate the other. It has been

proved in all democratic countries that coalition government cannot be successful. I can quote from Dawson—

Mr. Ewan: Is that Gerry Dawson?

Mr. BENNETT: This man was a lecturer at the Toronto University and well versed in the laws of Parliamentary Government in Canada and other parts of the world. Intellectually speaking, I suppose he would not deign to waste his time on the hon. member for Roma. He said—

"The normal Canadian Cabinet is therefore composed entirely of members owing allegiance to the same political party. This homogeneity creates a much more efficient executive body, gives more consistent leadership, and discourages internal dissention."

This Government are not prepared to follow the system of democratic, clear, homogeneous government. We have indecision; we have compromise; we have party animosity. We have the Deputy Premier struggling to maintain his status in the party. In order to retain numerical strength, Country Party members must on occasions adopt an attitude of intimidation towards their junior colleagues.

We have heard it claimed that Queensland at the moment is in a very prosperous condition. It has been argued that there is no unemployment. That argument is very false. It has also been argued that many new industries have been established in Queensland, but the Deputy Premier never seems to quote a list of them. He realises that they refer in the main to petrol service stations—which largely have been no acquisition to Queensland. He fails to recognise that industries such as the Pelaco shirt manufacturing industry, which operated successfully in Queensland for many years, producing a substantial and well-regarded article, have had to go out of existence because of the industrial conditions forced upon them by the present Government.

Mr. Hughes: Half a dozen employees at Sandgate.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member had better be careful or I shall have something to say!

I am perfectly satisfied that for the first time for many years in the history of Queensland, the population drifted considerably during the last financial year. That drift occurred notwithstanding the fact that there has been an annual influx of migrants.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: The remarks of hon. members opposite remind me of a young professor who taught psychology and philosophy at a prominent University. If I may crave the indulgence of the Committee I shall quote the professor. He said, "There are three kinds of lies—lies, damn lies and statistics. the latter's use being to draw an imaginary straight line from a doubtful hypothesis to

a foregone conclusion." I cannot quite say into which one of those three categories Mr. Morris's contention would fall.

I have already made it clear in my speech in the Address-in-Reply debate that during their term the Government have considerably worsened employer-employee relationship. A most important aspect of the State's development in relation to undertakings, their economical application and financial arrangements, is the preservation of a good employer-employee relationship.

Mr. Ewan: You should get out of Brisbane.

Mr. BENNETT: I have got out of Brisbane. I have been out to Charleville. I spent a week in Roma doing certain work where I was able to make observations. In the course of my particular type of work for a week in Roma last year, and in the course of my stay at Charleville, I formed the conviction that the graziers in those districts were intent on getting rid of the hon. member for Fassifern. I agree entirely with him that the graziers largely control the Government. I know that from what I was told during my visits to those districts.

I would say that during the last few years this Government have adopted a provocative and inflammatory attitude towards their employees and have caused erstwhile good employers in private industry to adopt a similar attitude, much to the disadvantage of Queensland, and, no doubt, much to the sorrow of Government members. I know that they are anxious to get rid of the Minister for Labour and Industry, but he is a bit too smart for them in political chicanery.

The worker is entitled not only to the needs of life but also to the joys of life. We heard the Treasurer make some very hard and certainly inflammatory remarks about the attitude that had been adopted by members of the Ship Painters and Dockers' Union. One particular case, typical of other cases, was that of a man who was in hospital and who could not obtain social service benefits for his wife and family because the Treasury Department claimed that he was on strike. He died, leaving his wife in very poor circumstances. Subsequently, through the intervention of the Commonwealth Industrial Commissioner, after many months' delay during which these unfortunate members and their wives had to live on the smell of an oily rag because they were not allowed to work under the award handed down by the Federal Arbitration Court the Court upheld the conditions that the men had enjoyed for at least 20 years. The Court upheld their contention almost in its entirety, certainly so far as wages were concerned.

At the time the struggle was on—and it was an unnecessary strike and did a terrific amount of harm to the economy of this State and certainly inflamed the employer-employee relationships, leaving

sore scars on the hearts of many workers—the Treasurer said that, so far as he was concerned, the docks could rot. But the court said that the men's attitude was entirely correct and that they were entitled to what they had demanded. The court did not expressly use that term but the decision meant that the Government had been virtually taking lock-out action against the men. Yet the Government did nothing for Murphy's widow; they did nothing for the starving wives and children of these men who were kept out of employment for 14 weeks. All they did was put the men back to work because they had to go back to work, and then loaded them with 14 to 16 hours a day to catch up on the work that had not been done on their responsibility. That is certainly a damning indictment of this Government. The Commonwealth Industrial Commissioner, even before he heard the case, observed that the employers—meaning the Government—were more to blame than the men were.

Inflation affects the worker more than it does any other section of the community because of his limited resources and his fixed and limited income. He has not the elasticity of financial reserves necessary to meet sharp increases in living costs from time to time. I am not stating my own personal opinion when I say that the worker is entitled to fight and strike for wage justice. That is not a revolutionary statement; it is a fundamental principle of British law. We have only to quote from H. Vester and A. H. Gardner on "Trade Union Law and Practice" to see clear authority for that. The worker is entitled to strike in the fight for wage justice and to improve his working conditions. At common law under our British form of Justice a strike is not in itself unlawful.

Mr. Ramsden: You went on strike a few weeks ago.

Mr. BENNETT: No, I was locked out, but I proved the lockout was unlawful, and the council had to pay my full costs. Furthermore, the Lord Mayor suffered the indignity of having to admit in open debate in the city council that in view of the learned decision of the Chief Justice, he had to concede that all my previous suspensions also had been unlawful. There again the ones who suffered the greatest injustice through those suspensions were the electors whose rights I was unable to protect owing to my enforced terms of absence.

Mr. Smith: Did not the Chief Justice say that he wished he had time to consider the authorities cited to him, but that, as the decision had to be given immediately, if justice was to be done he had no alternative but to allow the application?

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Windsor, a very junior barrister, has much to learn. He may be in capacity the equal

of the Q.C. for Mount Gravatt, but I still say he has a tremendous amount to learn. He was not in court and I presume he did not read the judgment. I ask him to indicate if he has read the judgment.

Mr. Smith: You answer my question first.

Mr. BENNETT: I am tempted to use the word "fool" again, but in deference to you, Mr. Taylor, I shall not do so. Any lawyer who starts to talk about a judgment without first reading it is an embryo in law.

At common law a voluntary strike for a lawful purpose, such as raising wages or compelling an employer to fulfil an engagement is not in itself unlawful. I might point out here that in England, a Tory Government, with an attitude similar to the shell-back attitude the present Government adopt towards their employees, in 1920 passed the Emergency Powers Act of 1920. It authorised the Government of England to declare a state of emergency, but even in giving themselves that power the Tory Government made provision for a state of emergency simply to ensure a continuance of social service. The 1920 Act, however, maintained the right to strike and peaceably persuade others to strike. That right was preserved. The emergency powers under the Transport Facilities Act are being abused by this Government.

Dr. Delamothe: How about Chifley's putting the Army into the coal mines?

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member's colleagues in the Federal House can ask that question. I remind the hon. member for Bowen that this is a Committee of the State Parliament and that I am talking about State Parliamentarians. I could indict the hon. member's Federal colleagues, as they were indicted by the hon. member for Gregory, but I am referring to the position in Queensland.

I make the observation that inflation affects the worker more than any other section of the community because of his limited resources. The average worker in periods of inflation and in times of wage injustice is not able to go to the bank or write out an extra cheque and is not able to go to a friend and borrow £10 or £20. He is not able to get anything on credit, because when one worker is on credit usually many hundreds of them are on credit. What other avenue has he for the purpose of enforcing his rights? He is entitled to the joys of life.

This attitude of the present Government comes at a time when profit margins are high. We can pick up "The Courier-Mail" every morning and see that all these large companies are paying tremendous dividends. They are paying millions to buy into the feast that is going on, yet we are told that the 28-per cent. margin is the ruination of this Government. I entertain a fair degree of respect for the Treasurer's ability, and I certainly respect his professional capacity as an accountant. But I was singularly amazed

to find that repeatedly throughout his Budget speech he could hark to nothing but the 28-per cent. margins increase. He claimed and argued that the worker should get no increase, but he did not refer to the enormous profits that the companies are making. He said nothing about the take-over peregrinations and operations of the bloated companies from the South; he did nothing to curtail the hire-purchase system, or the operations of the motor companies, the private banks and the insurance companies. He did not mention their activities, but to use a colloquialism, he had to get "stuck into" the poor unfortunate workers who, he must agree, are finding it very difficult to meet their commitments.

The workers are becoming more and more angry as their financial hardship increases. This Government should be abundantly aware that discontent is rife, and if they wish to keep this "ship of Queensland" launched in a safe sea, it is high time that they paid respect to the demands of the workers as well as to the dictates of the large companies, the oil companies, the banks and the graziers. During recent times several committees or commissions have been appointed.

Government Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are certain hon. members whom I will warn shortly and I will deal with them if they continue this constant chatter across the Chamber and prevent the hon. member for South Brisbane from being fairly heard.

Mr. BENNETT: At this stage I lodge a protest against the way in which various commissions or bodies with a distinctly political bias have been appointed by the Government. I do not wish to tarry very long on this point, but the main one was the Electoral Boundaries Commission, which was presided over by a very junior barrister. He was junior even to the hon. member for Windsor.

Mr. Smith: How much more senior are you than I?

Mr. BENNETT: I would say nine or 10 years.

This appointment was given to a man who applied for admission to the Bar not long before the appointment of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. He had been practising previously as a solicitor and he applied for admission as a barrister just prior to his appointment as chairman of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. It was only a few months.

Mr. Smith: Do you ever tell the truth?

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member is certainly not noted for telling the truth.

Mr. SMITH: I rise to a point of order.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SMITH: I can take it and I can hand it out but if I hand it out—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Windsor has indicated that he has a point of order. Will he please state it!

Mr. SMITH: I should imagine that when I rise to take a point of order, if the members of the Opposition had any knowledge of Standing Orders, they would remain silent while I take the point of order. If they care to ignore Standing Orders, then I will do so, too. The remark of the hon. member is offensive to me; it is quite untrue, and I ask him to withdraw and apologise.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member please state the words that are offensive to him?

Mr. SMITH: He said that I am noted for untrue statements.

Mr. BENNETT: I deny that I said that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! My interpretation of the remark of the hon. member for South Brisbane was that the hon. member for Windsor made untrue statements, and I ask him to withdraw that remark.

Mr. BENNETT: If I may say so with respect, the hon. member for Windsor accused me of making untrue statements.

Mr. SMITH: I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: I am taking a point of order at the moment. The hon. member claimed that I was continually making untruthful remarks and I told him he was not noted for making truthful remarks. I did not say he made untruthful remarks.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member please continue his speech!

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Taylor, I rise to repeat the point of order I previously took. The hon. member for South Brisbane said in his speech quite categorically that I was noted for untrue statements. I ask him to withdraw and apologise.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! My interpretation of the remark of the hon. member for South Brisbane was not the same as that placed on it by the hon. member for Windsor, but my interpretation of it was that the hon. member for South Brisbane was reflecting on the hon. member for Windsor and I should be pleased if the hon. member for South Brisbane would withdraw any reflection he made on the hon. member for Windsor.

Mr. BENNETT: I withdraw any reflection that might have been made, but I hope that the hon. member, seeing that he is so obsessed, will not make reflections on other speakers by way of interjection.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member proceed with his speech!

Mr. BENNETT: As I was saying, the appointee to the Electoral Boundaries Commission was junior to me when he was previously at the Bar. He left the Bar to go into a solicitor's practice, and some few months, if my memory serves me correctly—certainly not a year, anyway, but some few months—before his appointment as chairman of the Electoral Boundaries Commission he reapplied for admission to the Bar. As my integrity has been challenged in this, let me test the integrity of the Government. He came back to the Bar and practised in the Inns of Court and he had a room there at the time we all received notice to quit. We had to get out, but during that time he received his appointment and brought in a redistribution, which to say the least was favourable to the Government parties of the day, and obviously they commended him on a very fine job. It is rather significant that, before his appointment to the Land Court, we all made arrangements at some considerable expense, to buy into the new Barristers' Chambers Pty. Ltd. That imposed particular financial hardship on those junior members who would otherwise have preferred not to expend the money, but in order to get some place to practise, some chambers in which to operate, we had to buy into that company. It has turned out much to our satisfaction, of course, and the building is a very fine one, but we bought in so that we might practise there. It was rather significant that the chairman of the Electoral Boundaries Commission did not buy into Barristers' Chambers Pty. Ltd., though he had nowhere else to go, and he still had not at that stage any appointment to the Land Court. Would it be fair and reasonable to say, Mr. Taylor, that he confidently anticipated that he would receive his appointment to the Land Court? Hon. members opposite claim that they do not play politics in these appointments, but that is so much tommy-rot. There again, I do not profess to be an expert in any branch of the law, or any field for that matter, but I would say that the gentleman who presided over the Electoral Boundaries Commission, who was subsequently appointed to the Land Court and who in turn became president of the Land Court, certainly had more knowledge of boundary redistribution than he had of any land matters.

Mr. Low: You should be a sanitary contractor.

Mr. BENNETT: If I were, the hon. member would be the first one I would pull the chain on.

Then we have the Town Planning Committee of the Brisbane City Council, the planning committee for Brisbane. There again there is a party-political bias. The Lord Mayor, the Liberal Party pigmy in the city council, is the presiding officer of that committee, and Alderman Ord, one of his

cohorts and colleagues, is the deputy chairman. No Labour thought is allowed into the committee, which should be a non-political committee for the development of Brisbane.

The Town Planning Committee has usurped its jurisdiction for the planning and development of Brisbane, and it is significant that it deals with isolated applications for site approvals when they are made by big companies. If any person acting on his own behalf makes application to the city council for site approval for a particular purpose, it will never see the light of day in the Town Planning Committee, because the committee will say that they are concerned with the overall development of the city, not the particular application. As the hon. member for Kurilpa should well know, that obnoxious fish-marketing project was high-jacked into West End not because of its merits and not because the zoning was appropriate at that time. It had been rejected by all the officers of the city council, and it had been rejected by the appropriate authority, the Registration Board. But L. J. Hooker, who was the agent in the sale of the particular block of land, saw the Lord Mayor, who had it referred to the Town Planning Committee. They, in turn, referred it to the Registration Board, and, rather amazingly, it was then approved.

Dr. Delamothe: What has that to do with the Financial Statement?

Mr. BENNETT: That shows what political bias does.

Dr. Delamothe: You are not in the council now. You are in Parliament House. That is the worst of having two jobs. You don't know where you are.

Mr. BENNETT: I might have two jobs, but I read in the newspaper that the Liberal member in the neighbouring seat also has two jobs, plus a very unsuccessful fruit-vending business in George Street. I did not hear the hon. member for Bowen make any complaint about the three or four jobs that the hon. member for Kurilpa has.

There is one other committee that is dominated by political bias, or something like political bias. It is a fundamental prerequisite in the practice of our British law that justice should not only be done but that it should appear to be done. A committee has been appointed to make suggestions on improvements to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, and no doubt most, if not all, of those suggestions will be implemented by this lily-livered Government. They will be against the workers, but the workers have no representation on the committee. Why should they not be represented? It should be a non-political committee to investigate the defects in our industrial legislation. If democracy is to be vital and have spark and

spirit, legislation must become obsolete from time to time and require amendment. That is fully recognised. But any committee appointed to investigate and delve into these amendments should certainly be a non-political committee. If people holding certain political views are appointed to the committee, other people holding opposite views also should be appointed so that both points of view may be expressed. In this instance I say quite candidly and very sincerely that the erstwhile hon. member for Kurilpa, who was my State member—and incidentally the skids were put under him by Mr. Hughes in a very intriguing fashion I am informed—

Mr. HUGHES: I rise to a point of order. Those remarks are entirely incorrect. In the usual fashion of the hon. member, he is being offensive and I ask that the remark be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Mann interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member for Brisbane does not keep quiet when I rise to speak I shall deal with him.

The hon. member for South Brisbane has made a remark that is offensive to the hon. member for Kurilpa, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. BENNETT: I withdraw it, but the—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I trust that when the hon. member speaks he will speak so that the Chair can hear him.

Mr. BENNETT: The committee appointed to investigate the amendment of the State's industrial legislation will be presided over by Mr. Connolly. I was about to say that I have the utmost regard for his ability, particularly as a lawyer. I respect his clear-thinking brain. But he has been so steeped in Liberal Party policy that as a politician his sincere ambition will be to amend the industrial laws of Queensland in a way that will readily please his great mentor, the Deputy Premier and Minister for Labour and Industry. Although I respect the brain of Mr. Connolly, as a pure lawyer, and have admiration for his clear-thinking processes, as an industrialist he is a babe in the woods. He knows nothing about industrial law and has never practised in the industrial jurisdiction. Many other lawyers at the Bar—and many other men who have never been lawyers and never practised at the Bar—would be better qualified than he to make suggestions to the Government on the improvement of the industrial legislation—men who have been advocates before the Industrial Court, men who have had hard experience in the great school of learning in the practical application of industrial improvements. Those are the men who should have been members of the committee, not Mr. Connolly. In view of the history of Mr. Wright I was wondering

whether Mr. Connolly will be appointed President of the Industrial Court in the very near future as a reward for the good work he will do for the Government.

Mr. Knox: What is your opinion of the other two members of that committee?

Mr. BENNETT: I have only a few minutes left and I am talking about Mr. Connolly.

In the short time available I should like to deal with the electorate I have the honour to represent as a State seat, and which in State matters has been largely neglected for over a quarter of a century.

Mr. Ramsden: What a nice thing to say about a previous Labour Premier!

Mr. BENNETT: I have proof of it, anyway. The Woolloongabba railway yards are a scar on the development not only of Wolloongabba, but on the whole of the south side of the city. It might have been all right 80 years ago when the yards were put there and the old train puffed across the Fiveways. There are no less than five crossings at the 'Gabba within a very short distance, four of which are across main thoroughfares. Statistics show that 10 trains and 44 light engines cross those roads every 24 hours. The railway yards are retarding progress and depreciating the value of large areas of land on the south side. It is a very negative attitude for the Government to claim that it is impossible to do anything about it. It is a defeatist attitude, a kitten-on-the-hot-stove attitude, to adopt. It was put there by human beings; it can surely be taken away by human beings.

In addition, there is the smog nuisance. Apparently from what we heard from the Deputy Premier today he has a vested interest in smog or chest and lung diseases because he is doing his best to entice a firm here to manufacture millions more cigarettes for distribution in Queensland. Transport depots have been allowed by the so-called Town Planning Committee to enter the Kangaroo Point area, and again the C.M.O. administration has wantonly failed in its duty to develop the city.

There is also the underpass to the Story Bridge on which Mr. Morris again offers no help. My colleague the hon. member for Norman referred to a letter which seems to be a standard letter sent out by the Minister in reply to these queries—

“Owing to the typical neglect of the previous Labour Government we cannot do anything about it.”

That is a defeatist and hypocritical attitude by a man lacking in enthusiasm for any reform. In the same letter, which I can produce, the Minister states that the people of South Brisbane and Kangaroo Point are perfectly satisfied with the present arrangements, yet within three weeks of my receiving that letter another lady was killed outside

Mt. Olivet Hospital, Kangaroo Point. So much for the information received by the Minister for Labour and Industry.

Then, on the planning of South Brisbane, we encounter the problem of Victoria Bridge. Incidentally, the C.M.O. administration are so wrapped up with the necessity to widen Victoria Bridge that they spent £80,000 to £90,000 preparing plans for a new bridge, but the Liberal-Country Party Government said, “Scotch those plans; firstly we are not interested in that bridge and, secondly, we will spend the money in the country.” So that project has been shelved.

In this age of knowledge we hear much from the Treasurer, who is in charge of housing, but when I spoke of neglect during the last 25 years I was castigated by the hon. member for New Farm, who, incidentally, has not done anything about the New Farm power-house. I was amazed to learn recently that in a heavily-developed residential area where sewerage has been available for the past 30 years, the pan system still obtains at the Dutton Park railway station. Can hon. members imagine any member of the State Parliament tolerating for 30 years such a dirty, filthy, unhygienic system for train passengers at the Dutton Park station? I was shocked and amazed to see that nothing had been done over all those years.

That is an individual and isolated problem of a domestic nature; it is not a matter for the Government but for the State hon. member, who should know what is going on in his own area. You cannot expect the Minister to know that the pan system has been operating at a certain railway station for 30 years whilst sewerage has been available during that time.

I should like now to make short reference to prison reform in this State. Not all men who, from time to time are consigned to Boggo Road, and to other prisons in Queensland, are no-hopers. Many of them are capable of mental and moral rehabilitation. They should not be consigned to the scrapheap as they are by the present Government. No adequate psychiatric treatment is available for these unfortunates who have to spend some time in prison. No adequate rehabilitation training scheme is provided for them. They need help to re-enter society and become useful citizens after they have served their punishment. I should say that virtually every person is born innately good. Their environment, conditions and circumstances lead certain men to the paths they unfortunately follow, but that is no reason why they should be permanently consigned to the moral scrapheap, and the Government owe a great duty to the people of Queensland to rehabilitate these men. This is the only State that does not pay even the part-time salary of a chaplain to look after the moral welfare of prison inmates. Some States pay the full-time salary of prison chaplains, and that action is certainly warranted. All other States at least pay the part-time salaries of chaplains.

We have heard today some pious platitudes about the aboriginals of Queensland. The Government, instead of using the Aboriginals Preservation and Protection Act to protect aboriginals, have in fact used the Act as a screen behind which they can hide. The average person has difficulty in coping with his so-called emancipation, and it is the moral responsibility of the Government to assist him, particularly as he has been divorced suddenly from his environment. There is much I could say on the matter, but time is limited.

I shall make one further brief observation about the extraordinary speech delivered this afternoon by the Deputy Premier. One would expect that a man in his position would have dealt with some major aspects of the Budget, and its difficulties and complexities, but like a character from Shakespeare he came in again, protesting and protesting, and speaking about the police. Having had my say and having sincerely said what I wanted to say, I repeat that I still believe and still claim that what I said was quite truthful. Having made those observations and having expressed myself in the way I did, I shall not—like the hon. member for Townsville South—allow the matter to become a phobia. I spoke sincerely and it is up to the Minister to do something about it. I was rather amazed at his suggestion that I make my complaints to him. I have experience of his temperament. He certainly has not a judicial brain. I should say that he has an addled brain, and there would be no purpose in submitting complaints to him. If he wants to hear more on the matter, I refer him to Wilson on "Police Administration," and the passage dealing with the manner in which people are arrested for traffic offences. The heading is "Fair-play Enforcement," and it reads—

"The practice of traffic officers hiding from the view of motorists so as to observe violations and then apprehending the violators from ambush, known as 'in-the-hole' enforcement, is not justified except to arrest an individual persistent violator who can be brought to justice in no other way. Regular and continuous traffic patrol permits the service of a sufficient number of notices of violation to maintain a suitable enforcement index, and it has many advantages over 'in-the-hole' operations."

(Time expired.)

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 11.1 p.m.