

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 1961

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

"(2) If the closure will cause dismissals, will he give consideration to finding alternative employment for these displaced workers?"

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

"(1 and 2). I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer which I gave in this House on August 23 last to Question No. 8. The closing of Cairncross Dock to allow conversion of the pumping plant from steam to electrically operated plant has, perforce, reduced immediate employment opportunity. As a general rule, South Brisbane is used for docking the Departmental dredging fleet and Cairncross for private dockings. The loss of private docking opportunity means less available work and I regret that I am unable to provide employment facilities elsewhere. I would point out that this dock has always operated at a substantial loss. One of the major problems is its spasmodic use. The work now being undertaken will reduce the time for pumping out the dock from 8 hours to 3 hours. The whole object of undertaking the work is to encourage greater use of the dock by private interests. From our viewpoint, this should have two very desirable results. In the first place, I hope to see a regular and increased work force being employed at the dock in lieu of the rather meagre work force which demand, to date, has made inescapable. Secondly, I hope to see the operation of the dock established on a sounder economic basis. The Honourable Member will appreciate that working opportunity bears a direct relationship to the degree of use of the dock by private interests and every endeavour must be made to build up this degree of use."

TREATMENT OF HOOKWORM DISEASE, CAPE YORK PENINSULA

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"(1) Has he noted a report in this morning's 'Courier-Mail' that Mr. W. G. L. Imms, just-retired Diocesan Registrar of Carpentaria Anglican Diocese, had made the following statements in an interview at Cairns that (a) hookworm disease had reached very desperate proportions in the aboriginal missions of Cape York Peninsula, (b) contrary to his statement in Parliament that the overall incidence of the disease in the Gulf missions had been reduced to as low as thirteen per centum, the 1960 overall figure at Lockhart Mission was forty-seven per centum, running to as high as sixty per centum among school children and (c) despite a report by a Queensland health inspector giving these figures and asking for urgent control measures, the Government had refused to act?"

THURSDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER, 1961

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

QUESTIONS

CLOSURE OF CAIRNCROSS DOCK

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

"(1) In view of the fact that Cairncross Dock will be closed until mid-November for conversion to electrically-operated machinery, will this result in the dismissal or displacement of any employees during the closure period?"

"(2) If so, will he inform the House if these statements are factual and, if not, what is his reply to them?"

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

"(1 and 2): Reference to the statistics contained in my reply to a question on August 30th shows that they refer to aboriginals not only on the Gulf Missions but to settlements and towns. Weipa Mission has an infestation rate of 12.9 per cent. Arukun Mission 7.9 per cent., Lockhart River 59.4 per cent., Mitchell River 27.7 per cent., and at the Government Settlement at Bamaga where the natives have been educated to a high standard of hygiene the rate is only 1 per cent. The attention of the Honourable Member is directed to the reply given to a question asked by his deputy which refers to the subject.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"(1) What hospital and health services are presently being made available by his Department to church aboriginal missions in Cape York Peninsula?"

"(2) In view of the statement made by the Diocesan Registrar of Carpentaria Anglican Diocese that a Queensland health inspector had reported that forty-seven per centum of the entire aboriginal population of the Lockhart River Mission and sixty per centum of the school children were infected with hookworm, will he take immediate action to appoint a medical officer to supervise the medical treatment of the population of these church missions?"

"(3) As it would appear that church missions have neither the finance nor the staff to adequately protect the health of aborigines on standards available to the white population, does he propose to either take over the responsibility for the provision of hospital and medical services or provide the necessary staff and equipment for the purpose?"

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

"(1) The Flying Doctor Service which is subsidised by my Department visits aboriginal Church Missions in the Gulf area and Cape York Peninsula except Lockhart River where there is no airstrip. Negotiations for an airstrip at Lockhart River Mission have been going on for approximately four years between the Mission and the Department of Civil Aviation for a suitable site, and money is available from my Department to have this work done once agreement is reached by these parties. A medical officer from Thursday Island Hospital visits Bamaga. Surveys for tuberculosis have been carried out by the Chest Physician, Thursday Island. Hookworm officers visit all settlements and missions. All drugs that are required are supplied free. There

are hospitals at all the missions and settlements. All sick natives requiring hospitalisation are transported by air to the nearest hospital and, if necessary transferred to a base hospital by air for specialist treatment. Last year hospitals were built at Mitchell River and Edward River by my Department to an approved plan and supplied with equipment. There is a daily routine communication with Thursday Island by radio from all missions and this is available in an emergency at all times, day or night. Where necessary the doctor can talk personally to the nurse on the settlement."

"(2) To understand why hookworm is difficult to control it is necessary to understand the life history of the worm. The eggs are passed out with the faeces and the larvae develop on the ground. These larvae penetrate the skin of natives and eventually reach the small intestine where they develop to adults. They attach themselves to the intestinal wall and lay eggs and the cycle is again commenced. It will, therefore, be seen that the control of hookworm is the teaching of hygiene to the natives. At Lockhart River the standard of hygiene is poor. It is common for natives to defaecate on the ground and this is not always because of the shortage of sanitary conveniences. Where there are conveniences the nightsoil is collected and dumped into the sea and it is not uncommon to see faeces washed up on the beach. It is obvious that under such conditions of hygiene, hookworm will never be eradicated. The state of the hygiene has been brought under the notice of the mission authorities by the hookworm officer and the Director-General when he visited Lockhart River two years ago. The disease is kept going by re-infestations and treatment can be carried out by the mission authorities. It would be a waste of time to send a medical officer to supervise medical treatment."

"(3) My Department has accepted the responsibility for hospital and medical services."

IMPORTED FOODS

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"In view of a statement by the chief of the Australian Food Technological Association, Mr. M. Cousins, at a Surfers' Paradise conference on June 7 last that dangerously sub-standard processed and quick-frozen foods were being allowed into Australia and that strong measures were needed to protect the health of the people from such foods, does his Department exercise any surveillance over such foods when they enter Queensland or is that function left to the Federal authorities?"

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

“My Department exercises surveillance over foods for sale once they enter Queensland.”

STORM-AND-TEMPEST INSURANCE COVER

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

“(1) Is he aware that insurance companies, including the State Government Insurance Office, insist that storm and tempest cover on any building be taken out for the same amount as the fire cover and, if so, what are the reasons for this action and is it legal?”

“(2) Are there three different rates of premiums for storm and tempest cover for the Southern, Central and Northern divisions of the State and, if so, is it not a fact that these variable premiums have no relation to the factual amount of cyclone damage in each division, but are based purely on the theoretical assumption that there is a far greater risk of cyclone damage in the Northern division than elsewhere in the State?”

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

“(1) All insurers adopt the practice mentioned by the Honourable Member. I am informed that storm and tempest cover is regarded as being in the same category as fire cover. Both types of cover relate to the one asset and insure against damage or total destruction whether by storm, tempest or fire. If the premises has one value for fire cover purposes I should assume it has the same value in case of damage or destruction by storm or tempest. I am not aware of any illegality in the practice adopted.”

“(2) I am informed that there are four and not three different rates of premiums relating to different geographical areas and that rates are based on the grounds that some areas are more cyclone-prone than others. I will ask the Insurance Commissioner to examine the contention in the Honourable Member's question to ascertain if it has any basis in fact and, if so, to see if some revision in rates would be justified.

SILTING OF ROSS RIVER

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) asked the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation—

“(1) What sediment surveys have been conducted on the Ross River and other North Queensland rivers to assess suspended load and bed load during floods?”

“(2) By what percentage has the storage capacity of the Ross River weirs been reduced over the years by silting as a result of erosion in headwaters?”

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

“(1) No sediment surveys have been conducted by the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission on the Ross River, or other North Queensland Rivers. Provision has, however, been made to check the effect of siltation on Tinaroo Falls Dam, for comparison with estimates prepared during the design, such estimates being based on experience elsewhere.

“(2) Ross River weirs are under the control of the Townsville City Council, and no information on silting in these storages is available to the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission.

BUILDING OF BEEF ROADS TO INCREASE CATTLE PRODUCTION

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) asked the Premier—

“(1) Does he feel that the present beef-roads building plans, when completed, will achieve an increase in cattle production, while grazing companies are permitted to control great areas of the land to be served?”

“(2) Do not the present beef-roads plans in fact spring from a report by Mr. J. H. Kelly, published in April, 1959, who was then an officer of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics on the Gilbert-Leichhardt area?”

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

“(1) The beef road development plan inevitably must result in an increase in cattle production. This is its primary purpose, and it should be obvious to the Honourable Member that there is little chance of full productive capacity of these areas being achieved until suitable roads are constructed.”

“(2) No. The whole plan has developed from the original idea of my Government to assist increased beef production in the Channel country and the Gulf country.”

CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD BETWEEN JULARGO AND CLUDEN TO RELIEVE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

“In order to help relieve unemployment in Townsville and to keep Main Roads staff men employed, will he release the final section between Julargo and Cluden of the construction of the coast road for day labour under the direct control of the Main Roads Department, Townsville?”

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

“The scheme mentioned is under design and is programmed for release during this financial year.”

RESERVOIR SITE ON MARY RIVER,
KENILWORTH

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) asked the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation—

“(1) Have efforts been made to find a suitable site for a large reservoir on the Mary River in the Kenilworth region?”

“(2) If so, (a) have such efforts been successful, (b) what would be the size of the reservoir and its cost of construction, (c) what effect would such a reservoir have on floods in Gympie and Maryborough and (d) if a report is available, will he table the report?”

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

“(1) Yes. As part of investigations of water conservation in the Mary Valley, some 19 sites on the Mary River itself were examined.”

“(2) (a) Yes. An attractive site for a large reservoir has been located at 167.8 miles on the Mary River, just upstream of Kenilworth. (b) A reservoir with a capacity of 250,000 acre feet could be constructed at this site, a preliminary estimate of cost being between £5 and £6 million. (c) No detailed studies have been carried out to determine the effect of such a reservoir on floods at Gympie and Maryborough. The effect of such a storage on floods originating upstream of the site would be significant, but this effect would reduce with distance downstream. As the catchment area at the site is only 187 square miles, even if such a structure were built, large floods would still be experienced at Gympie and Maryborough from other uncontrolled sections of the catchment, the total area of which at Gympie is some 1,100 square miles, and at Maryborough approximately 3,500 square miles. (d) No detailed report is available on this site, but it is referred to in the report by the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission on the Mary Valley Irrigation Project, a copy of which is tabled.

Whereupon the hon. gentleman laid the report on the table.

SAFETY IN INDUSTRY

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) asked the Minister for Labour and Industry—

“In view of the importance attached to the protection of workers and the public generally, appertaining to safety in industry and road worthiness of vehicles, &c., and taking into consideration the Report of the Chief Safety Engineer and Chief Inspector of Machinery, Scaffolding and Weights and Measures for the period July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961, will he give consideration to creating positions for additional inspectors in all phases of industry relating to lifts, motor vehicle inspections, scaffolding, machinery and

sundry occupations covered by the Department under the control of Mr. A. J. Hillless?”

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

“Mr. Hillless has made recommendations for requirements for the following years in every category under his administration. When all details of this year's financial requirements are completed it is intended to increase his staff as far as available finance will permit.”

TONSIL AND ADENOID OPERATIONS, IPSWICH
GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. DONALD (Ipswich East) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

“Have operations on children for removal of tonsils and adenoids been suspended at the Ipswich General Hospital? If so, will he explain the reason why and take the necessary steps to have this service restored?”

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

“No, although the number of operations undertaken has been reduced because of shortage of staff. I would add two doctors have been sent from the Brisbane and Princess Alexandra Hospitals to help at the Ipswich Hospital. Approval was given recently for the appointment of visiting part-time specialists but an ear, nose, and throat surgeon was not asked for as there was not one living in the town. This position will be further discussed with the Medical Superintendent of the hospital.”

CONVICTION AND PARDON OF ANTHONY
FRANCIS CAVANAGH

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) asked the Premier—

“(1) Did he receive a letter dated September 7 from Anthony Francis Cavanagh claiming £1,000 damages following his wrongful conviction?”

“(2) Has he replied, stating that certain legal expenses would be met by the Government, but that any other claim would have to be made by Mr. Cavanagh against individual police officers concerned?”

“(3) Was the pardon justified and, if so, why will the Government not pay appropriate damages?”

“(4) If the confession and conviction were validly and legitimately obtained, why was the pardon granted?”

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

“(1) Yes.

“(2) and (3) I have replied to Mr. Cavanagh stating that the Government would pay the reasonable legal expenses incurred by him in obtaining the pardon

but that the Crown would not accept any liability in respect of any wrong which he alleges he has suffered as the result of some person's act or omission.

"(4) The pardon was granted because of the discovery of a very large part of the moneys alleged to have been stolen and the dockets relating thereto in circumstances providing proof of innocence."

OVERSEAS VISIT BY MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) asked the Minister for Transport—

"(1) What are the names of the officials who accompanied him on his recent overseas trip to investigate railway matters?"

"(2) Were any women allowed to travel with the deputation? If so, who were they, and will he inform the House who financed their trip?"

"(3) Will he give details of expenses incurred by himself and each member of the deputation separately, also the total cost to his Department?"

"(4) How many countries were visited by himself or the deputation?"

"(5) What was the date of departure from Queensland of the deputation and the date of its return to Queensland?"

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

"(1) Mr. P. J. Goldston, Locomotive Engineer, Rockhampton, and Mr. A. G. Lee, Assistant Secretary to the Commissioner."

"(2) Mrs. Chalk travelled with the party. Her expenses were paid by me."

"(3) Mr. Lee, £1,816 14s. 6d.; Mr. Goldston, £1,896 17s. 5d.; Mr. Chalk, £2,090 12s. 7d.; total cost to Department, £5,804 4s. 6d. This amount includes the return air fares of £2,753 5s. 6d."

"(4) The party visited the United States of America, Canada, Great Britain and France, and returned to Australia via Rome, Athens, Calcutta, Hong Kong and Singapore."

"(5) Departed on April 17 and returned on June 11, 1961."

ALLOTMENT AND EXPENDITURE OF HOUSING COMMISSION FUNDS

Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"What amounts of Housing Commission funds were allotted and expended in the years 1957-1958, 1958-1959, 1959-1960 and 1960-1961 in the cities of Brisbane, Toowoomba, Townsville, Rockhampton, Bundaberg and Cairns?"

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

"Dissection of the information as requested was not made, consequently it

is not available. The Commissioner's Annual Report sets out particulars of the number of houses built in each locality. That should give the Honourable Gentleman a broad indication of the information he is seeking."

PAPERS

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

Report of the Public Service Commissioner for the year 1960-1961.

Report of the Government Gas Engineer for the year 1960-1961.

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Regulation under the Public Service Acts, 1922 to 1960.

TRAFFIC ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

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

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Traffic Acts, 1949 to 1960, in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SIXTH ALLOTTED DAY

Debated resumed from 12 September (see p. 320) on Mr. Camm's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, on which Mr. Duggan had moved the following amendment—

"Add to the question the following words—

'However, it is the opinion of this Legislature that, due in great measure to your present advisers having failed to successfully manage and extend the financial resources of the State, to encourage and foster new industrial enterprises, and to take adequate action to conserve and stabilise the economy, serious unemployment has become an established feature of the economy, oversea migrants are now loth to come to Queensland, and our own native-born citizens are migrating to southern States in such numbers that our much-needed population shows the lowest percentage growth in the Commonwealth, and, accordingly, we desire to inform you that for these and other reasons this Government does not possess the confidence of the House.'

Mr. TOOTH (Ashgrove) (11.30 a.m.): In rising to support the motion and oppose the amendment I should like to join in the congratulations that have been offered to the new hon. member for Whitsunday, and say that his informative and interesting speech, which indicated his grasp of his subject, his obvious willingness to consider changed economic circumstances and the results that follow therefrom, mark him as an hon. member who will make a valuable contribution to the debates in the House. I should like also to congratulate the hon. member for Aspley, my good friend Mr. Campbell, who so ably supported the motion.

I do not know whether it is a breach of tradition or convention, but I should also like to congratulate the hon. member for Barcoo. He represents an area of Queensland that I know very well indeed, that back country in which I was born, and lived for a quarter of a century. Apart from their unusual political views the people from that part of the country indeed are the very salt of the earth. I also congratulate him as a fellow-teacher; we cannot have too many of them in the House. He will receive a welcome from the more intelligent members of the community but he will have to tread rather warily. Some years ago he was a member of the same branch of the Queensland Teachers' Union as I was. I warn him that he will not be completely happy in his association with hon. members on the other side of the House, because for some reason I have not been able to fathom, they seem to have a very strong prejudice against teachers. I refer him to the hon. member for Maryborough. I am sure he will confirm what I say on this matter. The hon. member for Barcoo must be very careful indeed in making any reference to his union activities. I have learned from sad experience that the Queensland Teachers' Union is regarded in the ranks of the Opposition with a very definite measure of suspicion, and indeed of distaste. If he makes any reference to the Teachers' Union or his activities with the Teachers' Union he will find that the phials of their wrath and scorn will be poured upon him.

I congratulate the managers of the A.L.P. on the sagacity they showed in selecting a particular type of candidate for the two recent by-elections. They selected men with particular backgrounds, associations and antecedents, which enabled them to present the A.L.P. as a moderate, reasonable, middle-of-the-road or right-wing party. They attracted in these remote areas a body of moderate opinion that they could never hope to attract down here where their activities are continually in the light of public scrutiny. There is no doubt at all that the A.L.P. is the Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde of Queensland politics. The benign countenance of Dr. Jekyll is revealed in Barcoo and Whitsunday, but in the biennial Federal conference in Canberra recently the real nature of the dominant element in Queensland Labour politics was revealed.

There have been a few protests from the other side of the House on my dealing with this subject. Surely that is an unreasonable attitude. The Leader of the Opposition and his followers have long attacked the Government parties. They have accused us of all sorts of things. They accuse us of chicanery, double-dealing; they even accuse us of disunity and internal strife. When they do these things, naturally they must invite comparisons and consideration of conditions not only in our ranks, but also in their own. So I propose to discuss these things. Possibly disunity is the thing they would like to hear about most. In referring to it, may I say that disunity can arise from many things. It can arise from personal enmities.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. TOOTH: I am being enfladed. It can arise from a clash of ambitions; it can arise from sheer bucolic stubbornness and it can arise from misunderstandings. All those are unworthy sources of disunity and should be avoided by reasonable negotiation. Another source of disunity may be a deep conflict of vital principles. On this there should be no compromise.

Let me say here and now that there is no division in the Government ranks on questions of vital political principles. We of the Parliamentary Liberal Party realise that we have an overriding duty to the majority of the people of Queensland—60 per cent. of them—who at the last election expressed firm opposition to government by a left-wing dominated Socialist group or party.

How our current problem will be resolved I do not at present know, but our higher duty will be kept in mind and will be paramount. I should wish, at this moment, however, to remind the House that the annual convention of the Liberal Party has offered the Country Party complete unity on any reasonable terms that they are prepared to lay down. This I feel is the ideal solution of all our problems.

At this point I wish to refer to a side issue introduced into this debate by the hon. member for Bundaberg—his reference to the publication in a Sunday newspaper of a letter, an alleged secret letter, written by the Premier to the Prime Minister in 1959—and his quite unworthy reference to a traitor in the camp.

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have already warned one hon. member about the practice of moving from his seat in the House to take up a position from which he is better able to interject. I now warn the hon. member for Townsville South that he is not in order in doing it, and that if he insists on interjecting from his present seat, I shall have to deal with him.

Mr. TOOTH: I accept the interjection of the hon. member for Townsville South although he made it from an incorrect seat

in the Chamber. He is correct in drawing our attention to his question of 30 November, 1959, to which the Premier replied in detail, which reply virtually contains all the information in this alleged secret letter.

Mr. Aikens: It was a lot hotter than the contents of the letter.

Mr. TOOTH: It could have been read by all. However, it is to the letter that I wish to refer. In his reference to this subject the hon. member for Bundaberg clearly implied that some Liberal member had revealed this document.

Mr. Walsh: It is highly suspect, anyhow.

Mr. TOOTH: This incident is, because the hon. member is usually so well informed that he should have known that this letter has been public property for over two years. It was part of a Press release in 1959, and it has been available ever since. It was, in fact, in the hands of the Australian newspapers on 28 October, 1959. It was in a Press statement issued on that day by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Burrows interjected.

Mr. TOOTH: Listen to this, it is interesting. It contained, in the first paragraph, these words—

“Today I am able to publish a letter from myself to Mr. Nicklin, Premier of Queensland, dated 26th October, 1959, and a reply from him, dated 28 October, which I have received today.”

The Prime Minister then went on to develop the Press statement and in the latter part of it stated that Mr. Nicklin had requested him, that is, the Prime Minister, to be responsible for the release of the information to the Press, and that he would appreciate advice of the actual statement.

Mr. Walsh: Strange that none of you has seen the letter.

Mr. TOOTH: I regret I have to say to the hon. member for Bundaberg that it is pitiable to see a gentleman who has rendered great and honourable service to the State in the past engaging, in the evening of his political career, in the luxury of personal spite.

We have been talking about the subject of unity, and a short time ago I said that unity could be breached by unworthy things and unworthy motives, and that it could be breached worthily if vital principles were at stake. We are charged now with disunity. Let me say that the Australian Labour Party at the present time is preserving a facade of unity on the unworthy basis of a compromise of vital principles. Their fundamental and basic disunity, both in the political and industrial spheres, is more bitter and greater in extent than at any time in history. In the Federal sphere the A.L.P. is led by a gentleman who has equivocated and temporized on this question of vital

principle over a long period of time. He is a tight-rope walker of remarkable political agility.

A little more than a year ago Mr. Calwell was reported in “The Age” of Melbourne, on 13 June, 1960, in these words—

“Unity tickets were only figments of the imagination of some people who were trying to divide the political and industrial wings of the Labour Party.”

They were a figment of the imagination of some people—the hon. gent. on my right, for instance—yet in recent weeks, three of Mr. Calwell’s senior colleagues have implored—I think the hon. member for Bundaberg said they went down on their knees—the biennial Federal conference to suppress the left-wing dissidents and the unity tickets they are peddling. Has Senator Kennelly a disordered imagination? Is Senator McKenna a malicious disruptionist? Is Mr. Whitlam a splitter or saboteur? They are fair questions. Those three gentlemen made their appeal at the Federal conference of the A.L.P., but did they receive any help from their leader, the Hon. Arthur Calwell? How could they expect it, because on 19 June, 1960, Mr. Calwell said in the course of a broadcast—

“Take for example the question of alleged unity tickets, the gimmick of a discredited group of malcontents employing the Goebbels technique of pushing a lie continuously in the hope that it will become accepted as the truth.”

Are these gentlemen, Senator Kennelly, Senator McKenna and Mr. Whitlam, a group of malcontents? Do they peddle a gimmick? Are they employing the Goebbels technique? Have they been pushing a lie before the Federal conference of the A.L.P.? The most important question of all, for which I thank the hon. gentleman in the Opposition who has just interjected, “Did they receive any help in this matter from Queensland? Did the Queensland delegates assist them in any way?” Where does the Queensland Central Executive of the Socialist Party stand on this issue? It is painfully clear, and was made clear at the Federal Convention a few weeks ago, that the Queensland Labour machine stands with the extreme Left Wing element in the A.L.P. today.

Mr. Houston: What are you worrying about?

Mr. TOOTH: I will explain why I am worrying about it in a minute.

This reveals the split personality policy of the Queensland socialists—the face benign of Dr. Jekyll, presented in all innocence and good faith, I am sure, by Mr. O’Donnell, to the solid, middle-of-the-road, or Right Wing electors of Barcoo on the one hand, and on the other hand the face of the malign Mr. Hyde, presented with full and fell intent by the Queensland delegates, to the timorous, middle-of-the-road delegates at the Federal conference of the

A.L.P. recently. Of course, this is not surprising. It is not surprising to have clear evidence and a clear demonstration of the extent of Left-Wing influence in the A.L.P. I personally witnessed this situation when, in response to invitations by pamphlet and advertisements in the Press, I attended a gathering in Willard House, on 4 August last, sponsored by the Queensland Peace Committee for International Co-operation on Disarmament. That organisation has a very close and intimate relationship with the A.L.P. The invitation to this gathering of the Queensland Peace Committee for International Co-operation on Disarmament—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have already mentioned to hon. members on my left that senseless and inane interjections will not be tolerated. I ask them please to refrain. I will allow a pertinent interjection, but I will not allow inane and senseless interjections.

Mr. TOOTH: I was tempted to go to this meeting because the advertisements invited us to hear ex-Senator Morrow, of the A.L.P., and winner of a Lenin prize. The first speaker, a reverend gentleman, told us mainly of the horrors of war. He appeared to be convinced that the western nations, and especially the Menzies Government, wished to see the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse on their white, red, black and pale steeds abroad in the land, and to see conquest, slaughter, famine and death striding the world. He was in favour of peace, but who is not in favour of peace? Who is not in favour of peace? An imputation is made over and over again that unless you accept the mode and method laid down by those people as to the way to achieve peace, you are opposed to peace. Some of the hon. gentlemen opposite have been asking me if I am not in favour of peace. Of course I am in favour of peace. I resent the implication that the only people who are in favour of peace are the people associated with these organisations.

Mr. Mann: Tell us something about your Government's policy, not a lot of nonsense.

Mr. TOOTH: If this is nonsense, the hon. gentleman should not be sitting here and listening to it. He is obviously interested.

I will refer now to what ex-Senator Morrow, a bright star in the political firmament of the A.L.P., a protege of Soviet Russia, and winner of a Lenin prize, told us. He referred to the pacific intentions of the Soviet Union and the evil machinations of the N.A.T.O. powers and Russia's wish and desire to abolish atomic weapons. He was supported by a very personable young lady who told us how simple it was to settle the Berlin problem, namely, to sit down peaceably at a peace conference with the peaceable Mr. Khrushchev and sign a peace treaty.

But the last speaker particularly interested me. He was introduced as a representative of the trade-union movement and he commended this peace movement. He berated Britain and the United States for war-mongering and he spoke kindly of the Soviet Union. I recognised him. He is a constituent of mine. He is the State secretary of a very big union and he is a member of the Q.C.E. of the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. Hart: I don't think he voted for you.

Mr. TOOTH: I am quite sure he did not.

Mr. Houston: What is his name?

Mr. TOOTH: Cannot the hon. member pick him? He is Mr. Frank Waters. He was the fourth speaker.

I recount these things as proof of the influences at work guiding and directing the policy of the A.L.P. and as evidence of the real disunity springing from vital conflict of principles and I say, as I have said before in this Chamber, that I have a very deep sympathy for those people in the A.L.P. who cannot find the occasion to really denounce the influences that are eating into what was once a great political party. These are matters of public interest. We are entitled to talk about them and we are entitled to consider them in precisely the same way as hon. gentlemen opposite were entitled to ask questions of us this morning about our activities as a group of people seeking public support. So I claim the right to raise them.

Mr. Mann interjected.

Mr. TOOTH: I suppose I had better stop and listen to the hon. gentleman or he will not stop talking.

Mr. Mann: Tell us what you are going to do about unemployment and the economy of the State.

Mr. TOOTH: I make it a practice to endeavour to deal with matters in proper sequence, and the subject I am dealing with today is that of unity and disunity in the political groups of this State.

Mr. Duffy: You should give that some consideration.

Mr. TOOTH: I can assure the hon. member that I give all such matters very serious consideration. They are matters of great public interest indeed. We must remind ourselves that the A.L.P. is a monolithic party. It differs from all other parties in Australia in that respect. It is governed from the very top. We had the spectacle recently in the Federal sphere, of Mr. Chamberlain, formerly President and now Federal Secretary, making announcements that obviously should have been made by the parliamentary leader, Mr. Calwell, which indeed any self-respecting leader of a major political party would have reserved to himself. Again in

Queensland, notwithstanding the dominant left-wing influences which I have clearly demonstrated exist and which we have on the evidence of a gentleman who knew them from inside, and is now outside, namely, the hon. member for Bundaberg—notwithstanding these dominant left-wing influences, we have a political leader and his followers in this House who, we know, are definitely pledged to an abject and slavish obedience to the dictates of the Q.C.E. This has been stated in clear and unequivocal terms again and again. So that this matter is one to which we are entitled to direct our interest and attention.

At this stage I should like to deal with another subject—the matters that were raised by the hon. member for Nudgee in a long speech in which he made a number of assertions, some of dubious value and others, I am sorry to say, completely without foundation.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. TOOTH: If the hon. member for Norman will listen, he will hear something that I am sure will be instructive to him in respect of his colleague's speech. I merely wish to deal with certain things said by the hon. member for Nudgee during his speech. In the latter group—those that were without foundation—the hon. member said this—

“At various times the Minister for Labour and Industry has referred to an increase in the number of factories. In the last 12 months the number has increased from 6,306 to 6,418, or in other words by 112 . . .”

That is a factually incorrect statement. What appears to have happened is this: that the hon. member has made a mistake in adding up a column of figures given by the Minister for Labour and Industry, and read in his absence by the Premier, in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Maryborough. The total for the year ended 30 June, 1960, was not 6,418 but 6,518, representing an increase not of 112 factories but of 212 factories.

Having achieved this error of fact at the outset, the hon. member for Nudgee then proceeds to erect a whole edifice of misstatement. First of all he refers to 208 bankruptcies in the course of the same year, and then he says—

“Those figures indicate a greater number of closures of industries than the increase in the number of factories.”

Of course, that is untrue in fact because of the initial error; but, even if the figures were true, the deduction is completely unsound, because it is founded on the peculiar assumption that each bankruptcy represents the closure of an industry. Surely the hon. member for Nudgee does not mean us to think that; surely he does not believe it. We know that bankruptcies can, and do, include all sorts of people. Occasionally a bank clerk may go bankrupt;

occasionally a teacher may go bankrupt; possibly a member of Parliament may go bankrupt. All sorts of people who are not connected with factories go bankrupt, and to relate bankruptcies to the closure of industries is completely irrational.

Again, the hon. member, working from the incorrect answer to his first sum, concludes that there has been a decrease in the number of factories outside the metropolitan area. Of course, the truth of the matter is that there has been an increase in the period under review, both within the metropolitan area and outside it. The actual figures are:—

	Increase
Metropolitan area	138
Outside metropolitan area	74
	—
Total	212
	—

It is pertinent at this point to draw attention, also, to the figures showing the number of factory employees in the period mentioned. In the metropolitan area there was an increase of 1,353, and for the whole State there was an increase of 1,828 in the period. It is a wonder that the contrast between these figures and his factory total did not alert the hon. member to his initial mistake.

The statistics relating to shops in the same period are also worth recording, and they show an increase in all parts of the State. In Brisbane there was an increase of 193 shops and 2,088 employees, and in the country there was an increase of 335 shops and 1,390 employees. This shows that, for the relevant period, there was an appreciable increase not only in the number of registered shops and factories but also in the number of people employed in them.

Having under-estimated the increase in the number of factories by 100, the hon. member for Nudgee tried to disparage the value of the increase that he did admit. He mentioned an increase of 28 motor repairers in Brisbane and said—

“Any workshop, even if it has only one electric motor, comes within the classification of a factory.

“Most service stations have a workshop, but the owners may not work in it for more than two or three hours a day. These facts establish the unreliability of the Minister's figures.”

Yes, that is what he said. He criticised the Minister for being unreliable when it comes to figuring. If this means anything, it must mean that while 28 more repair shops were admitted in Brisbane, there was little or no increase in employees in those shops. In point of fact the number of employees increased by 225, or 8 per cent., whereas the number of shops increased by only 5 per cent.

Let me refer finally to the hon. member's jibe about the unreliability of the Minister's figures. The figures supplied were those

of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops who is responsible for preparing those statistics. If hon. members will refer to Section 14 of the Factories and Shops Act of 1960 they will find these words—

“The Minister may, after the annual report has been presented to Parliament, publish any general statistical information including the occupation, calling, or classification of employees contained in the report or cause any such information to be supplied to any person.”

For very many years successive Labour Governments gave these figures to Parliament for the purpose of informing it “of the course and condition of trade.” The bases of the statistics have not been varied, and it is regrettable to find the hon. member wittingly or unwittingly, presenting for the year under review a picture of gloom and recession. In fact, the very reverse is established by a record number of factory registrations for the period under review, a record number of shop registrations, a record number of factory employees and a record number of shop employees.

Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) (12.3 p.m.): I take great pleasure in joining the debate to support the amendment moved by my Leader to the motion so ably moved by the hon. member for Whitsunday. As a Queenslander, I am very proud again to express my allegiance, and that of my constituents, to the Crown. For many years we have enjoyed an association under the British Crown and I think because of that, we in Australia have developed a way of life that is the envy of the peoples of many other lands.

The mover of the motion, the newly elected hon. member for Whitsunday, follows in the footsteps of a man known personally to me. I have known Mr. Camm since childhood; he comes from a very good family. His father was a workmate of mine. Although I disagree in the extreme with his politics I have a very high regard personally for him and his family. I took a very active part in the Whitsunday by-election and it was refreshing to campaign against a man of his calibre. I have had previous experience of campaigning in the Whitsunday electorate. With all due respect to his predecessor I say that if Mr. Camm continues to maintain his high standard of clean, friendly campaigning he will retain the respect of his constituents and those who oppose him politically.

I congratulate the newly elected hon. member for Barcoo on his entry to this very important Chamber. Mr. O'Donnell follows in the footsteps of a man who was held in the very highest esteem by all who had the opportunity of knowing him. The late Ned Davis and I came into politics about the same time, and it was my privilege to enjoy a long association with him. Representing such an important electorate that has had a close association with the Queensland Parliament for many years, I am sure that

Mr. O'Donnell will continue to give to the people of those western areas the same representation as was given to them by the late Ned Davis. He gave the people of the Barcoo electorate the representation that is required by those who live in that part of the State. I wish Mr. O'Donnell well in his parliamentary career.

This session of Parliament takes place in the fifth year of the regime of the Nicklin-Morris Government. Those of us who have been members of the Parliament during that period have seen them control the affairs of this State for four years, from 1957 to 1960 and now in 1961. I believe, in all fairness to them that we can say that, never in the history of Queensland, have any Government faced a more critical period of administration than this Government are facing today.

Whilst looking for material for my contribution to this debate I came across a pamphlet issued by the Premier or his party in 1960, three years after the advent of the Government that came in with such a blare of trumpets. It dealt with the period between 1957 and 1960, and it read—

“The new Government had one clear advantage. No man had to worry about loyalty within his own party.

There was so much that cried out for remedial action that each Government member, Minister or ‘backbencher’ had too much to do to worry about petty jealousies or ‘deviation from the party line’.”

I wonder if the Premier has the same thoughts in his mind today! It is said that “uneasy lies the head that wears the crown.” I should say that there would not be one man in politics in Australia today who has a more uneasy conscience than has the Leader of the Queensland Government at the moment, caused by dissension within his own party, and it is quickly coming to a head. I am afraid that, unless the Premier can produce those qualities of leadership he is credited with possessing, there is a distinct possibility that his party will be split asunder and we shall see a retraction of the words, “No man had to worry about loyalty within his own party.”

Because of happenings within the Liberal-Country Party Government there is very definite dissension arising between the Liberals and the Country Party. One wonders how far it will go before the crash comes. I ask the Premier and members of the Liberal Party, is it right that the people of Queensland should have to tolerate this type of Government in view of the problems facing both the Government and the people today? We on this side are looking for direct, dynamic and progressive government and, despite all that is said by the leaders of the Liberal and Country Parties, I feel we are not getting it. Because of internal strife within the ranks of the Government of the day Queensland is fast reaching the crossroads, so much so that

there is talk of the formation of a new independent Country-Liberal Party. Three days ago "The Courier-Mail" stated—

"The formation of an independent Country-Liberal Party to contest the 1963 election is seriously discussed. Candidates would oppose some sitting members, Country-Party members and Liberal members."

The happenings of the last 24 hours affecting the hon. member for Redcliffe more or less confirm the newspaper report. Because of dissension within the Government parties we cannot get a clear line on how the Government intend to develop Queensland. The Leader of the Opposition said that the Government had failed to manage the financial resources of the State, so as to encourage new industrial enterprises and thereby stabilise the economy and overcome unemployment. His statement is absolutely correct. Despite all the flag-waving of the Nicklin Government, they have no answer to the problems of development or unemployment. The Premier and his Deputy are endeavouring to control the rebels, if I may use that word, within the Government parties. Because of certain actions taken by the Government under the Transport Act certain Government members are prepared to foresake the Government if by so doing they can gain their own ends.

I return again to the pamphlet issued by the Premier. The first demand of membership of a political organisation is loyalty. How can people retain membership of a political organisation if they cannot be loyal to the party they represent? No legislation would have been introduced and no decision would have been made by the Government unless the decision and the legislation had been first discussed in the party room and accepted by a majority, thereby making it binding on all members of the party. The Premier said yesterday that if there was to be criticism of the Government it should be voiced in the party room, not on the floor of the House.

Mr. Aikens: There is no trouble in our party.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member is fortunate in that he has to control only himself, and sometimes he cannot do even that.

Unless the Leader of the Country Party can control his own forces, Queensland is going to be the greatest sufferer. What have we witnessed in the four years of Nicklin-Morris administration? We have had record deficits to which other hon. members have referred, record unemployment and record dissension within the Government parties.

Mr. Evans: And a record drought.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do not give me that story.

The position in Queensland today is somewhat similar to the position in the Federal sphere in 1941 when Sir Arthur Fadden

was said to have accused the Prime Minister of stabbing him in the back. If the Premier was asked, he might say that his deputy leader or someone within the ranks of the Liberal Party had endeavoured to stab him in the back. The Nicklin-Morris Government are not in a good position. Within the Liberal and Country parties distrust exists. Government members are turning their head from side to side to see who is next in line. Unless the Government can rally their forces and accept the fact that their responsibility is to the people of Queensland, rather than to individual members, the position today will continue. One of the most important factors agitating the minds of the Australian people today is Great Britain's contemplated entry into the European common market. There has been a great deal of newspaper controversy over it, and many public statements have been made. Because Queensland is so dependent upon its primary industries this question is of vital concern to us. I refer to a Press statement made on 21 August by Harold Cox, a very well-known Press reporter who pointed out how Australia would be affected if Great Britain joined the Common Market without having regard for Australia's requirements. He says—

"How drastically Australian exports would be penalised on the British market if Britain joined the Common Market without gaining the right of special treatment for Commonwealth countries is shown in the following itemised list:"

He then gave a list and mentioned primarily, butter, sugar, beef, veal, canned meat, canned fruit, apples and pears, dried vine fruits, cheese, eggs, processed milk, honey, wine, soup preparations, leather, and one or two others. Unless Queensland's interests are protected by the Federal Government our economy will be very seriously affected. Queensland is the major sugar producer in the Commonwealth and the sugar industry is of vital importance to Queensland. If strong direct action is not taken by the Australian Government to protect the Sugar Agreement with England, then the Queensland sugar industry will be in dire circumstances.

Mr. Ewan: Does not the Sugar Agreement run till 1968?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, so far as Empire preference is concerned.

Mr. Ewan: Under the negotiated Agreement.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity can tell the hon. member that there is much more to it than that.

There was a statement in today's paper, or yesterday's paper, by the Agent-General for Queensland pointing out that the increasing over-production could have some very detrimental effects for Queensland unless there

was some control by the International Sugar Board. The future is not very clear or hopeful for Queensland in the event of Great Britain's joining the Common Market.

Mr. Ewan: Do you know that the Commonwealth Government are negotiating with the United States of America?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, I am quite aware of that.

During this debate we have heard from a number of Government members. They would have been more helpful to the Government if they had made constructive contributions to the problems of the State. However, the hon. member for Condamine and the hon. member for Barambah referred mainly to the Transport Act. They are privileged to do that, but they made a purely individual approach. They were not really concerned about the people of Queensland generally. They thought only about the effects of the Act on their constituents and the primary producers. We had a dissertation on the trade-union movement from the hon. member for Nundah.

Mr. Davies: Obnoxious Knox!

Mr. GRAHAM: I would call him "Knocky Knox", on the trade-union movement. With all the serious problems confronting Queensland and Australia one would have thought he would have made a much more valuable contribution to the debate, instead of an attack on the trade union movement about which he knows so little. But he endeavoured to interfere in the affairs of the trade-union movement and to capitalise on circumstances that have existed in it for 50 years. They will continue to exist because each and every member of the trade-union movement is an individualist and so up to a point has certain rights and jurisdictions. The moment the hon. member for Nundah rose to his feet he commenced to give a dissertation on the unity tickets. He has a one-tracked mind. Like the hon. member for Ashgrove he seems to think of nothing else but unity tickets and Communists. He contributed little or nothing of value on the problems that we think should be discussed.

Mr. Ewan: Was he right about the unity ticket?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not know. Possibly the hon. member for Ithaca would know more about that.

As for those hon. members opposite wrongly called rebels—the hon. member for Barambah, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, and the hon. member for Roma, Mr. Ewan—their viciousness could be likened to that of a tame dove. But that is beside the point. Their opposition to the Transport Act gets away from the whole problem.

The problems facing Queensland today have come about mainly through the attitude of the Federal Government to Queensland's requirements. It has been said time and time

again that we in Queensland were not badly treated until uniform taxation was brought in. Since then Queensland has suffered greatly from the method of allocating funds. The Federal Government cannot escape responsibility for what is happening here today.

Mr. Ewan: Don't you think we should have got that £4,500,000?

Mr. GRAHAM: That was only a sop. As the hon. member knows, we get only £1,000,000 a year over five years, and Mr. Menzies had it nicely sewn up and tucked away waiting for the approach by the Queensland Government on the subject of Mt. Isa railway finances. That should cause every member of the Nicklin-Morris Government to run away and hide his head. The Press publication of a letter over the Premier's signature indicates clearly the extent to which this Government have more or less played a two-tone role on Mt. Isa. If any member of the Country-Liberal Party thinks he can justify the whole of the ramifications of the actions of the Nicklin-Morris Government, on Mt. Isa, he has another think coming.

Queensland's position has deteriorated greatly since the advent of the Menzies Government and until they realise their responsibilities to Queensland we will not make the progress we desire to make. The lack of Commonwealth aid has been a factor retarding Queensland's progress. There has been no word from Mr. Menzies or any Queensland member of the Federal Government. Mr. Menzies has concerned himself with the problems of many other countries. We have read articles by him about South Africa and other trouble spots in the world but little or nothing about Queensland. Queensland just does not matter to Mr. Menzies.

In the Brisbane "Telegraph" of 18 April, Mr. Harold Cox said—

"There is no sign of any immediate Federal action to stimulate work-producing development in Queensland . . ."

Queensland will have to depend on its own resources for any early relief from the present situation . . ."

That statement is true. He goes on to say—

"A survey of population by the Department of Statistics strikingly illustrates the close relationship between population growth and Federal developmental expenditure . . ."

Canberra's population increased last year by 10.65 per cent. under the stimulus of an almost unrestrained, and, in many areas, highly extravagant outpouring of Commonwealth developmental funds."

The correspondent went on to refer to the population growths last year of New South Wales, 2.18 per cent., Victoria, 2.91 per cent., and South Australia, 2.41 per cent., while Queensland, which is looked upon as the State having the greatest potential in the

Commonwealth, lagged far behind with an increase of only 1.36 per cent. He then went on to say—

“In New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, Commonwealth spending, both for development and continuing projects, is highest.”

I also quote from an article in “The Courier-Mail”—

“Victoria and South Australia were the States in which the bulk of the Supply Department’s £51,700,000 payments were made last year . . .

The Minister for Supply, Mr. Hulme, said that expenditure to June 30 was New South Wales, £7,624,000; Victoria, £23,333,000; Queensland, £795,000; South Australia, £19,394,000; Western Australia, £465,000; Tasmania, £100,000.”

Mr. Hulme also said that the principal offices of the department were established in Victoria and New South Wales. That may be so, but that does not justify the Federal Government’s attitude towards providing funds for Queensland. We get little or no support from the Federal Government.

As an indication of the failure of the Queensland Government to carry out their policy, we find in Bulletin No. 25 of 1961, issued on 31 May by the Queensland Government Statistician, the following remarks—

“Queensland’s rising purchases of goods has provided an increasing market for southern merchants, both in handling goods sent to Queensland from overseas via other States, and in supplying their own products to Queensland users.”

He goes on to say—

“Overseas imports into Queensland in 1959-1960 were only £50.9 million, compared with £68.9 million in 1954-1955, while during the same five years, estimated oversea imports via other States have risen by 50 per cent. to £81.3 million, and imports direct from other States by 50 per cent. to £149.4 million.

Queensland is thus providing an expanding market for the produce of other States.”

If time permits, I shall have something more to say about that later.

Mr. Ewan: Do you think we should import more?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not a question of importing more. It is a question whether we can develop the State without the assistance of the Federal Government. Unless they are prepared to assist us in our programme of development, we will neither import nor export. They cannot carry on with their policy of handing to other States unlimited finance for capital expenditure and denying Queensland the money to which we feel we are justly entitled. That is the issue on which I and many other people take umbrage. The present Government have

adopted a weak-kneed policy and have allowed themselves to be stood over by the Menzies Government. They have never shown any fight on behalf of Queensland. In fact, had it not been for the prodding of the Opposition to get finance for the Mt. Isa rail project, they probably would not have gone to Canberra and again discussed with the Prime Minister and his Cabinet the subject of additional assistance for Queensland. As I said earlier, they went there, and Mr. Menzies was waiting for them. He knew that they were coming, because he had been advised by the Deputy Premier that they were coming to Canberra to discuss the Mt. Isa rail project. As a sop he said, “We will do all we can for you”, and he then handed out the £5,000,000 he had stowed away in anticipation of this attack by the Nicklin-Morris Government.

It is very significant that on two occasions in one bulletin on the external trade of Queensland the Government Statistician thought it necessary to refer to Queensland as “Providing an increasing market for southern merchants” and as “providing an expanding market for the produce of other States.” Such statements are published, not by members of the Labour Party, but by people who claim to be supporters of the Nicklin-Morris Government. It is little wonder that the Secretary of the Queensland Employers’ Federation, Mr. J. R. James, as reported in “The Courier-Mail” on 1 June, stated that Queenslanders were in danger of being relegated to the role of wood-and-water joeys for all time, with Queensland a Cinderella State. How often have we heard the statement that Queensland is a Cinderella State? Mr. James also said—

“Unpalatable though it may be the sad truth is that the rate of industrial development in Queensland has not kept pace with the rate of development in New South Wales and Victoria. It is doubtful whether it is keeping pace with the development in South Australia, Western Australia or even Tasmania.

“Therefore, whatever justification may have existed in the past for maintaining parity or superiority of Queensland wage rates with wage rates in New South Wales and Victoria, no such justification exists today.

“The sad fact is that we can no longer afford to keep up with the Joneses in New South Wales and the Smiths in Victoria.” The lag in industrial development in Queensland, in effect the failure to develop secondary industries to process the State’s own raw materials, is occasioned by the failure of the Federal Government to assist Queensland in its development. “Queensland’s interstate exports consist mainly of goods to be used or processed in other States.” Those are the words of the Statistician in his 31 May bulletin. Does that not apply today to Queensland’s raw materials—to our coal, iron ore and aluminium? Despite the fact that

a company has been given a franchise for the development of Weipa and that an agreement has been entered into to develop Weipa's bauxite potential in North Queensland, little or nothing is being done about it today.

Mr. Evans: Do not be stupid.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am talking about Queensland. Bauxite has gone to Japan, to the southern States and to New Zealand. What has Queensland got out of Weipa so far? Irrespective of what the Minister for Mines might say about Weipa I predict that Queensland will never get the full benefit of Weipa while this Government are in office. They are allowing the raw materials to be exported to other countries. Time will tell. The bauxite deposits will go where they are going now—to Japan. The Federal Government sold the Bell Bay aluminium works in Tasmania. Already 30,000-40,000 tons of bauxite have been sent to Japan.

Mr. Evans: A trial shipment.

Mr. GRAHAM: There will be another trial shipment and still another. It will only be a matter of time before Japan obtains all her requirements from the vast deposits in North Queensland. I do not think the Minister can deny that. He knows in his own heart that the design of the company is to develop the industry in Queensland only to the extent of obtaining the raw material to send to New Zealand, Japan and Bell Bay.

Mr. Evans: You would not know what an alumina plant was.

Mr. GRAHAM: Maybe I would not, but the Minister would not have known much about it until he was told. There are many things I do not know and I suppose there are many things the Minister does not know. That is the policy of this Government. They are prepared to allow iron ore to be sent to Japan, to allow bauxite, coal and many other materials to be exported. Why did not the Government demand that the industry be established in Queensland?

Mr. Evans: We have.

Mr. GRAHAM: Coal, for instance, and other raw materials have been exported to build industries in Japan and elsewhere. Why not build industries in Queensland?

Mr. Evans: You were the Government for 30 years; why didn't you do it?

Mr. GRAHAM: No-one should know it better than the Minister. He has been in North Queensland long enough to know what industries are there. North Queensland depends on primary industries to keep its people there, but they are now leaving those areas because of insecurity and unemployment. The sugar industry today cannot carry the people of North Queensland as it did in the

past. In Mackay, as the Minister well knows, 1,000 men will suffer long periods of unemployment as soon as the sugar season ends. One would expect the Government to provide an answer to this problem.

Mr. Evans: What did your Government do?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not a case of what my Government did. The question is, what is the present Government doing? I am not saying who is responsible for the unemployment. I am not blaming the Nicklin-Morris Government any more than I blamed the Moore Government in 1929-1932, or any other Government. Hon. members opposite are the Government and they are responsible for overcoming the problems. What are the Government going to do? Are they going to allow the position in North Queensland to remain, because of drought conditions, if they want to put it that way, or because of lack of secondary industries? There is a permanent body of unemployment from the end of each crushing season to the commencement of the next. If the Federal Government have any regard for North Queensland let them make a special grant to the State Government so that the public works programme can be stepped up and local authorities in every part of the State, including the Mackay City Council and the Pioneer Shire Council, of which the Minister was a member, can undertake big public works in their own areas and so give people work. That is the answer.

I know that efforts are being made to establish secondary industries in Queensland. I have here an article that says that regional committees have been set up in Townsville, Rockhampton, Bowen and Cairns to collate information to help people with the necessary finance to establish industries in the North. It will take time, just as beef roads will before they will have much impact on the employment position. Beef roads will not solve unemployment overnight. It will be many years before the building of beef roads will be an answer to unemployment in Queensland, but I believe the Federal Government could overcome it in hours if they would make a special grant to the Queensland Government to enable local authorities and the Government to undertake large-scale public works. There is much work to be done in every city, town, and hamlet in Queensland that will absorb the unemployed and give the people in the North an opportunity of maintaining their standards of living.

Up to the present there has been no answer to the problem of unemployment. Local authorities are cutting back the work they could undertake, the Federal Government are closing their eyes to the unemployment, and the Nicklin-Morris Government are doing nothing about it. Not one member of this Government has had the courage to put forward a constructive idea. The hon. member for Ithaca gave us a dissertation on

disunity and the hon. member for Nundah talked of unity tickets in the Labour movement.

Mr. WINDSOR: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member referred to the hon. member for Ithaca as making a certain statement which I did not make.

Mr. GRAHAM: I meant the hon. member for Kelvin Grove, but it does not matter. On the score of intelligent contribution to the debate, the speeches of Government members deserve to fall on deaf ears. Surely they could have found time to speak of the problems facing their Government and the problems to be overcome in the development of Queensland. I am absolutely disgusted with the Government. I have been in this Chamber for 19 years. I know the problems of government. The Nicklin-Morris Government are sinking further and further into the morass of incapacity and ineptitude—a sorry day for Queensland. The Government, torn asunder with internal strife, are disregarding the requirements of the State and neglecting the welfare of the people. The amendment is certainly justified and opportune. We of the Australian Labour Party look to the Nicklin-Morris Government for more direct leadership than we have had to date. God help Queensland if the position does not improve in the next two years. In their four years of office they have virtually brought Queensland to its knees financially and, despite their platitudes about the establishment of industry and their promises of employment, there is more unemployment in Queensland now than ever before, and fewer industries. Unless the Government pull together and overcome their internal disension, the consequences will be very detrimental for Queensland.

Mr. ANDERSON (Toowoomba East) (12.43 p.m.): I desire to support the motion of loyalty so ably moved by the hon. member for Whitsunday and seconded by the hon. member for Aspley, and in doing so believe that we must all be reminded of the great honour it is for us to be members of the Great Commonwealth of Nations over which Her Majesty reigns.

Notwithstanding the troublesome period overseas it must be refreshing to our world leaders to know that we are ever ready to re-affirm our allegiance to the Crown and all that it traditionally represents.

Mr. Speaker, whilst our attention might be temporarily diverted by occurrences on the other side of the world, and which because of their magnitude should rightly command the attention of every self-respecting British subject, nevertheless we also have many pressing problems on our home front. They also are problems of considerable magnitude and I know the Government during the present session will in their wisdom leave no stone unturned in their endeavours to remove these things which are impeding the progress and development of our State.

In my capacity as member for Toowoomba East, my attention naturally turns to that quarter on an occasion such as this. I am also broad enough in my outlook to understand that my responsibility also lies to the State as a whole. However, before making reference to what I consider to be some of Queensland's problems, permit me to indulge a little reflection on what is happening in Toowoomba, what might be considered as local problems.

When my thoughts turn to Toowoomba, they naturally turn to health because, regardless of any other possessions that a city or an individual might have, health must necessarily be rated as top priority.

Toowoomba has a very competent team of medical men, practising either in a private capacity or attached to our general hospital, but perhaps the greatest weakness in the whole medical structure lies in the inadequacy of the general hospital itself. I acknowledge, at the outset, that the Minister for Health and Home Affairs is very conscious of our requirements at this base hospital, and has already applied his energies to its modernisation with the least possible delay. Very shortly, we hope to see a multi-storeyed surgical ward erected. Plans are already in train for greatly improving the accommodation available for resident medical officers. The Government are really on the way to providing Toowoomba with a hospital that will be adequate in every respect, sufficient to meet the demands made upon it by the people of the vast area that it serves as a base.

As on former occasions, I pay a tribute to the nursing profession under the excellent control of Matron Fountain. They have performed sterling work in the face of many obstacles such as the lack of patient accommodation. I trust that the Minister will not relax his energies till Toowoomba has a general hospital of which it can be justly proud.

In passing, I must also acknowledge the excellent work being carried out by the Maternal and Child Welfare Centre at "Unara" and, of course, we all trust that the provisions of a new Maternal and Child Welfare Clinic, as an addition to the Civic Centre, will soon be a reality.

With education, Toowoomba is well provided with adequate facilities, particularly in the primary and secondary fields. In fact, the number and the standard of schools provided in the city and suburbs is a credit to the present Minister for Education and Migration, and those who went before him. However, as most hon. members are aware, a very active association has been formed in Toowoomba to promote interest in, and make representations for, the establishment of a University. The Darling Downs University Establishment Association has already carried out commendable research into this matter. They have prepared a manuscript titled, "The case for a Darling Downs University College" a copy of which

I have here, is one of the most comprehensive volumes of facts it has been my pleasure to peruse. I will pass it round to hon. members so that they may study the excellent case that has been made. Their efforts have been well-timed and are by no means premature as we are now faced with the ever-increasing problem of catering for a rapidly expanding population. This, of course, has been brought about by an increasing post-war birth rate, the effects of which are about to be passed on to our present universities.

Generally speaking, our increase in population has been associated with an increased birth rate, reduction of infant mortality, an immigration policy with an emphasis on the lower age groups, and the more stable economic nature of the post-war years.

The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Queensland, Professor F. J. Schonell, has quoted the 18 to 22-year age-group as being the age-group from which the University drew its enrolments. In the last 10 years, enrolments have risen from 3 per cent. of this age group, to 6 per cent.—just double. When this increase is associated with the increasing desire for education within the age-group it will be seen what a great problem faces the Government in relation to future University enrolments.

There is another factor which has an important bearing on our University enrolments. I refer to the enrolment of overseas students under the Colombo Plan. With Australia playing a major role in the "giving Nations" under this plan, even greater numbers of this class of student can be expected.

We have now been faced with one of the unknown factors which always seem to beset man as he tries to peer into the future. I refer to the European Common Market. It can only be assumed at this stage that our reaction will be to seek closer economic relationships with our near northern neighbours. This, in turn, would increase the number of students from those countries seeking admission to our universities, so adding to the problem we are seeking to solve.

It has been said, and rightly so, that this is a scientific age. The cry is to train more scientists or perish. While that is a fair assumption in this rapidly-changing age we must not concentrate on these alone. The arts and humanities must also be exercised if we are to keep a national balance. This points to the need for more university facilities. We must encourage our young people to go on to the University and we must make provision for those who desire to go now. We must at all costs avoid limitations of university enrolment in Queensland. The field of expanding one's knowledge must never be restricted or we will face a new conception of a Dark Age.

Professor Schonell has quoted the possible enrolments at St. Lucia as being 16,000 in

1965. The Murray report recommends a maximum enrolment of 5,000, as have Cambridge and Oxford. Some British universities have only 1,200 to 1,300 students. Many have between 3,000 and 4,000. By these standards, St. Lucia is carrying a heavy burden which must be lightened. The amount of administrative duties the professors have to perform must restrict the time they are able to devote to academic and research duties.

In view of the magnitude of the increase in future enrolments, the expansion of St. Lucia does not appear to be the answer. That would only increase St. Lucia's present problem.

In answer to a question asked by Mr. R. W. C. Swartz, M.P., in the House of Representatives, the Acting Prime Minister stated that the university commission planned to establish university colleges at Townsville, Rockhampton and Toowoomba. This appears a logical solution as an overall plan. New colleges, not extensions of existing ones, are necessary to meet the need.

The site for a new university college must be selected where it can fill the greatest need. This need can be assessed by an analysis of the home location to the students at the University of Queensland.

In 1960 there were 8,700 students enrolled at St. Lucia. The home residence of these students was as follows:—

Brisbane	4,310
South of Gladstone	1,928
North of Mackay	793
Central Queensland, Gladstone-Mackay	503
Overseas	736
Other Australian States	431
Total	8,700

It will be noted that the northern part of the State, from Gladstone north, sent 1,292 students, while south of Gladstone sent 6,238 students. The remaining 1,067 were non-Queensland students. These figures indicate that the greatest need for additional university facilities is south of Gladstone. It is clearly seen from the analysis of enrolments I have quoted that the greatest need is in South Queensland. Let us build our university where the need is and where our students come from.

Toowoomba is an ideal site for a university college. A city with a population of over 50,000, it is the centre of a rich agricultural area with a population in excess of 215,000. A reference to the map reveals Toowoomba as the focal point of the transport facilities of this wide portion of the State.

The wheatgrowers of Australia, very practical men, have also chosen Toowoomba as the site for the Wheat Research Centre. This centre will work in close harmony with the University of Queensland under the chairmanship of Professor Teakle.

That very fine institution, Gatton Agricultural College, within easy distance of Toowoomba, could quite easily be changed in status to become the seat of a Faculty of Agriculture.

Toowoomba is an education city. In and around it there are 16 secondary schools. Many of these are boarding schools attracting boarders from all over the State and beyond. Many students come from Brisbane itself and it would not be unreasonable to assume that, if a university college were established there those students would elect to matriculate there also. Toowoomba is so situated as to allow a university there to form its own character and identity yet it is near enough to Brisbane to act as a load-sharing, neo-metropolitan university. The provision of a university at Toowoomba would allow the 502 students from Central Queensland to be absorbed into the Townsville college thus giving Townsville the numerical strength to obtain autonomy. It is realised, of course, that I refer to future students, not those at present undertaking courses at St. Lucia.

An area in south-west Toowoomba has already been chosen as a site, and hundreds of acres could be made available within 3½ miles of the centre of the city. Machinery has been set in motion to have this site dedicated for University purposes under the town plan.

The possibilities of the discovery of commercial quantities of oil in south Queensland are not to be discounted, and such a discovery could lead to an explosive increase in the size and importance of Toowoomba and district.

On the occasion of the 1960 Harristown High School Speech Night at Toowoomba, the Minister for Education and Migration said, *inter alia*, that the provision of a University college at Toowoomba depended on the support given by the citizens of Toowoomba. Accordingly, the Darling Downs University Establishment Association was formed, of which the Leader of the Opposition and myself are active members, to give the Minister the support that he sought. This association has now offered to raise £100,000 to assist in the establishment of a Darling Downs University College. I might add that the membership of the association now exceeds 2,000 in the area. Each of those members has paid a subscription of £1 1s., and others have made, or promised, substantial donations. I earnestly commend the work of the association to the serious consideration of every hon. member. May the Government pursue their vigorous education policy and establish a University college where it can meet a real need—at Toowoomba.

The people of Toowoomba are generally pleased with the great improvement shown in many Government departments and are conscious of the energetic endeavours of those responsible to eliminate costly delays. In particular, this is noticeable in the processing of documents in the Titles Office.

When the Government assumed office, it was accepted as inevitable that documents forwarded to the Titles Office for processing would not be returned for months. At the present time, due entirely to the efforts of the department, the delay has now been almost entirely eliminated.

Toowoomba can also boast now of a modern State Government Insurance Office. Not only does the office provide every facility for the convenience of the general public, but the building itself has contributed in no small measure to the overall modern aspect that the particular locality has acquired.

There are many other instances in Toowoomba where the Government have left their mark in a beneficial way; but there are, unfortunately, other aspects of Government that have brought them into disrepute. I refer, of course, to the general transport problems, which have already been referred to by the hon. member for Barambah, the hon. member for Fassifern, and the hon. member for Condamine.

I should like to inform the House at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I do endorse the sentiments of those hon. members who have taken this stand and spoken so forthrightly against the State Transport Act of 1960, or parts of it. Since the Government introduced the Act, because of my business interest in road transport and because of my loyalty to a Government that I believe will correct the errors in the legislation as soon as it has been given a fair trial, I have been reluctant to take a prominent part in discussions on this matter lest I should be branded a disgruntled road haulier. Notwithstanding this loyalty on my part, I have still been branded a disgruntled road haulier, and I think the time has now come for some plain talking on this matter.

Today, I want hon. members to place themselves in my position as the member for Toowoomba East, a locality that has come to be recognised as the very home and birthplace of road transport.

As a person whose practical experience in road transport goes back many years, and as a person representing this electorate as a Liberal, I am being continually asked, "What are you doing about the transport problem?" I have been informed that my inactivity up until now is due to the fact that the State Transport Act of 1960 is protecting Liberal electorates at the expense of Country Party areas. Whether by design or accident, that is the general impression created by the implementation of this Act, and I say quite unreservedly that if any one single piece of legislation enacted by this Government is going to help bring about their ultimate downfall, it is the State Transport Act of 1960.

I believe the time has come when we must all recognise the fact that as members of Parliament our loyalty is not limited to our parliamentary colleagues, but it more rightly belongs to the people of Queensland.

We are a Government primarily dedicated to the encouragement of private enterprise. We expound the virtues of our policy to encourage the initiative of the individual, and we claim this State of Queensland is a land of opportunity, with its doors wide open to welcome men of initiative who will establish new industries here.

But, is this our honest approach or is it just propaganda that is not worth the cost involved in producing the various advertising media so widely circulated throughout the State?

In our efforts to establish new industries here, let us not be blinded by our mediocre success in the metropolitan area to the extent that we ignore the welfare of firmly-established industries such as road transport.

Here we have a firmly-implanted industry, one that over the years has provided employment for many thousands of Queenslanders, and one that has also provided the Government of the day with a reasonable source of revenue.

Today we find the very existence of this industry threatened by extinction through the implementation of the 1960 Transport Act. Our promises to revise the Act in such a way that it would provide for healthy and equitable competition between road and rail have gone with the wind, and in place of those promises what do we find?

We find an accelerated effort on the part of those responsible for the administration of the Act to tax the operators out of existence under the pretext that business must be channelled to the railways.

Any effort to recoup the recurring losses of the railways must be regarded as commendable, provided that in doing so some other instrumentality is not called upon to subsidise these losses brought about by inefficiency and wanton disregard for the economics involved.

Let me take you back to November last year when the Minister for Transport moved that a Bill be introduced to consolidate and amend the law relating to transport.

During his introduction of the Bill, the Minister made statements that I think bear repeating now. I quote from "Hansard" at page 1538—

"Further, the need for any change in our transport legislation has been brought about by the continuing persistent public demand for a more liberal approach to road transport. I do not think any hon. member in this Chamber will deny that there has been a persistent demand from the public for a more liberalised system. That has come particularly from the country. The demand is not so clearly defined in the capital-city area because it is a centre of large population and transport costs are not so evident as they are in the far-flung portions of the State. I think it would be safe to claim that transport control is a matter that affects

country people much more than city dwellers and the Government are well aware of this. Nevertheless, we do recognise that any legislation that is to be passed must be for the benefit of the community as a whole.

"By introducing this Bill, I claim that the Government are facing squarely up to the transport problem and are not shirking any of the issues involved.

"It is realised that after this Bill becomes law, no longer will the railways experience much of the protection that they enjoy today, but this is a competitive age and the railways must compete or retire gracefully from some of the areas."

Again I quote from "Hansard" at page 1539—

"In the new approach to transport the Government are seeking to establish the following principles:—

(a) That all areas of the State receive fair and equal treatment in road transport matters."

Explanations such as these would naturally convey the impression that the Government were really approaching this problem in a fair and impartial manner. However, since the implementation of this Act many people have been astounded to find that this policy is not being pursued.

The Act, we were told, was designed to free the roads and to open up rail and road transport to fair competition. It has done nothing of the sort. On the contrary, so severe has been the taxation rate imposed on country hauliers and so absurd the list of prohibited goods that they cannot carry over a distance of 100 miles that every reputable road firm in Southern Queensland at least has been forced to restrict its services, retrench its staff and in some cases to operate at a loss. In the meantime, interstate road haulage has seized the opportunity to invade Queensland markets and what is known as border hopping could again become a major problem. This is ironical when one considers that the Act was primarily introduced to prevent such operations.

The most extraordinary feature of the Act is that it was brought down by a Government supposedly sympathetic to the lot of the country man, yet its full severity falls on country people alone. It will be argued that it is only the ex-licensed operators who are complaining about the taxation under the Act. It will be put to us that there are other operators who are still prepared to operate and pay the tax of 3d. per ton per mile. That is true, but the important point is that the ex-licensed hauliers were providing a daily service to the community. Regardless of whether their trucks were fully laden or only partly loaded they maintained that service, but in the other cases, no mention has been made, in the arguments, as to how often these new operators will carry loads to

a particular area. Hon. members can take it from me that their service schedule is dependent upon full loads being available and that they will not run until they have a full load. In many cases they are prepared to operate once a week but that is not enough to be regarded as a service to which many of our country people have been accustomed.

Ex-licensed hauliers have built their businesses on daily services and it would be a very undesirable move to depart from that standard.

This Act did not tax anybody living within 25 miles of a town thereby freeing about 80 per cent. of the people of Queensland, clustered around the main seaboard cities and towns of commodity taxation; and the list of prohibited goods does not apply to hauliers operating up to 100 miles. So the full impact of the Act is obviously falling on country areas, and once again, extraordinary as it may seem, the impact of the Act increases the farther a haulier travels. That is nothing short of a criminal blow at the development of our country areas by a Government pledged to develop country areas.

If industry around Brisbane is unable to compete if it is subjected to road tax, how much more necessary is it that our primary producers and country business men and country industrialists should be given the same privileges!

At this stage I should like to make it clear that road transport is not asking for the right to run on our roads for nothing, although the right has actually been advocated to a Liberal school of political science by no less a person than the Federal Attorney-General, Sir Garfield Barwick. All trucks registered over four tons, be they empty or loaded, pay to the Government a road maintenance tax. This tax has been assessed by the High Court of Australia as a fair and reasonable contribution to wear and tear of our roads and accepted by this Government and other State Governments after a detailed study of the matter by experts. In recent weeks the Treasurer has appeared to be under the impression that by asking for an open road the hauliers are asking for the right to run tax free. They are not. They have no objection to paying the road maintenance provided it can be administered fairly, and have no objection to paying a fair and just road tax, but country hauliers and their customers do not see why they should be singled out for a sectional commodity tax that increases as they travel, when something like 80 per cent. of our urban population goes scot free and many city trucks are registered under four tons and do not even pay road maintenance tax. When one studies the implication of sectional taxation on country road transport, it makes one wonder if the Government are sincere in any way in their stated aims of developing country areas, or if they are only interested in a handful of coastal cities, mainly Brisbane.

The vast proportion of the State's income is derived from primary products, beef, sheep, wool, grain, minerals and so on. We are facing the threat of the European Common Market, with the crying need to decrease production costs to meet more highly competitive markets. There is no greater factor than transport charges in arriving at production costs of our primary producers and rural industries. Yet in Queensland we are imposing unjust sectional taxation on the transport of their goods to and from the coast.

The Government have now embarked on a venture that I claim will only further contribute to our losses. I refer, of course, to the recently granted concessional rates on rail to the South-west. This particular area has always been an unprofitable area for the Railway Department. Table 13 of the report for 1960 of the Commissioner for Railways refers to the southern division. The division showed a loss of more than £4,000,000 in that year but the point I wish to emphasise is the Warwick-Dirranbandi section. This section showed a loss of £588,534 for the 12 months. During that period the Railway Department was charging £15 a ton for second-class goods from Brisbane to Goondiwindi, a rail distance of 284 miles. Now, because of the intrusion of the New South Wales railways into the area, the Government have been prepared to reduce the railway rate to £6 10s. a ton for the same class of goods. This rate is 7s. 6d. a ton less than the charge for the same class of goods from Brisbane to Gattoon, a rail distance of only 61 miles. Moreover, the railways have reduced the first-class rate from Brisbane to Goondiwindi to £5 a ton. In doing so they are going to the extreme when one considers that road hauliers are required to pay almost the same amount in tax if they wish to carry goods to the same area.

I claim the whole approach to this has been made very hastily, without thought being given to the economics or the wisdom of the venture. A more acceptable and logical approach would have been to afford road hauliers some taxation relief so that they could have counteracted this interstate competition, and at the same time provide the Government with a reasonable return. Not only would such a scheme have the desired effect of retaining business in Queensland, but also it would eliminate the certainty of the southern division falling further into debt through these operations in the area concerned.

I want it to be clearly understood that in opposing the present scale of taxation under the Transport Act I am not denying the right to any Government to impose taxation in any field provided the taxation is fair and reasonable, but like the hon. member for Barambah I am strongly opposed to the requirement to pay tax on goods that are not carried. Neither is my opposition to this requirement selfish. After all, the operator does not pay the tax, it is

passed on to the consumer like other taxes, and this is the point where I claim my loyalty lies with the people of the south-western portion of Queensland. They are the people who are being called upon to subsidise our railway losses; they are the people who are being called upon to provide some of the revenue which is building our roads and our schools throughout the whole of the State. Why should they be singled out for this imposition? Our future success at Loan Councils depends on this State's measuring up to a greater degree to the formula under which allocations are made, and at the present time, population is a deciding element.

What encouragement is offered the people in our sparsely populated grazing area of Queensland? In places like Goondiwindi, St. George, Bollon and Surat where they have of necessity depended upon the daily services of road transport for their supplies of perishables and foodstuffs, they are now being called upon to pay tax at the rate of almost £5 a ton for the privilege of having these goods brought in by road. If there is an inability in the area to consume goods in full truckloads the tax becomes correspondingly higher. For instance, if only 5 tons of goods are carried on a 10-ton truck, the tax is at the rate of almost £10 a ton. This is an example of the encouragement offered by our Government to those people who are prepared, either in the face of recurring droughts and floods, to open up and develop our State.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is not the only aspect of the new Transport Act which requires immediate amendment if we wish to remain in government. I very strongly urge that consideration be given to the hon. member for Barambah's suggestion that some board be constituted to administer the affairs of the Railway Department on a sound businesslike basis. Furthermore, I recommend the formation of a similar board for road transport. However, this board would mainly provide an avenue of appeal. It is my considered opinion that no Act of Parliament should deny the right of appeal to any individual, but those hon. members who, like me, have perused the contents of the State Transport Act of 1960, have found that a right of appeal is completely denied.

On two occasions we have gone to the polls with a promise of a Bill of Rights, and by now it must be obvious to all that while the Transport Act remains in its present form there can be no hope of Queenslanders getting their Bill of Rights. Imagine the position: a Transport Act which completely denies a right of appeal, side by side with a Bill of Rights! It is true that certain amendments have already been made, but in the main, we must agree that they do not go near enough to rectifying the real issues involved. Let us be humble enough to accept that some of the legislation is wrong, and above all, let those

responsible for the forming and the implementation of the Act be humble enough to accept constructive suggestions. I believe that the greatest obstacle to the solution of this problem lies in the lack of knowledge exhibited by many about the exact nature of the Act itself and the unacceptable provisions which it contains. Security of tenure for the road transport industry is totally disregarded under this Act, and the absence of such an essential consideration is not only very disturbing to private enterprise but is also foreign to this Government's expressed policy. I specifically refer to Section 37, Clause (11) of the Transport Act which reads—

"A person shall not be entitled to apply for or obtain a permit under this part as of right, or have any right or remedy whatsoever in law in respect of the refusal of the Commissioner to grant or the cancellation or suspension by the Commissioner of such a permit."

A transport operator is virtually operating from day to day at the pleasure of the Commissioner. Such a state of affairs is hardly conducive to the development of the industry, let alone its expansion. It is interesting to compare this arrangement with that recently entered into by the Government with Amoco in which this company is offered security of tenure for at least 10 years by obtaining the exclusive patronage of all governmental departments for that period.

I have in the past advocated the creation of more all-party committees to examine matters that cause public concern. We now have an opportunity to put such a committee to very good use. I endorse the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Merthyr in this debate last week when he referred to select committees. Moreover, in our Opposition we have many sincere Queenslanders who could play a much bigger role in the development of the State by service on such committees. Instead of a committee that is predominantly Country Party or Liberal, select or all-party committees could function to advantage in handling the transport problem. They would be ones in which decisions would be made and suggestions offered which would not necessarily be motivated by a desire to suppress any suggestion of Government error.

Members of the Opposition, instead of sitting there merely for the sake of opposing and indulging in negative sniping, should be invited to contribute suggestions such as those made by the hon. member for Barambah, in the hope that, while there is still time, an acceptable Transport Act could be framed.

Personally, while I agree with the principle of his suggestion to devise a sliding scale of taxation, I believe the scale should be applied in a manner that would produce a more equitable distribution of tax. I am of the opinion that the rate could remain at

3d. a ton mile for the first 100 miles—it could even be raised to 4d.—but after that point is reached the tax remains constant. Furthermore, the first 25 miles should be completely free. This provision would serve not only to harmonise with the Government's desire to grant this 25-mile concession but also to counteract any desire on the part of operators to seek immunity under Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution.

In short, tax payable on a journey of 100 miles would actually be assessed at the rate of 4d. a ton mile for 75 miles—£1 5s. a ton—and journeys in excess of 100 miles would still be taxed at the rate of £1 5s. a ton. Such a scheme would not place country people at any disadvantage to those living within 100 miles of the capital, where most of the loading originates. It will be argued that taxation imposed on a basis of vehicle capacity is the only way the Act can be carried out and, whilst there might be some substance in the argument theoretically, in actual practice no vehicle operates fully loaded all the time.

To eliminate the obnoxious requirement referred to by the hon. member for Barambah, which amounts to paying tax on goods that are not carried, some thought could be given to applying the tax to a percentage of the gross carrying capacity of the vehicle. This principle appears to work very satisfactorily in its application to payments under the Roads (Contribution to Maintenance) Act, which are assessed in part on 40 per cent. of the capacity of the vehicle.

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

Mr. ANDERSON: I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the hon. member for Balonne. In this case I believe 50 per cent. or 75 per cent. of the capacity of the vehicle could be considered in respect of the State Transport Act. However, time does not permit me to go into all the aspects of the Act. That concludes my contribution towards the problem of road transport today. I again emphasise the need for all hon. members to study the Act very carefully and to contribute constructive thoughts, which will undoubtedly assist to solve this problem which confronts not only the Government but also the people of Queensland themselves.

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) (2.40 p.m.): I wish to associate myself with the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Deputy Leader and supported by previous speakers on this side of the House. Before giving my reasons for supporting the amendment, I wish to congratulate Mr. O'Donnell, the new member for Barcoo, on his election. During the debate various speakers, particularly members of the Government parties, have said what a great man the hon. member for Whitsunday is. Personally, I have never met the hon. member, but I listened to his speech in moving the motion for the adoption

of the Address in Reply. After listening to that speech and the speech of the hon. member for Barcoo, I have no doubt in my mind about the quality and sincerity of the speech delivered by Mr. O'Donnell. I am certain that he will have a long and successful parliamentary career, and I know that he will be a welcome addition to the ranks of the Opposition.

I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition for several reasons. In my opinion, the Government are completely ignorant of the reason why the amendment was moved, just as they are ignorant of many other facets of Queensland's economy. During the last few years we have heard fanfares of trumpets and a great deal of publicity designed to fool the people, but the Premier of Queensland is now in a real panic. I can honestly say that right now the Premier could be called "Frightened Frank" because of the turmoil within the Country and Liberal parties. This afternoon the Brisbane "Telegraph" carries a bold headline "State Crisis" in relation to a pseudo State Country Party man. It is a crisis, because the Country Party boys and the Libs. have their six-guns out and are fighting it out. With all this monkey business and fighting going on, I should like to know how the Liberal Party accepted the hon. member for Rockhampton South. I should say that if anybody should get into the Liberal Party, it should be the hon. member for Redcliffe.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. THACKERAY: For the benefit of hon. members opposite, I inform them that I have my hearing aid turned off today.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am afraid I shall need a hearing aid to hear the hon. member if the interjections persist. I ask hon. members to allow me to hear the hon. member for Rockhampton North.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. May I call your attention to the fact that the hon. member for Maryborough is continually interrupting a member of his own party who is trying very hard to make a speech? Is this not in very bad taste?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will watch the conduct of hon. members

Mr. THACKERAY: I thank you for your courtesy, Mr. Deputy Speaker. No doubt hon. members opposite are trying to prevent me from saying some of the things that they do not want to hear. As I said, it has been suggested that the hon. member for Bowen should join the Country Party if the hon. member for Redcliffe is admitted to the Liberal Party. It is a pretty silly idea on the part of the Liberals. They are slick chicks in their own right, and they knew that, if they could get away with the deal, the Country Party would still be one less at the next election because the A.L.P. will win that seat then.

At least there is one fighting man in the Country Party—the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, Mr. Evans. He is the only man with the courage to stand up and oppose the Federal Government. No-one else in the Country Party or the Liberal Party is prepared to do that.

Getting down to tin tacks, the Government have made use of sensational headlines over the past four years as part of a publicity stunt, telling the people what the Government are going to do for Queensland. I have a headline here, "Glorious Plans for Queensland", about which I shall say something in a few minutes. Today the people of Queensland are crying out for full employment. Unemployment is the No. 1 problem in Queensland. The people are crying out for homes; they want price control; they want control over the exorbitant prices being charged for meat, footwear and other essential commodities. The prices spiral is ever increasing. The Government said that they would not interfere with the "C" Series Index yet last year, by their Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill, they interfered with it to such an extent that it is now costing the unions thousands of pounds to go to the Industrial Commission for quarterly basic wage adjustments.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. THACKERAY: The clowns are enjoying themselves today.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has referred to other hon. members as clowns. It is an unparliamentary expression and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. THACKERAY: I withdraw it, but I thought they enjoyed my comment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THACKERAY: Unemployment is a permanent part of the picture in Queensland today. In July this year there were 16,202 unemployed in Queensland whereas in July last year there were only 6,822. It means that in the last 12 months 9,390 more people have become unemployed. Yet the Government say that there is nothing to worry about, that it is only seasonal, and that the drought has a lot to do with it. There is proof of permanent unemployment in Queensland. In the city of Rockhampton, in July, 1961, in the peak of the meat industry, there were 192 unemployed. In July last year there were 116 unemployed, showing that in Rockhampton alone in the last 12 months unemployment has increased by 76.

A great deal has been said in the House about unemployment in Rockhampton and the setting up of unemployment committees. The Minister for Labour and Industry set up an advisory committee on unemployment in Rockhampton. As has been the case with other committees set up by that Minister this committee has never ever functioned.

One of the managing directors of the Rockhampton "Bulletin" was on the committee but he resigned because of the poor attendance at meetings and the deplorable attitude adopted by the Government. Last year another unemployment committee was set up, comprising people from all sections of the community. It gradually died away because of poor attendances. At the last three meetings only two attended—a reporter from the "Morning Bulletin" and myself. The hon. member for Rockhampton South talks as if he did everything. One would think that nobody else existed. There are four other parliamentary representatives for Central Queensland but according to the hon. member he does everything. He is one of the worst attenders at meetings in Rockhampton. He arranged for a meeting last Saturday, but only five of us attended. Only one union showed up—the A.M.I.E.U. I know that union has the greatest number of people unemployed in Rockhampton, but it is not the wish of the Trades and Labour Council to have a Tory Mayor representing the Liberal Party, who were responsible for the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill last year, crying with crocodile tears about unemployment in Rockhampton. Recently he made a statement in Rockhampton about a crocodile that had died at the Rockhampton Botanical Gardens. What do we find there? Headlines again—we must have an autopsy on what killed the crocodile! I believe we should have an autopsy on the present Government to find out why they are so dead in relation to unemployment in Queensland. If the hon. member for Rockhampton South, with his doctor colleague on the Rockhampton City Council, can spare time for that sort of thing they should come down here and rejuvenate this hopeless Government.

The hon. member for Rockhampton South spoke the other day of a scheme for the expenditure of £100,000. I support him in that but, so far as receiving any financial assistance from the Federal Government is concerned I believe the whole scheme will be no more than a fairy tale.

Hon. members know what happened in relation to the Mt. Isa project only a week or so ago. We were told the terms on which the Government agreed two years ago. I spoke to Mr. George Pearce, the Government Whip in the Federal Parliament, and he told me that two years ago this Government agreed to the conditions laid down. He said that Mr. Hiley agreed entirely in principle and also signed the document that the Commonwealth Government would make available a certain sum each year for the reconstruction of the Mt. Isa line. I do not think we will get much money from the Commonwealth Government to relieve unemployment in Central Queensland. I do not think that the Queensland Government are sincere about doing anything in that regard. They have been in power for four years and have done nothing.

A perusal of the figures relating to shops and factories in the Rockhampton area for 1960 and 1961 will disclose that they are stationary and that no new shops and factories have been built during that period.

The statistics in relation to the building of homes are also enlightening. I have compared the figures for Rockhampton which was the second city in the State with those for the three cities that have now outgrown it—Ipswich, Toowoomba, and Townsville. Last year, in the month of May, the new homes built in Townsville numbered 72, whilst 32 were built at Ipswich, 31 in Toowoomba and only 11 in Rockhampton. That is the trend in all fields in Rockhampton and Rockhampton is not progressing as it should.

When this Government came into power in 1957 the Deputy Premier, who is one of the greatest propagandists of all time, had plenty to say in an endeavour to slip in ahead of Mr. Nicklin and become Premier. In the Brisbane "Telegraph" of 7 September, 1957, he had this to say—

"The State Government was preparing a five-year plan for the industrial development of Queensland, the Deputy Premier (Mr. Morris) said today.

"Mr. Morris said the plan would place heavy emphasis on the industrial potential of Central Queensland."

He goes on—

"The plan would provide for five years of spaced development in the central zone."

Then follow on various dates these sensational headlines—

"Big Cabinet Plan to Expand Central Queensland"

"To ask Federal help in survey"

"Raw deal claim for Central Queensland"

Then the hon. member for Rockhampton South, the fighting Mayor of Rockhampton, in 1958 said—

Mr. Pizzey: You give him plenty of publicity.

Mr. THACKERAY: He said plenty about the hon. gentleman in 1958. Amongst other things he said—

"The politicians are only partly to blame. It is the public servants who rule the whole country. They are stopping us from getting our fair share of development."

He talked about the railway station at Rockhampton—

"During the election members of the present Government had ridiculed the galvanised iron station as a 'a Chinese pagoda,' but when they got into power they had made no move to replace it."

He added—

"Conditions were not fit for a dog."

A Government Member: Who said that?

Mr. THACKERAY: The hon. member for Rockhampton South, the hon. member who on Tuesday last spent the whole of his 40 minutes patting Ministers on the back, and saying they were all doing a wonderful job. Not one new industry has been established in Rockhampton.

On 6 April, 1960, at Springsure, the Premier referred to the "first report on the master plan for Queensland," but we have never heard another word about it, just as we have heard nothing further about the five-year plan. The next thing we were told was that Central Queensland may become the granary of the East. The Premier discovered that fact only when he was electioneering this year.

There is an opening for the establishment immediately of a cement works in Rockhampton. On 7 March, 1960, a big splash was made in the newspapers about the establishment of a cement works when the market expanded. The Minister for Labour and Industry had much to say about it. A company in Rockhampton, Limestone Leases Pty. Ltd., is interested in establishing a cement works in Rockhampton. I said last year in the House, and I repeat it without fear of contradiction, that only one company should be allowed to establish a cement works in Rockhampton, Limestone Leases Pty. Ltd., and not the giant monopoly that the Government support. Government members may have shares in it for all I know. If everything we read is correct, the Government should support a local cement works, not the monopoly that now controls the cement industry in Queensland. I refer to Queensland Cement and Lime Company Ltd. and North Australian Cement Ltd. The same directors control the two companies.

It was only after a series of questions in the House that those companies decided to build a clinker plant in Rockhampton. The clinker is brought from Brisbane to Rockhampton where it is crushed. I do not think those companies have any intention of building a cement works in Rockhampton. Limestone Leases Pty. Ltd. submitted a report to the Director of Secondary Industries and many people were under the misapprehension that the proposal was rejected. In fact, it was recommended by the Secondary Industries Board, a board of seven members of industry and a representative of the Government. The recommendation was sent to the Minister for Labour and Industry, who passed the report to State Cabinet. The rejection was by Cabinet on the ground that there was no room in Rockhampton for two cement works and there is no evidence of another company intending to set up a cement works in Rockhampton. If the article in "The Morning Bulletin" of 12 September is correct, the Premier should institute an inquiry. Very serious statements have been made about a cement works in Central Queensland. The article contains the statement that if a cement works was

established by Limestone Leases Pty. Ltd. the Government and Queensland would save in the vicinity of £200,000 a year.

Mr. Pizzey: Why don't they go ahead with it?

Mr. THACKERAY: They are asking the Government for a guarantee. I refer hon. members to the following passage—

"We emphasise that subject only to a guarantee for £250,000, we had available all the finance needed to proceed immediately. We had actually arranged a loan for this amount, but the lending body specified a State Government guarantee. Three such guarantees totalling £480,000 were given to North Australian Cement Ltd. some eight years ago. We do not want one penny grant from the Government, merely the signature of a guarantee. Our assets would total about £600,000 as security for the loan."

This article appears over the signature of W. R. Thomson, Limestone Leases Pty. Ltd., Rockhampton.

It continues—

"In Brisbane last week we were approached unexpectedly by an Australia-wide company with an offer to provide £500,000 capital for the works subject to granting of the Government guarantee. More important the same company will immediately establish another large basic industry associated with the cement industry."

I know the company that is involved. It is a very reputable Australia-wide company. I should say that everything Mr. Thomson says is true, because it would hardly be recommended by the Board and then be knocked back by Cabinet. It is an amazing set of circumstances. Of course, when a proposal is knocked back by Cabinet, one is inclined to ask, "Why is it knocked back by them if they believe in decentralisation?" They cannot believe in it when they would knock this company back. The limestone deposit at Rockhampton is the best of its kind in Australia. Here a Government openly talk about decentralisation, but they are not prepared to support a local company.

I wish to talk about another industry in Rockhampton, and I do not think I will get many interjections from the Country Party on this. I refer to abattoirs. I am wholeheartedly in favour of their establishment at Rockhampton because we could then tap the large number of cattle in Central Queensland. However, I do not believe that Mr. Hinchliffe, the manager of the C.Q.M.E., should be given a franchise for the local abattoirs. If Mr. Hinchliffe was prepared to make 20 per cent. of the killing facilities available to public operators we of the A.L.P. would not oppose it as strongly as we do. Mr. Hinchliffe is only concerned about the local abattoirs and the killing of 300 head a week for local consumption, but he has the audacity and the temerity to say that with the local killing

of 300 head a week, and the additional cattle he would bring in for the season, he could employ 200 to 400 men a week. With an established killing rate of 47 head per man a day, at the Lakes Creek Meatworks, these men would be working only one or two days a week. They can kill over 1,000 head a day at Lakes Creek. With the 300 head for the local market at Rockhampton, Mr. Hinchliffe cannot substantiate his statement. Within 250 miles of Rockhampton there are 84,310 square miles of grazing land, and our last statistical return showed 1,811,570 head of cattle. There are also the calves, pigs and other animals that are not included in that return. With nearly 2,000,000 beef cattle the turnover would be approximately 400,000 to 500,000 head a year. The hon. member for Kedron told me of a friend of his who was able to turn off store cattle as fats. after three months, that with the greatly improved pastures now used in Central Queensland 300 were turned off in three months on suitable lot feeding of grain.

A Government Member: Do you believe that?

Mr. THACKERAY: I honestly believe that cattle fattening is barely tapped in Central Queensland. Mr. Hinchliffe no doubt opposes the establishment of the abattoirs because he believes in the big monopolies. If it were established in Rockhampton it would most likely exceed Cannon Hill within 10 to 15 years because Central Queensland has two-fifths of the cattle of Queensland. Mr. Hinchliffe does not want another meat industry there because of the competition it would mean. Fifty per cent. of the men he can keep unemployed for six months of the year would leave there and take permanent employment elsewhere. That is one reason why we should wholeheartedly support the establishment of an abattoirs.

At this juncture I wish to thank Alderman Robert McKean of Rockhampton and Alderman Busden for the part they played despite the smear campaign engaged in by members of the Liberal Party in Rockhampton in an attempt to crucify them. The intention was for the Mayor of Rockhampton to come in and have the move for the establishment of the abattoirs defeated. The ironical part about it is that though members of the Country Party sit on the front Government bench—and we have two Country Party hon. members present in the Chamber—they openly allow a man in Rockhampton who is directly opposed to their policy to cut right across it and to defame those moving for the abattoirs in Rockhampton, notwithstanding the fact that the graziers, their greatest supporters in the country, are openly hammering for it. I do not know how many members of the Country Party have much courage. The only man on the Government side who has ever had the courage to stand up and fight on this abattoir question is the hon. member for Mackenzie. Everyone else sits back. How much support is the Minister getting on it?

If everything is running true to form and if what we hear in this House is true, the hon. member for Rockhampton South, I am led to believe, tried to have it placed on the agenda of the last Liberal Party meeting that abattoirs in Queensland be opposed in their entirety. Yet hon. members opposite are over there as blood brothers of the graziers. The graziers are their best supporters but they openly chop them down.

Mr. Hodges: Are you referring to district abattoirs?

Mr. THACKERAY: I am openly supporting the abattoirs because it will be State-owned, under the management of a board, and furthermore, it will employ men in Rockhampton and will handle Central Queensland cattle instead of having large numbers of them leave the district each year. Approximately 208,000 went through last year. We should be killing them and treating them there and providing work locally.

Mr. Pizzey: Why do you think they were sent from there?

Mr. THACKERAY: I know the answer the Minister wants—because the managing director of Lakes Creek meatworks would not pay the ruling market price. On Tuesday of last week an article appeared in the paper about the fall in meat exports and it included this statement—

“A 20 per cent. fall in Australian meat exports since June 30, 1960, has alarmed the meat industry.”

And that is the whole crux of the argument on the abattoir matter. The overseas market has fallen down. The price has deteriorated and so has the market. For years and years the export companies have not worried about home consumption. They have worried only about the export market because it has been the most lucrative. Now that the export market is falling down, they want to come in on the local market. That is exactly what is happening here.

Furthermore, Mr. Hinchliffe has eight butcher shops in Rockhampton and Lakes Creek, which would control over 50 per cent. of the distribution of meat in Rockhampton. If he were given the franchise of a local abattoirs, with no price control now on meat, the people of Rockhampton would get low-grade meat, meat not fit for the export market on certain conditions, and there would be a flood of it in Rockhampton. He would have the control of the entire wholesale and retail distribution of meat. I am directly opposed to that, because he would have the industry in his hands. If he is such a wonderful fellow, why is he introducing the Federal award in the meatworks next year?

Dealing now with the Berserker Road scheme, as I said two years ago, it is only a goat track, and the man directly responsible for the scheme is the hon. member for

Rockhampton South, the Mayor of Rockhampton. Let us see who is truthful and whom we cannot trust. I prefer to accept the Minister's answer to any trust in the hon. member for Rockhampton South, because he is not known to be very truthful at times. The Government have committed themselves and future Governments to spending the Commonwealth Rural Aid Grant on the Berserker Road scheme. Without a shadow of a doubt, the A.L.P. will win the next election and we will reverse this policy when we are the Government. This Berserker Road will not provide a public service. It is only a tourist road; but it comes within the category set out in the answer of the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity in his answer to my question. I have a great deal of time for the Minister, but on this occasion I do not think he has been strong enough to stand up to the hon. member for Rockhampton South in regard to the Berserker Road scheme.

I have a list here of the number of roads in Rockhampton and rural areas that need immediate attention. I could mention more than 17 roads in the municipality of Rockhampton that require an expenditure of over £100,000 to put them in good order. There are roads that need forming, access roads, roads that are serving the dairying industry and which have never been touched for 10 years, and roads that are serving small-crop farmers which also have never been touched. The money should be spent on these rural roads along which people are living, instead of on the Berserker Road scheme.

This is more or less a personal duel between the hon. member for Rockhampton South and the Rockhampton City Council and myself. Let me be quite open about it. The hon. member for Rockhampton South would never have had the scheme put on the agenda of the Rockhampton City Council if one member of the Australian Labour Party had not voted against the Australian Labour Party, the Q.L.P. and the Civic Advancement Party and supported Mr. Hinchliffe on this proposal.

Mr. Coburn: Is he still in the Labour Party up there?

Mr. THACKERAY: I do not know. The vote was six to five. Progress Associations in Rockhampton have been screaming their heads off about the Minister opening this road and assisting the Mayor of Rockhampton. There is a little more to this, because the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation answered my question relating to the land that would be available. The hon. member for Rockhampton South said one thing in Rockhampton about this road, but the Minister said the opposite in answer to my question. I asked the Minister for Public Lands whether certain Crown land would be made available to local authorities in Rockhampton. He said that he had been approached by the Rockhampton City

Council but the matter was still under consideration. Yet on 9 September, 1961, in George Westacott's "Topics of the Day" we read—

"It was at the Bank opening that His Worship waxed wrath over the Berserker road. In general terms he charged Rockhampton with not recognising a good thing when it saw one, and in this instance was looking a gift horse in the mouth.

He claimed that this was something for nothing. The Commonwealth was giving us the money to build the road and the State would hand over enough free land adjoining for the Council to make a fortune out of it. He would be balmy to give such a proposition the knockback."

The Mayor of Rockhampton said that, but when I asked the Minister for Public Lands about the matter he replied that it was still under consideration. The Mayor of Rockhampton has the temerity to tell deliberate untruths. Either he is telling untruths or the Minister for Public Lands is telling untruths. I would rather believe the Minister for Public Lands—not that I have much time for him either—than the Mayor of Rockhampton who is a flambuoyant, open-mouthed type of gentleman who would say anything to create an impression. Who is telling the truth, the Mayor of Rockhampton or the Minister for Public Lands? If the Minister for Public Lands had anything concrete he would have submitted it to Parliament because it involves the use of Crown land. The Mayor of Rockhampton is the man who comes forward with all these hare-brained schemes, suggesting what wonderful ideas they are.

I want to say a little about the Emu Park-Tungamull road. I should have the whole-hearted support of the hon. member for Callide on this subject. For some considerable time we have been working together on the scheme. Before I left the Keppel electorate I told Mr. Jones what was wanted by the associations at Yeppoon, Emu Park and Keppel Sands and the Rockhampton Chamber of Commerce. We require a tourist road from Rockhampton, taking in Tungamull, Keppel Sands, across Cooraman Creek to a point the Minister mentioned in his letter to me, which I shall not have time to read, thence to Yeppoon, a distance of only 25 miles. The proposed scheme is a 35-mile road. The Livingstone Shire Council, under special Commonwealth aid allocation, is being forced to spend £28,000—£5,000 from the Commonwealth Government and £2,000 from the shire council—on an unnamed and unformed road. The alternative road I am suggesting would open up a tourist area.

I have insufficient time to deal with the Rockhampton Harbour Board other than to say that the ratepayers of Rockhampton, on the statement of the Town Clerk, are subsidising the cheap harbour dues for the Central Queensland Meat Export Company, which is the greatest exporter over the wharf.

(Time expired.)

Mr. SMITH (Windsor) (3.20 p.m.): I wish to express admiration for the capable way in which the hon. member for Whitsunday and the hon. member for Aspley discharged the task of moving the occasional motion in reply to His Excellency's Speech at the opening of this session. I join with them in expressing on behalf of my constituents in Windsor and myself our loyalty to Her Majesty. I again wish to reiterate previous expressions of admiration for the manner in which His Excellency and Lady May have undertaken their multifarious grounds of activity, and the distinction with which they have discharged their several duties, together with the way in which, day by day, His Excellency has endeared himself more and more to the people of the State with whom he has come in contact.

It was very truly pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition that His Excellency had entered with tremendous zest into the duties of his office. That, I think, gives point to those parts of His Excellency's Opening Speech in which he said—

"During the past twelve months, my wife and I have continued our tours of shires and towns in many districts of the State."

"Throughout Queensland marked progress is taking place in every branch of human endeavour."

That is an expression that gives the lie direct to the spurious concern shown by hon. members opposite when dealing with the motion moved by the hon. member for Whitsunday and seconded by the hon. member for Aspley, and when speaking to the amendment moved by their Leader.

I submit that it would not be wide of the mark to suggest, in dealing with that amendment, that it was moved for the sole purpose of allowing an alliterative assault by a loquacious Labour leader. He indulged in a great deal of alliteration.

Taking the contributions we have heard supporting the amendment and dealing with the motion, it would be quite fitting to suggest that it was moved to allow an alliterative assault by a loquacious Labour Leader and to permit expressions of—

bias by Barooka,
braying by Brisbane,
belligerence by Belmont,

and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I omit the obvious from Bulimba. We could have expected the—

carping of Cairns,
the irascibility of Ipswich,
the kibosh of Kedron.

We listened for—

the moaning of Mackay, and
the mutterings of Maryborough.

We heard the nonsense of Norman, the plaintiveness of Port Curtis, and we could join the rantings of Rockhampton, the shouting of Salisbury and the scream of South Brisbane, and add to it all the trugidity of

Townsville and the wailing of Warrego. That would be the best use of alliteration one could offer as comment on the amendment and their contributions in favour of it.

Before I deal with what I consider to be a matter of considerable importance to this State and to this Chamber I should like to revert to a remark I made here in 1957 when I first dealt with one of the reforms that I consider necessary—motor vehicle insurance. Hon. members will recall that at that time I referred to the rights as between husband and wife. I made this statement long before the advent of my colleague on the other side of this House. I made certain statements then that it was unjust and iniquitous that a husband was debarred from suing a wife, and vice versa, in respect of these matters.

At a later stage, when we had enjoyed the entry of the hon. member for South Brisbane to this Chamber, I counselled caution in sweeping aside all of these restrictions applying to husband and wives and I am very happy to say that I received a measure of support from the Standing Committee set up by the House of Commons and the House of Lords, comprising some eminent members of the legal profession and the English judiciary in the persons of the Right Hon. Lord Jenkins who was Chairman of the Committee, the Right Hon. Lord Justice Pearce, the Right Hon. Lord Justice Donovan, the Hon. Justice Ashworth and the Hon. Justice Diplock. These five members of the English judiciary had with them a panel of illustrious men such as Professor Goodhart, and others well known for their works and treatises on law. The report is a short one of some nine pages, but fortunately for me it bristles with suggestions in line with those I made some years ago. I am very happy to be able to point out that fact.

The position they dealt with has also been referred to in one of the current editions of the Australian Law Journal, Volume 35, No. 3 at p. 62. I refer to that because it is a book in common regard in Queensland. I have been fortunate enough to get the actual report from our library, and I shall read from it for the benefit of those who are interested in matters of reform in law, some of the points made by the committee under the illustrious chairmanship of Lord Jenkins. The Committee said—

“The present state of the law is both anomalous and unjust. It is anomalous that at the present day a husband should be in a worse position than his wife in regard to the right of action in tort.”

Further, in the same paragraph, the following appears:—

“A further unsatisfactory result of the present law, of considerable importance in modern conditions, is the fact that a husband's (or wife's) third party insurance is of no avail to a spouse who is injured by the other's negligence.”

That is the finding of these gentlemen. They considered the point and came to a conclusion supported, I think, by the reasonable, thinking people of the State; it is unreasonable that a husband and wife are at such disadvantage.

In their report they refer to evidence of unanimous dissatisfaction with the law in its present state. They go on to quote from an edition of Salmond on Torts, an authority on the subject—

“It is difficult to understand some of the present-day law relating to husband and wife. First, it is generally agreed that the principle which prohibits actions in tort between husband and wife is justifiable, not on the ground of the obsolete fiction of the legal unity of the spouses, but because such litigation is ‘unseemly, distressing and embittering.’”

They go on further to say—

“Secondly, even if this is desirable, it is difficult to discover any reason in logic or justice for denying to the husband the two privileges at present possessed by his wife—the right to sue for pre-nuptial torts and for the protection and security of his property.”

A wife can sue a husband in those two fields, but a husband cannot sue a wife, and, on the face of it, it does appear to be an illogical distinction.

They go on—

“Thirdly, whatever rule may be thought desirable to regulate the position as between the spouses themselves, it is surely indefensible that third parties should be adversely affected by any marital privileges—as they are in several cases at the moment.”

Paragraph 6 of their report reads—

“In our view there is no good reason in this day and age for distinguishing in this way between husband and wife.”

That is a clear, categorical statement by those people well-trained in the law, people who have come in contact to a great degree with the world at large. They say—

“In our view there is no good reason in this day and age for distinguishing in this way between husband and wife, and where a right of action is given to one it should be available to the other also. It is on this basis that we proceed to consider in what circumstances the right of action should be available.”

Paragraph 7 of their report reads—

“If we were to start with a clean slate, it would no doubt be possible to adopt either of two clear-cut solutions: to permit no actions at all between husband and wife, or to allow complete freedom of legal proceedings.”

I do not propose to read the remainder of their deliberations, but shall proceed to their recommendations. They are summarised in this way—

“(1) In the case of torts not affecting the title to or possession of property either spouse should be able to sue the other as if they were unmarried.

“(2) The court should have power to stay the action (either of its own motion or on the defendant's application) if, having regard to all the circumstances including the conduct of the parties and the nature of the matter complained of, the judge is satisfied that the complaint is not one of substance or that it is not in the interests of the parties that the action should proceed.

“(3) The power to stay should be exercisable in the case of torts committed before the marriage, or after the parties have ceased to cohabit, as well as in the case of torts committed during cohabitation, but should apply only to actions brought during the subsistence of the marriage.”

Finally, they suggest the removal of some sections of the Married Women's Property Act. I have referred to the committee's report, but in the Australian Law Journal, which comments upon the report, there is a very interesting summary of the parts I did not read. In its final paragraph, the Law Journal says—

“The committee makes it clear that the court would not normally stay proceedings where the defendant appears to have a claim to indemnity or contribution from some other source, whether by means of insurance or otherwise. No reason would be seen why an insurance policy which purports to cover injuries to third parties should not extend to the insured's wife or husband unless the policy expressly provides otherwise. A consequence of the recommendations would be that a third party liable jointly with one spouse for injury caused to the other would be in a position to recover contribution from the spouse so liable.”

Were the time available we could undertake an excursion into a number of interesting situations where you have one tortfeasor held to be jointly liable with another, and the one tortfeasor finding himself completely absolved from liability because he was the husband of the plaintiff. The position has been made plain on a previous occasion and I reiterated it today to show that my submissions made in this Chamber have received the highest judicial backing and that a report of a like nature is before the Mother Parliament at the present time.

I propose to deal today with a matter that is of considerable importance to the State. There is admittedly in Queensland at present, in common with the rest of

Australia, a shortage of ready money. Many people are finding that the credit squeeze is affecting their finances.

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention to the state of the House.

(Quorum formed.)

Mr. SMITH: On the question of financial arrangements one often finds that when a right has to be pursued, or some obligation defended, the financial means of the person concerned are not sufficient to take his requisite remedy at law. My proposal this afternoon touches on the matter of providing in this State—the only State that has no such provision—some form of legal assistance. I make it clear at the outset that I am not proposing free legal aid. I am proposing assistance which will amount to legal aid, but not necessarily the provision of that legal aid without cost to the litigant. The proposal does intend, and in essence proposes, that legal assistance be made available to a person with limited means, on his satisfying a very stringent and rigorous means test. This proposal is not novel. In the other States of Australia, for instance, in New South Wales in 1918, in Victoria in 1958—which provision repealed an earlier one of 1928—in South Australia in 1925, in Western Australia in 1928, provisions similar to the one I am now advocating were made. These provisions have been in operation, with one alteration in Western Australia, and the one repealed, and re-instituted in 1958 in Victoria, in the form in which they were originally introduced. I submit that this is a most important matter for us to consider in Queensland because we have no form of assistance for litigants in actions of a civil nature.

We are at the present time confronted with the spectacle of the case of a man named Cavanagh who sought and obtained a pardon. I must say that the answer given this morning seemed to give rise to grave doubts as to whether the pardon was given on proper grounds. However, it was given. Suppose a person wishes to enforce some civil right. In Queensland, unfortunately, unless he has money he must forgo his rights. I know that in 1215 in the Magna Carta it was proudly proclaimed that “To none will we sell, to none will we deny or delay, rights or justice,” and it has been tritely said that the doors of the Supreme Court, the courts of justice, are open to all, just as are the doors of the Ritz Hotel. The only trouble is that many people cannot pay to go through them and a statement like that brings our legal system into disrepute because we have so many civil aids, so many departments set up to assist people in this, that and the other way but in matters relating very often to their rights or their very livelihood they are deprived of any worthwhile assistance. In criminal cases we provide in Queensland an adequate although not magnificent system of

assistance, but one looks in vain for any such assistance in civil cases, and those are important.

In England in 1949 there was passed a very important measure and it has continued to the present day without basic alteration. It has been administered by the Law Society there and has been an unqualified success. It was amended in 1960 to relax the stringency of the means test, not to increase it. Anyone in his right senses will realise that if an Act had been in force for 11 years, and administered and applied for that time, the Government of Great Britain would not have seen fit to extend its provisions unless it had been working well and truly and fairly. We all know that the members of the British Parliament are just as much concerned about their financial position as are the members of any other Parliament, yet in 1960 the Parliament of England saw fit to extend the assistance to people previously outside its ambit.

I have been assured by practitioners from England that it has been an unqualified success, not to the practitioner—and here I must issue the timely warning that legal assistance is not a bean feast for lawyers as it is applied in England and as I propose we should apply it here. The lawyer works for a stipulated 85 per cent. of the taxed costs recovered. In the ordinary matters in our courts a lawyer will certainly want the taxed costs and very often he looks for and receives more than those but under legal aid he can recover only 85 per cent. of the taxed costs. Those costs do not come out of a fund contributed entirely by the State. Admittedly the State makes an initial contribution. I think in England £300,000 was allotted to fund the Legal Aid Fund. Eighty-five per cent. goes to the practitioners and 15 per cent. is used to administer the fund. In all those years it has been running at a profit and running so well that last year they were able to enlarge the scope of assistance and extend it to people who previously had not been getting it. To disabuse the mind of anyone who might feel that the assistance is given lightly I point out that you do not get assistance if you are the possessor of a motor-car or a TV set or like items. You must show that you are in a financial position which prohibits your obtaining legal aid from your own resources. You can take the man of your own choosing because in England every reputable practitioner lists himself as available for the service. It is regarded as a service by those practitioners. Silks, junior barristers, busy practitioners, and those who are not so busy, regard it as a duty and an honour to make themselves available for service in this field, and they all take the work. I was informed by a solicitor that in one trial that involved about two months' work by him, he obtained fees amounting to about 50 guineas. Although this was well below what he would otherwise have charged, he regarded it as an honour to undertake the work. That was on the criminal side.

On the civil side, of course, his position would have been secure to 85 per cent. of the taxed costs.

It virtually boils down to legal assistance on hire purchase, because a person who has a case or action pending goes to a solicitor and makes known his case. The solicitor then submits to the committee administering the legal aid assistance his opinion of the case. The committee does not issue the necessary certificate just on that say-so. It considers the report of the practitioner and considers the matter itself, and if it is satisfied (a) that the man is in a financial position that does not enable him to obtain legal assistance and (b) that he has a worthwhile case, either to prosecute or to defend, it issues the certificate. From then on the matter is handled through the committee administering the legal aid fund.

A client can choose whatever counsel he wants. He is not compelled to take any particular practitioner but has the opportunity of exercising a choice. His fees are paid from the fund, and the committee then sees that it recovers the fees from the client by instalments. The practitioner does not do it as a matter of duty; he does it as an ordinary matter of practice. He is paid in the ordinary way, except that he gets only 85 per cent. of the taxed costs, not one hundred per cent.

In this way the client gets representation, and his case is presented as it should be presented because he is represented. Hon. members should not imagine that a person can go along and represent himself with success. To listen to some submissions made by hon. members here, one would think that they knew all the principles of law. Nevertheless, it is unwise for a layman to go into court, particularly on an involved matter, unless he has representation, and in this way he gets the best representation he could desire. As I have pointed out, all reputable practitioners are desirous of submitting themselves, and do in fact submit themselves, as possible nominees on this panel.

Having reached that stage, let me point out that when this Act was brought down in England about 90 per cent. of the matters that were contested with legal assistance were matrimonial causes. There is a significant social evil attendant on the absence of this assistance in Queensland. In Australia, matrimonial causes now come under the Matrimonial Causes Act recently brought down by the Federal Attorney-General. The Act is common to all States, and it disposes of all causes and matters concerned with matrimonial affairs, including children and property matters. I am concerned here with the plight of children who may be born into a family with limited means which then breaks up. In the case of a well-to-do family it does not matter, because the party who wishes to break up the family—let us say it is the husband, a man of means—knows he can pay his wife's costs. If the wife has means, she has no worry

because she can pay the costs. But if the husband and wife both have limited means, or more particularly if the party who has the care of the children has limited means, it means this: a husband may be struggling to maintain and support four or five children, and perhaps his wife, dissatisfied with their humble circumstances and still enjoying the beauty of her youth, forms another attachment and leaves her husband and family. After five years—and this is most important because of the law in force today—she is entitled to bring an action claiming a dissolution of the marriage on the ground of separation. A concomitant to that action is the settlement of property and custody rights to the children of the marriage. In the intervening five years the husband may have looked after four or five children of very tender years. He may have had a worthless spouse who deserted him and the children. She may have misconducted herself, but as a poor man he has not got the money to employ a private inquiry agent to snoop around and get evidence to divorce his wife. He has not the money to institute at the end of two years an action for dissolution of the marriage on the grounds of desertion. He carries on doing the best he can. He supports his children—educates them, feeds them and clothes them. Then we come to the stage where at the instigation of his wife, the wrongdoer, he is met with some legal proceedings. If he could show himself to be a person entitled to legal aid under the practice obtaining in England he would be saved from the consequences which almost automatically follow in Australia. He would not have to provide security for his wife's costs in the action. He would be able to go into court and present some case claiming the custody of the children. As it is now, if he has not got the means, he must go to a solicitor and say, "My wife is taking proceedings for divorce against me." The solicitor will quite naturally and rightly say, "That will cost you so much. We will require to brief counsel for this and we need so much on account." This is the man who for the last four or five years has been striving his hardest to keep his family together. He has fed them and clothed them. He has not got that amount of money in hand. He is an honest working man, in employment perhaps, but he could not lay out 100 or 150 guineas on the nail. The solicitor is not obliged to act for charity. He could not ask counsel to act for nothing. He could not take the case with the prospect of ultimate gain; that would be professionally improper. He has two choices. He could say, (1) "Very well, you cannot pay me, I will do it for nothing." I do not think that there is anyone in the Chamber who, in his particular line of business, would be keen to do for nothing any of the services which normally attach to his ordinary occupation. I cannot see people doing that more than once anyway. In any event, the solicitor either says he will do it for nothing

or (2) he says, "I am sorry, I cannot help you" and the man goes away. It is quite open to the wife, using the ordinary processes of law, to go to court to get against that man an order for costs, securing the costs of her own action that will eventually come on, and to get against him an order for maintenance to keep her in her ordinary station in life, as well as to get a division of property which years ago she deserted. Probably it is property to which she did not contribute in any way. Probably the husband's wages had built up the possessions that they shared. But because he has not been able to put his case before the court, because he has had no legal assistance, he may lose custody of the children that he has looked after through thick and thin in the intervening years. It is a pretty sad story for a man and a sad picture for the family. I am not saying that necessarily the woman is in the wrong. Very often the man is in the wrong, but I have taken this as a specific instance. Perhaps five children are torn from a loving parent and their custody granted to a disinterested one, not because the court did it willingly but because the court did not know—there was no presentation by the husband of his side of the story. The court has nothing more to go on and in all fairness, honesty and conscience it gives custody of the children to the woman. With legal assistance that man would have been enabled to put his facts to the committee in order to get assistance, and the case could have been determined on its merits. It could well be that the same results would have eventuated but at least he would have put his case. We must take heed of the importance of family life and the devastation to the young that can be caused by proceedings that do take place. We are breeding, in circumstances and situations such as I have outlined, four or five possible delinquents of the future because they are shuttlecocks; they are going perhaps to the wrong parents. We are then fostering in our midst places like Westbrook and the Wilson Home, places that I do not regard with any joy or pride.

We could, on the other hand, perhaps save the State an immense burden by granting legal aid, in the first place, to many of these people from broken homes. By granting legal assistance to a man or woman who could put their cases we could get the right parents for these children and in future years avoid creating many of our delinquents.

The legislative steps involved are quite simple. The Act in question, the 1949 Act in England, is a short Act and in its framework and scheme is quite a simple measure. It sets out in the first part what shall be the assistance and I think it is important to read to the Chamber just what is envisaged by "assistance" by this Act. It points out in Section 1. Part (1) in the Legal Aid and Advice Act of 1949—

"Legal aid shall consist of representation, on the terms provided for by this Part of this Act, by a solicitor and so far as

necessary by counsel (including all such assistance as is usually given by solicitor or counsel in the steps preliminary or incidental to any proceedings or in arriving at or giving effect to a compromise to avoid or bring to an end any proceedings)."

So you get the full gamut of representation—the representation in court and the preliminary assistance incidental to those proceedings, and they are important and valuable requirements. Having decided what assistance is, can any hon. member of this Chamber say that we could not gainfully adopt such a provision in this State? What are these necessitous people in our midst to do if they have to go to court? They cannot go on their own. If they do they have a most unhappy reception. They are faced in many circumstances with strange surroundings. The court does not work on the principles espoused by T.V. sessions seen from time to time. The courts here do not work on the basis of Perry Mason pulling a rabbit out of the hat. Anyway, the person who does pull the rabbit out of the hat is not always the person who is in the right.

Mr. Sherrington: Is this rabbit the hon. member for Redcliffe?

Mr. SMITH: If it is a goat the hon. member is asking about we could probably identify him. There are many provisions of this Act that commend themselves to me and that I commend in turn to this Chamber. The financial provisions in Section 2 make it quite clear that no litigant profits under this Act. If he recovers an award or judgment then so much of that judgment as is necessary to pay costs—not entirely, but there is a sliding scale which protects the litigant, allowing him judgment but ensuring that he pays his proportion of the costs. If the award is not big enough he pays it by instalments. The practitioners do not lose their fees. They get their fees at a reduced scale if the award is not big enough. I am harping on the reduced scale to show it is not the bonanza suggested from time to time in this Chamber. The litigant, however, is placed in an immeasurably better position. He can have his litigation and pay for it on terms. I do not think anyone can object to that.

Mr. Bennett: You are suggesting that we put the law on the instalment plan?

Mr. Hanlon: Go to gaol today and pay tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH: Taking the first of those interjections, which is relevant, I say "Yes". It is what the law courts in England have been doing for the past 12 years. They are doing it on hire purchase. I cannot see how any hon. member, including the hon. member for South Brisbane who can see some strange things, can possibly see any wrong in such a scheme. It is far better to allow a litigant with a just cause to wage that cause in court and pay for it over the next 12 months.

Mr. Sherrington: Don't you believe in free legal aid?

Mr. SMITH: No, I do not. Obviously the hon. member for Salisbury was not present when I explained the Act. If he was here he probably could not understand my explanation.

I am reminded by the hon. member for Condamine, and I am not surprised, that he could not be understood in the country. I do not know where he would be understood. Free legal aid in my view is not desirable. A litigant should be able to put his case and later pay for it in the manner I have suggested. I should be surprised if there were many hon. members in this Chamber, well paid and well looked after as they are, who could stand the cost of a very big action. I could not.

Mr. Ramsden: What is that about being well paid?

Mr. SMITH: I accept the correction. There are ways in which costs can be run up.

Mr. Hanlon: Mr. Aboud ran them up pretty well in the Westbrook case.

Mr. Bennett: And the Palm Island one.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. Noble: The hon. member for South Brisbane is jealous.

Mr. SMITH: For the benefit of the hon. member for South Brisbane I point out that if for any reason the Committee of the Law Society does exclude a counsel or solicitors from one of these panels the right of appeal is given. Provision is made that a person can only be excluded for good cause. The hon. member for South Brisbane could appeal if he was excluded from the panel.

Mr. Bennett: If this scheme of yours came into operation, your people would have to pay you off in tobacco leaf in Boggo Road.

Mr. SMITH: We could probably get some of the tobacco the hon. members people put away years ago.

The English provision has been in force for 12 years. The ramifications of the Scheme have been expanded in the last year. Obviously finance is not a pertinent question, because no-one could convince me that in a country such as Great Britain members of Parliament would extend the ramifications of the scheme if it were running at a loss in the first instance. They would have had it investigated carefully before they approved the amendment. They did, and I submit that their experience is experience well had and gained. We could profit by adopting in toto the measures set out in the Act. We would not be the losers; we would be the gainers, and I commend the proposal to the House and State.

Mr. BAXTER (Hawthorne) (3.59 p.m.): On my own behalf and on behalf of the constituents of the electorate of Hawthorne, I wish to be associated with the motion of allegiance to Her Majesty. At this particular stage in history it is very desirable that countries in the Commonwealth of Nations should be closely associated. We are all facing imminent danger, and Queensland has problems peculiar to itself. The European Common Market has been discussed. If Great Britain joins the Common Market it is possible that Australia and Queensland in particular will experience a period of depression in primary industries. In the amendment so capably moved by the Leader of the Opposition the Government are charged with not having advised the Governor well enough on the speech he made in the House appertaining to the extension of the financial resources of the State in an endeavour to encourage and foster industrial enterprises and to take adequate action to stabilise the future of Queensland. That amendment is very necessary. Queensland is a primary producing State producing for export more than most other States. We send our commodities overseas to build up credit reserves to enable us to buy manufactured goods. We also buy from South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria. We contribute at least twice to the upkeep of the Commonwealth and for years we have been worse off than any other State. No assistance came from the South for the Burdekin Bridge although Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. was supplying more steel to the southern States than to Queensland. It is immaterial to the southern States that Queensland is more vulnerable to invasion by our enemies than any other State. That was demonstrated conclusively during the last war and such an attitude has continued to the present day. Recently Federal members have admitted that the Brisbane Line was an established fact, and judging from the recent actions of the Federal Government it is being adopted again.

Queensland sends more anti-Labour members to the Federal Parliament than most of the other States but, with the exception of Senator Wood, they are not doing justice to Queensland. That fact is recorded in Federal "Hansard," in the speeches of hon. members. It is sufficient to make us talk of recession but we must not do that. We must stand united today as a Commonwealth of Nations if we are to survive. The niggardly Commonwealth grants to Queensland make us disgusted with the lack of understanding of the potential of our State. Our minds go back as far as 1954, 1955 and 1956-1957, when the Hon. R. G. Casey came to Queensland as Minister for External Affairs. He came up here, he flew around and said, "What a valuable State this is! What a vast potential it has! I will do everything possible to see that it gets an extra allocation of money." And there the matter died. All he is remembered for in Queensland today

is that he flew in an aeroplane which, unfortunately, somewhere near Cloncurry killed a poor eagle.

Then before the last elections Rip Van Winkle Menzies, the tourist Minister of the Commonwealth, came up here and exclaimed, "Oh, my goodness, this is Queensland! What a wonderful country it is! Look at its vast potential! I never realised we had in Australia a country so big as Queensland. Why, the Maranoa electorate is as big as Victoria. I never realised that." He promised us everything, and what happened? He went back south and went to sleep in the bed he had slept in for the last 10 years. Rip Van Winkle returned and to this day I have never been able to find whether he put his beard under the blankets or not.

Mr. Sullivan: Are you talking to the motion or are you making a political speech?

Mr. BAXTER: I am talking about the economic position today. That is the situation that still exists after many years of administration, or maladministration, in the Federal sphere by the Liberal-Country Party coalition. Note that I said the Liberal-Country Party coalition. I want to stress that and to have it clearly defined. In Canberra today we have a Liberal-Country Party coalition, not the same as in Queensland, where we have a Country-Liberal Party coalition.

Mr. Sullivan: You will be tricking yourself up soon.

Mr. BAXTER: No, there is a distinction there and it is very important, as I will point out later in my speech. Recently we had the spectacle of the Premier waving his arms about following the amendment moved so capably by the Leader of the Opposition and seconded so capably by the Deputy Leader, daring the Leader of the Country-Liberal Party coalition in Queensland to take action on the most important problem of unemployment. But they are not in the least interested in whether the working-man has security or equality of wages or the right to buy his own home. They are making a bigger mess today with the Queensland Housing Commission than was ever made between the years 1946 and 1956. They have slipped and failed miserably. They have done nothing whatever to assist the people. They have assisted certain sections in the building industry. They have allocated moneys to building societies and those moneys have been eaten up in administration and have not been expended for the benefit of the working-class.

I have in my hand a beautiful illustration from last Thursday's "Courier-Mail"—Nicklin seeking a showdown. Flying to Canberra to meet the Prime Minister. He is going to fix up everything! But he did not do it until the Leader of the Opposition and

the Deputy Leader forced him into a corner so that he had to make a pretence of showing good faith.

Mr. Ramsden: I think you over-estimate your own strength.

Mr. BAXTER: Will the little tit-wits keep out of this for a while, please? That is why the Premier decided to go to Canberra. But before he went, another man stole away to Canberra like a thief in the night to do a job under the Premier's neck, and he did the job very efficiently, too. I refer, of course, to the Leader of the Liberal portion of the coalition Government of Queensland, and I want you to bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that it is a Country Party-Liberal Party coalition in Queensland.

Away the Premier went to Canberra, and in "The Courier-Mail" of 31 August this headline appeared—

"Seeking Showdown—Nicklin Flying to Meet P.M."

It could have been, too, that the visit might have been touched off by the announcement of more generous financial assistance to other Australian States controlled by Liberal Party Governments and Liberal Party Premiers. In Queensland, of course, we have a Country Party Premier. The report went on to say—

"Simmering resentment turned to open hostility when Mr. Menzies said on Monday that the Queensland Government had never complained of the terms of the Mt. Isa rail agreement."

The Mt. Isa rail agreement is a very good topic to discuss at this time, so I shall deal with it and see how Queensland has fared with the representation given by the Country-Liberal Party coalition Government. If you think it is a happy family, Mr. Speaker, have a look at the mid-day paper today.

These fellows from "The Courier-Mail" are not bad; they are on the ball, you know, Mr. Speaker. A further extract from "The Courier-Mail" says—

"Under a Commonwealth-State Agreement signed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) and W. A. Premier (Mr. Brand) in Canberra at the week-end the £41,200,000, 400-mile railway is to be completed by December 31, 1968."

Let us have a look at that statement. The Premier of Western Australia is of the same political colour as the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies.

A report dealing with Commonwealth aid to the South Australian Government appeared in the same paper, and this is a part of it—

"The basis of the offer was that the State would repay in full to the Commonwealth over a period of 50 years, 30 per cent. of the expenditure incurred by the State for the purposes outlined, with interest at the long term bond rate.

Mr. Menzies said he had made it clear in making the offer that it would be separate from assistance under the 1949 standardisation agreement."

We must never at any stage confuse this allocation of £41,200,000, of which only 30 per cent. has to be repaid, with the standardisation of the railway system. That is a different agreement altogether.

At this stage we do not know what is going to happen to our gladiators who go to Canberra in their shiny armour and their bright swords. The Premier went there, accompanied by the Treasurer. They were simmering with resentment. But do not let us misconstrue what happened because further information is available. The Premier went down.

Mr. Ewan: He did a good job too.

Mr. BAXTER: There is always some little backbencher who will come in and say that he did a good job. The hon. member for Roma rushes in where angles fear to tread and says, "He did a good job." I shall deal with his interjection very shortly to prove very conclusively that he did not do a good job for Queensland. There was a hue and cry about the Premier's being accompanied by the Treasurer, but what really happened? It is well hidden in the newspaper article; you would not notice it if you did not look twice. We were told that he would be joined by the Treasurer, Mr. Hiley, in Canberra, as Mr. Hiley would be in Canberra not for the unemployment situation, not for the allocation of funds for the Mt. Isa project, but for a fisheries conference. Hon. members opposite have been giving us all this sly political salesmanship over the years. They have been getting away with it to a certain extent but it is catching up with them now. This Liberal Treasurer of ours probably would know—

Mr. Newton: No he is not.

Mr. BAXTER: I accept that interjection. He is not "liberal" in the true sense of the word. He is Liberal only in the political party sense. The hon. member for Roma is asking me whether I think he should be in the Country Party. Heaven help the Country Party if he were! I have another newspaper article here to which I must draw attention. It is pertinent to the interjection of the hon. member for Roma, that Mr. Nicklin did a very good job in the south. I quote once again from that jolly good paper "The Courier-Mail"—"Mr. Nicklin answered 'Yes' to a series of questions from Mr. Duggan, the Leader of the Opposition." It shows how strong are the Queen's Opposition in the Queensland Parliament. If it were not for the activity of the Australian Labour Party Opposition, the Government would not have been as good as they are—and that is not much good. So the Premier answered, "Yes", to the Leader of the Opposition's question. We

are fighting to reduce unemployment and to get an equitable distribution of money. We are fighting to do everything possible for the improvement and development of Queensland.

Then the Leader of the Opposition justifiably asked—

“Should not Queensland have received much more favourable consideration from the Commonwealth in financing the line—?”

That is the Mt. Isa line—

“. . . in view of the enlarged major contribution that would be made by Mt. Isa Mines Ltd. to Australia's overseas funds?”

The Premier answered, “Yes”, to that question. Then my Leader asked—

“Was the Commonwealth attitude not niggardly having regard to the fact that 70 per cent. of the cost of a similar project in Western Australia would be defrayed by the Commonwealth Government?”

Once again the Premier replied, “Yes”. He agreed with the Leader of the Opposition. There are two very vital points. Then the Leader of the Opposition asked if the Premier had read an article stating that the Commonwealth had offered South Australia £1,325,000 for the dieselisation of the Port Pirie to Broken Hill railway and that South Australia would be required to repay only 30 per cent. of the expenditure over 50 years. Once again the Premier of Queensland, Leader of the Country Party-Liberal Coalition Government said, “Yes”. The Leader of the Opposition then asked did he know that South Australia had got more favourable treatment than Queensland which had to repay the Mt. Isa loan in 20 years, and at a higher rate of interest, and once again the Premier said, “Yes”.

Mr. Ewan: He was very agreeable, wasn't he?

Mr. BAXTER: He was very agreeable. Then he makes a clear and distinct statement, that the Premier of Queensland agreed with the Leader of the Opposition that the Commonwealth attitude towards the Mt. Isa rail project was niggardly, but denies the claim that he had not complained at the terms, so let us have a look at that. It was because of that statement that the Premier flew to the South to stand up and fight the Commonwealth authorities and get Queensland's just deserts from the Federal Government. He forgot, however, an article that appeared in “Truth” on Sunday 10 September. I think it is well worth reading.

Mr. Sullivan: Read it.

Mr. BAXTER: I will, for the edification of the Country Party member for Condamine, because I do not think he has seen it. If he had he would never ask me to read it,

unless there is at the back of his mind a feeling of animosity towards the Premier because of the controversial Transport Act. This was to sink the case of the people of Queensland when the Premier approached the Prime Minister for recognition for Queensland in relation to the Mt. Isa project. The political writer of “Truth” had this to say—

“The recent bull-like charge to Canberra by the Premier, Mr. Nicklin, and his Treasurer, Mr. Hiley, to complain about Canberra's unfair treatment over Mt. Isa railway finance was just a phoney.

“Before it started it was doomed to failure—because of the Premier's poor memory.

“He had forgotten that in 1959 he wrote a most obsequious letter to the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, thanking him for all he had done for Queensland on the Mt. Isa issue.”

The letter is then set out in the article.

The Premier may have been only acting as a figurehead. My experience leads me to believe that such things can happen. If the subject had been related to transport only, I make bold to say that the Minister for Transport would have written a letter for signature by the Premier. I think the Premier will admit I am right when I say that letters form the State to the Prime Minister's office have to be signed by the Premier. He is duty bound to sign them. If the issue had been related only to transport, the Minister for Transport may have compiled the letter. It would have been included in correspondence to be attended to by the Premier, and the Premier would have done the right thing and signed it.

A Government Member: You are giving us ideas.

Mr. BAXTER: Never mind about ideas. That is the way in which these matters have been done since Parliament was Parliament.

The thought that comes to me is that as the Mt. Isa negotiations had been handled by the Treasurer, as he went overseas to try to get the money wherever he could, in the United States and elsewhere, and as he negotiated a loan from the Commonwealth Government and insisted on the approach to the World Bank, he, the Treasurer, could have framed and written the letter. He could have sent it along for the Premier's signature. That is what I think happened.

A peculiar situation exists in the Government. The minority of the Government is trying to control the majority of the Government. We have the spectacle of the tail trying to wag the body of the dog represented by the Coalition Country Party Government.

It is possible that the letter came from the pen and mind of the Treasurer, a representative of the Liberal Party in Parliament.

I shall read the letter so that it will be on record. It is dated 28 October, 1949, and reads—

“My Dear Prime Minister,

“My Government gratefully accepts the offer to finance the construction of the Mount Isa Railway Project as outlined in your letter of the 26th instant.

“In order that there be no delays in reaching final agreement on all points, we have already commenced to prepare the details as set out in paragraphs one to three in the annexure to your letter.

“At this stage, all our advices are that the project will broadly encompass the full scheme as outlined in the Ford Bacon and Davis reports.

“We are firmly of the opinion that Mt. Isa Mines Limited should complete a freight agreement with my Government and have no doubt that they will acquiesce in completing such an agreement, substantially along the lines tentatively agreed on previously.

“I agree with you that minor matters can be clarified later when your proposal is being written into agreement form.

‘APPRECIATE’

“This project will, I believe, be of tremendous benefit not only to Queensland but to the whole of Australia, as it will open wide to development one of the richest mineral and pastoral areas of the Commonwealth. It is particularly significant that this agreement should have been brought to fruition in Queensland’s Centenary year.

“My colleagues and I deeply appreciate your Government’s interest and particularly the part played personally by yourself and your Treasurer in making such a material contribution to the successful conclusion of the lengthy and difficult negotiations that have taken place in connection with the project. Please accept our sincere thanks.

Kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Frank Nicklin,

Premier.”

That is the letter that went forth and we have heard no protest by the Premier about the Mt. Isa line. We can be justified in saying there was no protest. That letter was never brought to light, and it should have been so that we could discuss it. In that letter the Premier referred to the agreement being completed in the Centenary year. I doubt if it has been completed yet. If it has, it has been done only temporarily—in the last few months. That is one of the subjects I want placed on record. The Premier flew down to Canberra to take action to straighten out the anomaly created by the allocation of moneys to Western Australia, South Australia and Victoria for schemes under which they had to pay back only a portion of the money they

borrowed—only 40 per cent.—over a period of years, whereas Queensland has to repay the whole of the amount in 20 years. Is that justifiable? Have the Federal Government done the right thing for Queensland? Have the Queensland Federal members of the Government, Messrs. Davidson, Hulme, Wight, and McCole, done their job for Queensland? I say certainly not! There has been one lone voice raised for Queensland, and that by Senator Wood. He has tried to do a good job, but his own colleagues, the men of his own political colour, have dumped him. It would be interesting to know why they have sold him down the drain. There is another very interesting matter. While the Premier was in Queensland doing his job we had another man in the South, the Deputy Premier, the Leader of the Liberal Party, the minority party in the Government, also doing a job.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I remind the hon. member that he has only five more minutes in which to complete his speech. I warn him against very tedious repetition. I hope he will not repeat himself.

Mr. BAXTER: I will not repeat myself, Mr. Speaker. I did it only to draw attention to what was happening. There will be no tedious repetition.

The part that struck us is that he went down there the day before and is claiming now that he was the saviour of Queensland, that he got £5,000,000 for roads. I think it was only a dummy, that it was really given to us beforehand. It is purely propaganda on the top line. It even shocked and surprised the people of Queensland and the Government to think we got it. It is to be expended over a period of years and at the end of the period it will be worth only half that sum.

Queensland’s finances were better in 1870 than they are today. With 115,000 people the State built 207 miles of railway line. In 1880 the 211,000 people had built themselves 637 miles of railway line. Today we are pulling railway lines up. It will cost us a great deal of money to re-lay them in the next decade, as we progress. There is nowhere in the South for further expansion. There is only Queensland left to expand, and we will expand. To do that we will have to build more railways and that will cost us a lot more money.

Here we are fighting to get enough money to build a railway line to the best mining enterprise in the southern hemisphere. Its mineral products could even be the best in the world. But the majestic and costly Snowy River project, and other big projects in the South, have been covered by the Menzies Government, who have never given us anything.

When the Premier sat on this side of the Chamber he argued the case well in support of the Menzies Government. Now he has to go through the trials and tribulations that Labour Party representatives had to go

through in the past. My sympathy is extended to him. Unfortunately he is not followed very closely by the majority of his party, and he is hitting his head against a brick wall in the South because the Federal coalition is not co-operating with his Government.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (4.39 p.m.): I rise to support the motion before the House and to oppose the amendment. I preface my remarks by saying that I am privileged on behalf of the people of the electorate of Kurilpa to express to Her Majesty the loyalty of her subjects and in particular to His Excellency the Governor of Queensland their very deep appreciation of the real interest he takes in every citizen and in every part of the State. I believe that the way in which Sir Henry conducts himself and the personal interest that he shows in the people of Queensland have won him their warm regard and affection. It can be said of him, "He is truly great, for he has a sincere, personal, noble, common touch."

I pay a tribute to him for his initiation of Commonwealth Youth Week. A great deal of good came from it. I also pay a tribute to Mr. Gordon Olive and the members of the committee who worked so hard to make it a success.

Mr. Davies: It was a pity that the value of Youth Week was detracted from by the fact that so many young people were, and still are, unemployed.

Mr. HUGHES: I shall certainly touch on the question of unemployment. It appears that not only are hon. members on this side of the Chamber the only ones who are aware of this problem but also that we are the only ones who are interested in doing something about it. During this debate I have not heard one constructive suggestion by members of the Opposition. Apparently they moved the amendment for political gain at the expense of the privation and misery of the people of Queensland.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member for Maryborough has been in the Chamber during the whole of the debate. If he will curb his impatience, I will give him the facts about unemployment in Queensland. I hope he will then be able to contribute something worthwhile to the debate. I give him the benefit of the doubt—he may be able to make a constructive suggestion.

Queensland is blessed with good family life, a Christian belief and tolerance, and many people who are dedicated to their jobs and community service. For instance, we have here Miss Sedgman, a young lady who is always courteous. Members of the Railway Department often show a great deal of courtesy, and I particularly mention the work of Miss Doran, Mr. Bartlam and

other people at Palm Island, Yarrabah and other settlements, and in other parts of Queensland, are giving dedicated and loyal service, diligently applying themselves to their chosen vocations.

On the other hand, we have many disruptionists in Australia, people whose loyalty is known to be questionable, who sabotage the welfare and prosperity of the State and the nation. It is noticeable that many decent unionists are being misled by a few Communist leaders who are exploiters of the unionists.

An Opposition Member: Here it comes again!

Mr. HUGHES: I am not going to belabour this point, but it is something that should be repeated. I will leave it to those who read these statements to judge for themselves. Australia would be better off with the common or garden variety of tolerance commonsense, and freedom than with Communism. Many of these Communist leaders are exploiters of the unionists. There are hundreds of instances that could be cited, and all hon. members should know it.

I become sickened by the hypocrisy and homage paid to those who in their lifetime were such a disruptive element. Take the recent death of a trade-union leader. Banner headlines appeared in the Press, "A Legend in His Lifetime." On his death, business and industry were disrupted and work on every wharf in Australia came to a stop, thus affecting the economy and welfare of the people of Australia. I am sure that all members of the community are aware of this.

We have many misguided people in Queensland, and we also have our share of knockers.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: I can hear a woodpecker on my right. Hon. members opposite interject loudly, but they do not make constructive suggestions nor do they think constructively. It is for that reason that I oppose the amendment.

When the Leader of the Opposition moved his amendment I did not think he had his heart in it. It was obvious he was playing a role in which he was out of character. He was paying lip service to the dictates of his Federal colleagues. There was a plan behind it. He introduced the Federal aspect into matters of State for the sole purpose of attempting to score politically on behalf of his Federal colleagues.

There is no doubt that he was under instructions to hurl criticism, any sort of criticism, to be a knocker, to use his position in Queensland to bolster the flagging weakness of an inept, divided, warring and leaderless Federal Labour Party. In carrying out his usual and normal role as Leader of the Opposition I have a profound respect for the hon. member for Toowoomba West. I have an admiration for him as a person. As a general rule

he applies himself diligently to matters before the House and gives a worthwhile analysis of the various measures brought before us for consideration.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: I believe in giving credit where credit is due. I wish the hon. member for South Brisbane would take a leaf out of my book and think constructively. It may be a lot to ask of him. But there is always a little good in the worst of us, and there is always some hope even for the hon. member for South Brisbane.

When the Leader of the Opposition speaks I am an attentive listener. Usually he presents a fair analysis of a Bill. In more cases than not he is in agreement with it. He makes an impartial analysis in his contribution, but on this occasion he was completely out of character and for no other reason than that he tried to capitalise on the misery and privation of the unemployed in order to bolster the hopeless task of his Federal colleagues.

Mr. Duggan: Having listened to both your compliments and criticism I must now leave to attend a meeting.

Mr. HUGHES: I certainly hope the hon. gentleman will read the rest of my speech in "Hansard," and in respect of some of it I hope to have his support.

Opposition members have capitalised on the misery and privation of many people who are the victims of three continuous years of drought and unprecedented seasonal conditions. No doubt it was distasteful to some of them to have to resort to such deprecatory tactics in an effort to bolster the political hopes of their Federal colleagues, but in the fullness of time they will be disappointed because Federal Labour are in a political wilderness and they are there to stay. They will always remain there while they have no realistic policy and while they are suspect and in the grip of Left-Wing dominated unions, coupled with a lack of leadership. Indeed, they are a leaderless rump of a once legion of Labour.

While there has been so much heartless, hypocritical wailing from hon. members opposite, it is with deep regret to Queensland and Queenslanders that they have not advanced a single constructive suggestion. The hon. member for South Brisbane is attempting to interject again. There has been the Elvis Presley type of gyrations, showmanship gestures, waving of arms, and beating of desks, but not one practical suggestion, not one constructive thought has been put forward. Not one plan or proposal has been put forward that might in some way alleviate the unemployment that we know exists to some extent. To instance the hollowness and shallowness of the arguments put forward, the Leader of the Opposition berates the Government for becoming a claimant State and budgeting for a deficit. His statements

condemn his Federal colleagues because Mr. Calwell, as leader of the Federal Labour Party criticises the Federal Liberal-Country Party for not budgeting for a £100,000,000 deficit for development. They cannot have it both ways. Here, because of local conditions, they berate the Treasurer for budgeting for a deficit and on the other hand their Federal colleagues are berating the Liberal-Country Party Federal Government for not budgeting for this all-time high, fantastic £100,000,000 deficit. It shows the shallowness and hollowness of the argument he put forward.

I think it is time the Opposition got their thinking into the right perspective and advanced constructive suggestions with a view to alleviating the very vital human problem of unemployment. If they are interested in unemployment we shall be pleased to hear their ideas.

Mr. Bennett: How did you go with your noxious weeds case?

Mr. HUGHES: Had I the legal right the hon. member would be the first noxious thing I would remove from the face of the earth. There is no better time than now to assess the position carefully, fully and impartially, in the State, particularly regarding unemployment and development.

I have studied the position for quite some time and I am aware of the need for something to be done. The answer to the problem is elusive; there is no doubt about that. Nevertheless, I believe it is of vital and sufficient importance to the lives and welfare of Queenslanders to be urgently considered, because it has a deep bearing on the lives of all members of this community and the welfare and economy of the State.

I do not lay claim to having found the complete long-term answer to this problem, but I do believe, as I propose to submit, that I have a scheme that is worthy of consideration. I intend to put to hon. members a proposal that may be found practical and workable and in the best interests of Queensland and Queenslanders.

Mr. Davies: Have you discussed it in Caucus?

Mr. HUGHES: Members of this Liberal-Country Party Coalition Government can stand up on the floor of this Chamber and express their views, as has been evidenced from speeches earlier today, when they sincerely believe that they have something worthwhile and constructive. We do not require to have notices put over TV like prominent leaders of the Labour Party do, to say that if any member expresses views contrary to Labour policy he will be expelled from his party. We have the intestinal fortitude, the ability and a common-sense approach to all matters affecting human values in which neither the personal aspect nor the disciplinary aspect is involved.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: It is obvious that hon. members opposite have not heard the saying, "The taller grows the willow the more it tends to bend." That can be applied to those members of the Liberal-Country Party Government who have assumed authority and a wide responsibility. We have a greater degree of intelligence, application of common sense and tolerance than is to be found on the other side.

An A.L.P. Member: Ability and intelligence!

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member has referred to something foreign to his party, to those who have been termed the untouchables.

This is a proposal involving the participation of every resident and tourist, involving the whole State of Queensland and every unemployed male anywhere, at any and all times.

It follows on the suggestion originally put forward by the hon. member for Bowen who advanced the bright idea of having the Commonwealth Government pay the unemployment benefit to local shire councils who could utilise this money and the unemployed men in their towns on council work. Hon. members opposite make inane interjections. I heard one of them say, "Give me one ounce of rumour and I will make a ton of trouble."

An A.L.P. Member: Name him.

Mr. HUGHES: In fairness I do not think I should.

The hon. member for Bowen could be said to be the father of the suggestion that I have mentioned. In his systematic way he has engaged in serious discussions with Federal and State authorities. With other Government members he is concerned about the problem of unemployment and he is making a worthwhile and sincere attempt to overcome it. The hon. member for Rockhampton South put forward certain suggestions with a view to alleviating unemployment, a cause of concern to those who have the welfare of the citizens at heart, but in this House only Government members have expressed regard for the welfare of the people.

The proposal I now put forward is more embracing, because it will utilise the total number of unemployed males who have a need and genuine desire for improvement and who elect to avail themselves of these benefits.

I think it would be opportune in my introductory remarks to make some observations on employment in the State. From hon. members opposite we have heard only inaccuracies, figures plucked out of the air, and distortions. They could not care less about the welfare of the people or the economy of the State; their only desire is to get for themselves some snide, political propaganda.

Mr. O'Donnell: You are in the box seat. Do something.

Mr. HUGHES: At least we are able to think clearly and to put forward constructive suggestions. We are doing something about it. The hon. member for Salisbury who has been interjecting does not even think at all.

I readily admit that there is unemployment in Queensland. We do not close our eyes to facts. There will probably always be some unemployment, but, judging by the interjections of hon. members opposite, it would seem that they are suggesting that the blame for all of it can be laid at the door of the Government. They seem to think that if a Labour Government had been in power there would have been no unemployment. I refer hon. members to the following statement by Mr. Haylen in the Federal House, which indicates Labour's attitude to unemployment—

"I realise that there cannot be total employment but if we can get down to 5 per cent. of unemployment for all practical purposes that can be regarded as total employment."

Mr. Davies: That is misrepresentation.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member will have an opportunity to refute the statement if he can. If hon. members opposite want further proof of the attitude of Labour members, I shall read a statement by one of their erstwhile supporters, Mr. Gair, on 29 September, 1949. In those days, when they were at the bar, it was, "Good old Vince; good old Johnno, old boy." Mr. Gair was then Secretary for Labour and Industry. In reply to a question in this House he said—

"The principal reason for unemployment in Queensland is seasonal. The seasonal industries of Queensland are unique so far as the Australian States are concerned. The ebb and flow of seasonal employment is much more severe in this State than in any other State."

It was all right for Mr. Gair to say that in 1949. At that time Queensland had a Labour Government. That state of affairs was not questioned, but now the position has changed. The people of Queensland realised not only that they would fare more favourably under a Country-Liberal Government than under a Labour Government but also that they will experience impartiality which they never experienced before. They now say that unemployment is the fault of the Government. Now they say that if there is any seasonal unemployment, it is all wrong. I do not hear any interjections from the Opposition now; they are noticeably silent.

Mr. Pizzey: In Canberra, Mr. Monk said you must expect 10 per cent. to be unemployed.

Mr. HUGHES: As the Minister for Education and Migration has said, Mr. Monk said it was all right to have 10 per cent. of the working population unemployed.

It is all right for Opposition members and their associates to say such things, but they should keep them in the archives, with dust collecting on them, never to see the light of day, but for snide reasons of their own, they attack the motives of Liberal-Country Party members when they refer to them. On 29 September, 1949, Mr. Gair, then Secretary for Labour and Industry, and a member of this House further said, in reply to a question—

“The principal reason for unemployment in Queensland is seasonal. The seasonal industries of Queensland are unique so far as the Australian States are concerned and the ebb and flow of seasonal employment is much more severe in this State than in any other State.”

Furthermore, he said—

“The economists regard unemployment of 3 per cent. to 4 per cent. of the local force as a normal contingency of the movement between jobs that is characteristic of a healthy economy and a free and mobile labour force.”

Hon. members of the Opposition want it? I'll give it to them! It is all right when they are in office but it is all wrong when Federal and State Liberal and Country Party Governments are in power. These statements should prove to the House not only just how far out of step they are in their thinking, but how unrealistic they are in dealing with these problems, and how politically snide are their accusations.

This problem should exercise the thinking capacity of every hon. member. We should advance constructive suggestions with a view to alleviating it, to find some temporary, and if possible, long-lasting, solution. Hon. members opposite have never put up a constructive suggestion on this matter. If they are patient I will put one to them to test whether they are sincere or only paying lip service. If they are sincere they will support what I have to say. I believe that hon. members will concede that there has always been unemployment in varying degrees, and there probably always will be. There will be men leaving jobs for various reasons, men with families shifting their place of residence for health and other reasons who will be temporarily unemployed. However, I believe that as far as possible the incidence of unemployment must be kept to a minimum. The Opposition has made every attempt to gain political capital from the unemployment situation in Queensland without paying due credit to the Queensland Government for the very worthwhile steps that have already been taken to curb unemployment.

The Opposition has conveniently forgotten to give credit for the fact that recently Queensland received an extra £1,000,000 on

our borrowing programme. They conveniently forgot that the Premier recently told the House that a vigorous programme of works is being implemented in all parts of the State; that subsidies paid to local authorities are almost twice the amount paid in 1956-1957. Then, there is the most recent gesture of the Federal Government in granting Queensland an extra £5,000,000, of which only £650,000 need be matched by £350,000 from this State, for the construction of roads in areas where they will further assist the development and economy of Queensland. Couple these forms of assistance with the State's increased spending on school buildings and public works, etc., and a creditable and practical measure of worthwhile achievement is being undertaken by the Government.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: All these annoying interjections remind me of a little ditty which could well be applied to hon. members of the Opposition. It runs something like this—

“He used to be bored
Now he is overboard.

Psychologists and doctors say
Diverting pastimes have a way
Of smoothing out a wrinkled mind
And everyone should try to find
Some hobbies which can be enjoyed
So time and hands are well employed.

This good advice got through to Duggie
He followed it so thoroughly.
Diverting work he sought to do
Keeps him from work he ought to do.”

That just about typifies the attitude of the Opposition. They are all noise and of no significance because there is no constructive thinking. They cannot put forward even one worthwhile practical suggestion. So I suggest they curb their impatience and listen to something that is worthwhile. I think it is pertinent to get the record straight and I do so accordingly. In spite of what Labour hon. members say, Queensland deserves credit for the fall in July in the number registered for unemployment benefit. The figures for August are not yet available.

Mr. O'Donnell: It has not fallen.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member's interjection shows that the Opposition do not even take the trouble to look up statistics or to speak to those in authority who can properly advise them. They prefer to seize on anything, to pull a figure out of the air, if they can score politically from the Government, regardless of the truth or accuracy of their assertion. For their benefit I will state the truth and give them a lesson on the facts of life and I will ask them to take note.

Mr. Houston: Give us the figures published right up to date.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think the figures for August have been released by the Minister and the Department of Labour and Industry, but statistics prove that for July the Queensland figure dropped to 2,208 people, which was a very appreciable reduction. It gives the lie direct to the assertions of the Opposition.

It is significant that Queensland is the only State in the Commonwealth that registered a decrease in the number receiving unemployment benefit. Every other State registered an increase. The decrease of 2,208 is in marked contrast with the increase of 3,000 in the Labour-governed State of New South Wales.

Moreover, Queensland compares more than favourably with other States in the number of persons registered for employment in terms of the percentage of the work force. If hon. members opposite want analogies, I will give them a few more in a moment. New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Tasmania recorded 2.7 and 2.8 per cent. Queensland's figure was no higher than that of those other States; it was on a par with them despite the short meat and sugar-industry season with three successive years of drought. Mr. Gair, the former Labour Premier of Queensland, said that Queensland's seasonal industries made its employment problem unique.

Statistics from an official survey prove that more factories are working overtime in Queensland than in any other Australian State and that there are more employees on overtime in Queensland than in any other Australian State. Queensland has the lowest number of factories on short-time work. These are factual figures. They are not wild, inaccurate assertions given for their political significance by an inept Opposition. Bearing in mind the tremendous incidence of unemployment in Queensland due to seasonal conditions, accentuated by three years of drought, particularly in the meat industry, none but the most politically biased could fail to give credit to this Government for keeping the position under control. While I admit there is an unemployment problem, I will test the sincerity of the members of the Opposition when I call on them to admit that, in the circumstances of the times, coupled with an almost unprecedented incidence of seasonal unemployment, this Government and the people of Queensland are to be commended.

Mr. Houston: Rubbish!

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member says, "Rubbish!"

Members of the Opposition wanted an analogy. I suggest that rubbish is exactly what they expect the people of Queensland to fall for. They insult their intelligence and their common sense and their ability to understand the figures released from

authoritative sources. They prefer to pluck figures out of the air. The hon. member for Maryborough wants some figures on unemployment. All right, I will give him some analogies. In 1947, when Labour Governments were in office in the State and Federal Parliaments, there were 6,507 people unemployed in Queensland in January of that year. That represented 1.19 per cent. of the work force. In January, 1961, 7,397 unemployed people were registered. That was the second highest figure this year, and it represented 1.19 per cent. of the total work force.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: Hon. members opposite want analogies, but they do not like facing facts. In 1947, 1.19 per cent. of the work force was unemployed under a Labour Government, and now, after three years of drought, the percentage is still only 1.19 under this Government. The average time a man was unemployed in 1947 was 14 weeks. Census figures show that it dropped to 12 weeks, and it is now about eight or nine weeks.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: If hon. members opposite have any degree of sincerity, I challenge them to look at those figures. They have gleefully capitalised on misery and hardship caused by unemployment for political gain. I believe that their arguments are put forward hypocritically and will not bear scrutiny.

As a type of spot survey, I took last Saturday's "Courier-Mail" and examined the columns advertising employment. An analysis showed that there were 235 separate advertisements listing at least 271 vacancies. A sample range included clerks, truck-drivers, salesmen, cleaners, tradesmen, shop assistants, and builders' labourers. In addition, 35 of the advertisements listed plural vacancies, which meant that there could be from 2 to 200 jobs to be filled. To be scrupulously fair in presenting this information to the House, I point out that the figures do not include the call for labour by the Commonwealth Government, the Snowy Mountains Authority, Universities, or hospital authorities.

Mr. Melloy: What about the hundreds of children who have not obtained jobs?

Mr. HUGHES: I shall deal with that point, too. I have the capacity, common sense and resolution to stand on the floor of the House and put forward a considered proposal. I suggest that hon. members opposite, if they really are concerned about unemployment, should show their sincerity and skill by doing something about it. The best thing they can do at the moment is to sit and listen.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: It is significant that there was a considerable call for tradesmen in the employment columns of "The Courier-Mail" last Saturday.

Mr. Houston: Do you know where you can find jobs?

Mr. HUGHES: I have been able to find jobs for the people who have come to me. I am on the committee that assists blind and physically handicapped persons, and even today I was able to place a blind person and a physically handicapped person in employment satisfactory to them. I am doing my job. Can the hon. member for Bulimba say sincerely that he has done his? A practical test is the only real test. If the hon. member can say that, at least he is fit to occupy a seat in the Chamber; but I doubt whether he could say that sincerely.

Against the 271 advertisements for labour in the "Courier-Mail," only 24 advertisements sought employment. They ranged from a pensioner who wanted part-time gardening work to a Scottish Soccer football player requesting a position as a football coach. There were, however, 5,814 males receiving unemployment benefits in July. The monthly average, January to July, is 7,557. There is every reason to believe that this can be taken as a peak figure. Of that number most were seasonal, unskilled, and semi-skilled. There is a continuing decrease owing not only to the implementation of the proposals put forward by this Government but also because of the confidence and expansion of industry in Queensland. It is against that background of awareness of the problem and the general aspects and statistical data relating thereto, that I advance this proposal which, if implemented, will serve as a means of obviating economic insecurity for the work force, arrest the drift to privation and human tragedy, be of outstanding assistance to local authorities, provide public works, and make productive, an army of idle unemployed, and generally advance the progress and development of the State.

I propose that a State development force be formed whereby—to use an Irish-ism as I have heard it referred to—the unemployed will become employed, and instead of receiving £6 a week unemployment benefit, soon to be £7 a week, they will become a productive unit and receive the basic wage of £14 4s.

Mr. Davies: Who is going to pay it?

Mr. HUGHES: This again will test the hon. member's sincerity. He can do his share by supporting the proposal. Time, of course, will not permit me to go into all the details or refinements of the proposal but I shall outline the principles. I suggest for the purpose of consideration that Queensland be zoned into three or four sections, each with a development committee, the committee to comprise a member of Parliament, local authority representatives, business men and Government nominees, such as main roads engineers. I suggest that there be a principal

development committee in Brisbane to which each zone sends its recommendations, lists projects and sends delegates. If necessary there could be a Parliamentary Development Committee along similar lines to that suggested by the hon. member for Merthyr. Victoria has a development committee.

Mr. Davies: Are you aware that councils in Queensland cannot raise money at the present time?

Mr. HUGHES: Rubbish. In reply to questions the Treasurer has been able to say that Queensland's loan programme has been filled. Local authorities have been able to raise their loan money. If the hon. member took a diligent interest he would read the answers to questions.

The structure and composition of the principal committee could be along similar lines to the Fire Brigade Board whereby business men, local authority representatives, members of Parliament and public servants give their time to conduct this vital semi-public service.

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

Mr. HUGHES: The principal purpose of the zone development committees would be to approve, in order of priority, the projects which the development force would carry out during the year. The local authority would be required to supply plant and materials, and the State Development Committee would supply the labour on a no-cost basis to the local authority. This would allow shires and town councils in any part of Queensland to carry out a project owing to—

- (1) Having at their disposal a large body of men at one time;
- (2) Having the services of a large body of men on a short-term or specific project basis;
- (3) Constituting projects that are necessary and desirable yet which would be financially beyond them to achieve because of cost factors.

By the method outlined above, local authorities would get 100 per cent. value of their projects for merely the cost of materials.

Now, let us examine the all-important aspect of finance. I suggest that this proposal be financed in the following manner: the Commonwealth Government pay to the Development Fund Account the unemployment benefit payment now paid to the unemployed worker. For the purpose of quickly estimating the value of this, I take the average per head payment of £6 a week. As I suggest that the development workmen be paid the basic wage, I take for the purpose of quick calculation that the amount yet to be found is £8 a week per man.

This may be made up by instituting a development duty, that is, by payment of 3d. duty on any and every cash sale over £2

by affixing a 3d. duty stamp to any note, memorandum, or writing whatsoever, or anything that signifies or imports any acknowledgement whether the same is or is not signed with the name of any person, and including any cash sale docket—that is to say, an instrument issued, tendered or forwarded to a purchaser of goods amounting to £2 or upwards in value, by the proprietor of, or any salesman in, or any other officer or employee in any wholesale or retail establishment, immediately on the occasion of the purchase which denotes the amount then paid therefor, but does not acknowledge the receipt of such amount. From my investigations it will be found that the revenue thus obtained would provide a fund of £2,000,000.

I have every reason to believe that by this method the development force can be financed. However, should there be any deficiency, I suggest that Queensland has a justifiable case to present to the Commonwealth Government with the request that a grant be made of Commonwealth contribution to the development of Queensland.

I feel confident that the development duty will meet the financial requirements, particularly as the monthly average is 7,557 and falling.

Now let us consider the vital human aspect. As indicated, time will not permit me to deal with anything but the principles of this proposal. At the outset, let me impress on hon. members that this proposal is essentially a stop-gap or life-saver proposal to assist a man who suddenly becomes unemployed. It is to fill a transitional period between leaving one job and commencing another or permanent job. The proposal will benefit all as it will provide a man with at least the basic wage. It will help remove doubts, fears, hardships and hunger from the man's family. I believe it will have a worthwhile sociological effect on the man and his family and, indeed, on all sections of the community. I am all for high wages, if they are fair and just, for the working-man as I believe that in modern society people live up to their incomes. Therefore, it means that the spending power is immeasurably greater and it will have an encouraging effect on stability and employment.

I realise that there are some aspects that require detailed consideration. There are many questions which may be asked. Who is eligible? When and for how long? Where and on what type of employment? To these and many other questions, a number of friends, including businessmen, solicitors, cost accountants, representatives of unions, top public servants and myself, have met and given serious consideration. Whilst I am unable to deal with the refinements of it now I believe this to be a proposal worthy of consideration.

It is a development force which can greatly benefit Queensland. It is not a direction of man-power as qualifications, such as working in or near home-town, certain right of refusal, consideration of and for the

individual, can be embodied in the general terms. It will provide a man and his family with at least the basic wage. It should be confined to Queenslanders, e.g. those who are enrolled, which means a qualifying period of three months' residence. In effect, it means looking after our own and stabilising the population. Accommodation and feeding arrangements of the force may be overcome by mobile units. It would not hinder a man from obtaining employment as the Commonwealth Employment Service will have details of every man entering the development force and be the main agency through which he will re-enter permanent employment.

It will be of tremendous assistance to councils who have large civic projects which they desire to have carried out. Possibly it could be used to implement the pasture-renovation scheme outlined by the hon. member for Townsville South. It will overcome the problem of seasonal unemployment. It will mean productiveness instead of idleness with the community and the State benefiting. It will mean that everybody, including the passer-through, the tourist, and John Citizen will contribute a little to Queensland's development. I believe that as a trial it merits a five-year plan. In short, I believe this to be a positive proposal that is workable and practical and in which every citizen and the State benefits. It is also a test of the sincerity of those who express faith in the future. If we are to pay more than lip-service to the prospects, progress and development of Queensland, I believe the principles of the proposal I have outlined will merit the support of all.

Another problem of our times arising from the tremendous increase in the birth rate following the war is full employment of young people who are leaving school. The Minister for Education has informed the House that the estimated number of children who will seek to enter employment from August this year to July next year is 12,900 boys and 12,800 girls. The enrolments at August are given as 30,000 boys and 27,300 girls. These young people will be seeking jobs and many will experience delay and frustration unless an answer is found and worth-while practical suggestions implemented.

Along with the general employment problem comes the welfare and employment of youth which has been given a great deal of consideration by me.

Consideration should be given to a review of the present scheme whereby youths leave school and immediately enter trades as apprentices. I suggest it would be desirable for a lad to go from school to a trades college where he would receive 12 months' concentrated trade tuition. At the completion of the trade course the youth would go to his employer with a great degree of confidence and some appreciable productive skill. With such basic training, the five-year course could be reduced to three years. The productive capacity of youth would be of benefit to the

State. The employer would benefit as the non-productive and formative apprenticeship years of boys would be spent in the trade training college.

It is known that there is a shortage of skilled tradesmen, yet we find a five-year apprenticeship in most trades, that many youths who left school last year have not yet been absorbed in trades, that a number of employers are reluctant to employ 14- to 15-year old youths from school and carry them through their first two years of unproductiveness, and the glaringly disconcerting feature that one boy in every four cancels his indentures and does not complete his apprenticeship period.

I respectfully suggest to those in authority that they should consider a thorough investigation into all matters relating to apprenticeship, free apprenticeship training and avenues of assistance to bring about full employment. The family of the apprentice would be assisted in that his pay would be that of a tradesman at the end of three years instead of five years. Under such a scheme there would be a minimum of wastage and cancellation of indentures, and that would ultimately lead to more and better tradesmen. I think the proposal should succeed, with community education and public acceptance of it.

To overcome any hardship, I suggest that trade trainees be paid a wage of at least £3 10s. a week while undergoing the course of instruction. Although this is less than an apprentice would get in his first year in private employment, it would give him every opportunity and enable him to learn his trade more rapidly, thus reducing the apprenticeship period to three years, and the earlier payment to him of tradesman's wages.

Hon. members will recall that earlier I suggested a development duty to provide for unemployment, the estimated return being £2,000,000. I confidently expect that money from this source would be sufficient to cover trade training payments made to young people.

Apart from the aspects of employment and finance, the review I have suggested should cover, I suggest, apprenticeship from Grade VIII., intake into Technical College, trade training period, suitability and desirability of a person and the apprenticeship term and methods.

The five-year apprenticeship period was laid down years ago when conditions and technique were very much different from modern conditions and techniques. Modern techniques and materials have reduced the need for a five-year term. A young apprentice would be encouraged greatly if he could see that the end of his term was in sight. Enthusiasm and ambition can be expected to remain buoyant for two years in the workshops and under this system we would not have the tremendous number of casualties that are recorded under a five-year apprenticeship scheme.

The proposal I have outlined will give an opportunity to the boy whose parents cannot afford to "carry him" for long periods after primary school.

With the implementation of these proposals, boys will be able to say, "They gave me a chance and I did it; I became a tradesman;" they will not be saying, "I wanted to be a tradesman and I could have done it but I didn't get a chance."

Serious and urgent consideration will have to be given to a greater opportunity for girls, as 12,800 girls this year will be leaving school and seeking employment, and there are insufficient jobs for them. This is the harvest of the high post-war birthrate, and the position is aggravated further because this year and for the next few years the percentage of boys and girls seeking work will be 50-50, compared with the overall figure for females in the work force of Australia of one to six males.

The proposals I have made are practical, and it behoves every hon. member to advance further constructive suggestions for the solution of the problem. I issue that challenge in all sincerity to test whether hon. members opposite are giving only lip service to development, or whether they are sincere.

The House adjourned at 5.31 p.m.
