

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 1961**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

developments in new Secondary and Primary Schools are provided for in the Estimates of the Department of Public Works and Local Government in respect of State School Buildings; Technical Colleges and State High Schools; and Queensland Agricultural High School and College."

#### OFF-THE-COURSE BETTING

**Mr. DAVIES** (Maryborough), for **Mr. DUGGAN** (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition), asked the Minister for Labour and Industry—

"(1) In view of the statement in the last report of the Commissioner of Police that over recent years there had been a marked decrease in the number of prosecutions under the gaming laws, is he able to inform the House of the number of prosecutions for off-the-course betting—an offence not specifically listed in the report—during the past five years and the total amount of fines recovered in each year?"

"(2) Is it a fact, as stated by the Commissioner, that the matter of checking off-the-course betting is well in hand and every effort is being made to curtail these activities as far as possible?"

"(3) How many telephones have been cancelled in Queensland by the Postmaster-General's Department, following conviction of off-the-course betting operators, in each of the past five years?"

**Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN** (Landsborough—Premier), for **Hon. K. J. MORRIS** (Mt. Coot-tha), replied—

"(1) 1956-1957; 325; £15,224. 1957-1958; 327; £13,190. 1958-1959; 304; £11,265. 1959-1960; 274; £10,100. 1960-1961; 242; £10,247."

"(2) Every effort is made by the Police Department to curtail off-the-course betting activities as far as possible, and the decreasing number of prosecutions as stated in the answer to Question (1), indicates that this activity is kept in control."

"(3) 1956-1957, 149; 1957-1958, 76; 1958-1959, 60; 1959-1960, 46; 1960-1961, 40."

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF ABATTOIR AT ROMA

**Mr. LLOYD** (Kedron) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"(1) What contributions were allocated from the State's Loan Funds towards the establishment of an abattoir at Roma?"

"(2) What was the fixed capital requirement of this abattoir when it was established?"

"(3) What was the estimated annual turnover of stock at the time when moneys were advanced to assist in the establishment of this abattoir?"

"(4) What is the estimated annual turnover and what type of stock is to be treated at the proposed Callide Dawson Co-operative Abattoir?"

## THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER, 1961

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

### REPORT ON PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY

**Mr. SPEAKER** announced the receipt of the report on the activities of the Parliamentary Library for the year 1960-1961.

### QUESTIONS

#### EXPENDITURE ON SCHOOL BUILDINGS AND GROUND IMPROVEMENTS

**Mr. MELLOY** (Nudgee) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"What is the estimated expenditure in 1961-1962 on (a) school buildings and (b) ground improvements for secondary schools and primary schools?"

**Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY** (Isis) replied—

"The Honourable Member is referred to the Estimates of the Probable Ways and Means of Expenditure of the Government of Queensland for the year ending June 30, 1962, which on pages 25 and 97 indicates the Department of Public Works estimate of expenditure on school buildings charged against Revenue and Loan respectively; and on page 56 gives the estimate of my Department's expenditure on ground improvement projects of a lesser value than £500 under the School Ground Improvement Subsidy Scheme. All projects of a greater value than £500 under the Scheme and ground

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

"(1) Nil. The sum of £118,509 was advanced by the Agricultural Bank from its funds."

"(2) The fixed capital requirement was estimated at £190,000."

"(3) The estimated weekly throughput was 500 head of cattle plus an indeterminate number of sheep, calves and pigs."

"(4) The designed weekly capacity of the Callide-Dawson Co-operative Association's abattoir is 480 cattle, 50 vealers, 700 calves and 530 pigs. The annual throughput will depend upon the period of operation and the extent to which the designed capacity is utilised."

#### STATE INVESTMENT IN COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT SECURITIES; MOUNT ISA LOAN

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

"(1) Through the investment of all the various funds under its control, what is the total value of Commonwealth Government Securities held by this State?"

"(2) What is the average rate of interest reflected by the overall return on this amount?"

"(3) What rate of interest will the State be paying the Commonwealth on the £20,000,000 Loan under the terms of the Agreement to finance the Mount Isa rail rehabilitation project?"

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

"(1) The face value of Commonwealth Government securities held by the State comprise:—

	£	£
Treasurer's Cash Balances—		
Hard Core .. .. .	..	8,548,660
Short Term—		
Inscribed Stock .. .. .	1,100,000	
Seasonal Inscribed Stock .. .. .	1,326,000	
		2,426,000
Invested on account of specific Funds—		
Inscribed Stock .. .. .	10,423,120	
Seasonal Inscribed Stock .. .. .	76,000	
		10,499,120
		<u>£21,473,780</u>

"(2) Based on the face value, not the market price, the average interest rates are, respectively,

	Per Cent.
	£ s. d.
Hard Core .. .. .	4 0 6
Short Term .. .. .	3 19 6
Specific Funds .. .. .	4 0 9

Overall Average .. .. . 4 0 6"

"(3) Five and a-half per cent."

#### STATE LOAN REQUIREMENTS FOR WORKS AND HOUSING

**Mr. SHERRINGTON** (Salisbury) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"What were the amounts submitted to the Loan Council for approval as the loan

requirements for the State for works and housing for the years 1960-1961 and 1961-1962?"

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

"The submitted Loan Borrowing Programmes were—

	1960-1961 £	1961-1962 £
Works ..	31,875,000	30,561,000
Housing ..	3,994,000	4,312,800"

#### OFFENCES AGAINST THE DENTAL ACTS

**Mr. SHERRINGTON** (Salisbury) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"(1) How many prosecutions were launched by the Dental Board of Queensland for offences against 'The Dental Acts, 1902 to 1959' in the year ended June 30, 1961?"

"(2) How many persons were prosecuted for the illegal practice of dentistry in the years 1956-1957, 1957-1958, 1958-1959, 1959-1960 and 1960-1961?"

"(3) Where were the offences committed?"

"(4) How many were first offences?"

"(5) What fines were imposed?"

"(6) How many of those prosecuted were New Australians?"

"(7) How many held degrees not recognised in Australia?"

"(8) Who are the present members of the Dental Board?"

"(9) When will the next regular appointments to be Board be made?"

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

"(1) Forty-nine."

"(2) 1956-1957, 4; 1957-1958, nil; 1958-1959, nil; 1959-1960, 2; 1960-1961, 2."

"(3) Gympie, Mackay and Townsville."

"(4) Seven."

"(5) Twenty-eight at £20, 5 at £15, 28 at £10, 3 at £8, 4 at £5, 1 at £4, 1 at £3, 1 at £1."

"(6) None."

"(7) None."

"(8) Robert Joseph James Fanning (President); Alfred James Hoole; Edward Walter Haenke; Stephen Ralph; James Paterson, B.D.Sc. (Univ.Qld); Jeffrey Edward Jordan, B.D.Sc. (Univ.Qld); William Keith Ross Mackenzie, B.D.Sc., M.B., B.S. (Univ.Qld.)."

"(9) As from March 1, 1964."

#### TECHNICAL CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"How many persons are employed at the Technical Correspondence School and what are their classifications?"

**Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY** (Isis) replied—

"Ninety. The staff comprises—Teachers of Trade Subjects, 27; Instructors (part-time), 34; Draughtsman, 1; Office Staff, 28 (2 clerks, 6 clerk typists, 12 male assistants, 5 female assistants, 1 messenger, 2 cleaners). The 34 part-time teachers shown on the strength of the Technical Correspondence School are not employed in any other departmental teaching duties. In addition there are another 52 part-time teachers who are attached to other teaching establishments and consequently are not shown on the strength of the Technical Correspondence School."

#### TRAINING COURSE FOR SENIOR POLICE OFFICERS

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) asked the Minister for Labour and Industry—

"(1) Did the Government incur any expenditure with regard to the recent course of creative thinking taken by senior police officers and, if so, what was the total amount involved?"

"(2) Was any money paid to any outside persons or organisations and, if so, what were the amounts and to whom were they paid?"

**Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN** (Landsborough—Premier), for **Hon. K. J. MORRIS** (Mt. Coot-tha), replied—

"(1) Yes. £168."

"(2) One hundred and sixty-eight pounds was paid to Mr. D. Castle, Director of the Executive Training Centre of Australia, Sydney."

#### MEDICAL SPECIALISTS AT IPSWICH GENERAL HOSPITAL

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

"(1) How many specialists have been appointed to the staff of the Ipswich General Hospital?"

"(2) In what branch of medicine do they specialise?"

"(3) What is their remuneration?"

"(4) At what period of the day or week will their services be available to the Ipswich Hospitals Board?"

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

"(1) Seven."

"(2) Surgery, medicine, paediatrics, obstetrics and gynaecology, radiology, and anaesthetics. I have also recommended to the Medical Superintendent that the position of visiting ear, nose and throat specialist be created and this will be advertised in due course."

"(3) The annual remuneration for a senior specialist is £435 per session of three hours per week and for a junior

£365. The number of sessions which have been requested by the Board and approved was—Senior Surgeon, 3 sessions per week; Junior Surgeon, 3 sessions per week; Junior Physician, 2 sessions per week; Junior Obstetrician and Gynaecologist, 1 session per week; Junior Paediatrician, 1 session per week; Junior Anaesthetist, 3 sessions per week; Radiologist, 3 sessions per week. The number of sessions will be reviewed in the light of experience."

"(4) The times when the visiting staff will attend the hospital are by arrangement between the Hospitals Board and themselves. The list is a long one and I have a copy of the times which I shall give to the Honourable Member. All are subject to call in an emergency. Although the sessions are nominally three hours, the staff stay until all patients have been treated and operations completed."

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

#### SEALING OF COOLANGATTA-TO-MOSSMAN HIGHWAY

**Mr. COBURN** (Burdekin) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

"(1) What sections of the paved highway from Coolangatta to Mossman are presently under construction and what is the length of each section?"

"(2) When is it anticipated that each section will be completed?"

"(3) What sections will remain unsealed on this highway, when the sections presently under construction or for which approval for construction has been released are completed?"

"(4) What are the widths of the sections of the highway now under construction and to what standard are they being built?"

**Hon. E. EVANS** (Mirani) replied—

"(1 to 4) As the information will take some time to assemble I shall have it prepared as soon as possible and will make it available if the Honourable Member would be good enough to ask the question again."

#### BURDEKIN IRRIGATION SCHEME

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

"(1) Are employees of the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply presently blasting a channel to tap the remaining water in the Burdekin?"

"(2) Is it a fact that unless good rain falls in the Burdekin area no more water



will be available to the irrigated farms at Clare, Millaroo, and Dalbeg after the end of November?"

"(3) If this is correct, does it not further strengthen my claim for the immediate implementation of the Burdekin scheme?"

**Hon. O. O. MADSEN** (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Forestry), for **Hon. A. R. FLETCHER** (Cunningham), replied—

"(1) The Irrigation Commission is constructing, at a cost of about £15,000, an outlet channel and control structure at a rock bar in the bed of the Burdekin River just downstream of the entry of the Bowen River. This work will permit the controlled release downstream to the Irrigation Areas of some 2,000 acre feet additional to that available from Gorge Weir. It is expected the work will be completed by the end of this month."

"(2) It requires only a small inflow from the Burdekin River's very large catchment area to satisfy the full demand of the Clare, Millaroo and Dalbeg irrigation areas. Records show that in practically every year since 1920 more than sufficient inflow to meet an irrigation demand equivalent to present requirements occurred before the end of November, and in only one year this inflow occurred later than mid December. If no inflow does occur before the end of November, it is not expected that the subsequent demand can be met until supplies are replenished by natural flow."

"(3) It is pointed out that the three irrigation areas of Clare, Millaroo and Dalbeg were developed on the basis that some limitation in supply during the tobacco season would occur in dry years. Australian irrigation areas are generally planned on the basis of some limitation in supply in dry years so as not to unduly restrict development because of the effect of such occasional years. It is not considered that the possibility of a failure in supply this year which, as dealt with in answering Question (2) may well not occur, strengthens in any way claims for immediate construction of the Burdekin Falls Dam."

#### BRINSMEAD ROAD, MULGRAVE SHIRE

**Mr. ADAIR** (Cook) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

"Has the Main Roads Department prepared plans for the forming and bitumen-sealing of the Brinsmead Road, which is a gazetted tourist road in the Mulgrave Shire? If so, when can it be expected work will be commenced on this road?"

**Hon. E. EVANS** (Mirani) replied—

"Plans are not yet available. It is unlikely that there will be funds for the work in this financial year but its priority is such that preparation of plans is scheduled for this financial year."

#### PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

Report of the State Stores Board for the year 1960-1961.

Orders in Council under the State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1958.

Proclamation under the Forestry Act of 1959.

#### PETITION

##### AMENDMENT OF THE LIQUOR ACTS

**Mr. DEAN** (Sandgate) (11.26 a.m.): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition signed by 138 members of the Baptist and Methodist Circuits in the Sandgate electorate praying that the Parliament of Queensland will not amend the Liquor Acts of Queensland to allow liberalising of the sale and consumption of alcoholic liquor in the community.

Petition laid upon the table and, on motion of Mr. Dean, read and received—

##### "Petition

"To the Honourable the Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland, in Parliament assembled—

"This Petition of the undersigned Members of the Baptist and Methodist Circuits in the Electorate of Sandgate respectfully

##### Showeth:

"That your Petitioners have become aware that your Honourable House intends during the present Session of Parliament to amend the Law relating to the production, sale, and consumption of Alcoholic Liquor by making provision for (1) the licensing of cafes and restaurants; (2) the sale of liquor on the Lord's Day; and (3) the extension of facilities for the consumption of alcoholic liquor—

"And as these alterations in the Liquor Laws will, in our opinion, (a) be responsible for a greater death toll on our roads; (b) increase the number of broken homes; (c) cause a greater loss of working hours; (d) be the cause of more blighted lives among our young people—

"Your Petitioners, therefore, Humbly Pray that the Parliament of Queensland will not amend the Liquor Acts of Queensland to allow the liberalising of the sale and consumption of alcoholic liquor in the community,

"And your Petitioners will ever pray —."

## SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—  
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 10 October (see p. 627) on Mr. Hiley's motion—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1961-1962, a sum not exceeding £1,594 to defray the salary of Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor."

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

"That the Item 'Aide-de-Camp, £1,594' be reduced by £1."

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (11.29 a.m.): I rise to support the motion of censure moved by the Leader of the Opposition to reduce the Item by £1.

It is about three years since the Treasurer told the Opposition, when we referred somewhat disparagingly to his deficit duet at that time, that the Government had not blundered into deficit. He told us that rather than blundering into deficit they had deliberately adopted the policy of deficit financing to wipe out reserves that had been accumulated under Labour administrations, with a view to clearing the way for an approach to the Commonwealth Grants Commission. In other words, we would have to go broke before rich uncle would come to our rescue. On that occasion he said that the worst that could be said about budgeting for a deficit was that you are eating tomorrow's cake today. From his remarks at that time, apparently tomorrow's cake was to be taken care of by an increased reimbursement under a new tax formula from the Commonwealth, or a rake-off through the approach to the Commonwealth Grants Commission. At the time I suggested to the Premier, as he well knew, that the Commonwealth Grants Commission could not, and would not, allow such a fantastic position to develop, with the threat of Queensland and Victoria to join the three smaller States as claimants under the Commonwealth Grants Commission, leaving only New South Wales as the only non-claimant State. When the Treasurer spoke of his approach to the Grants Commission in 1958 we said that he was only hoping for the Commonwealth Government to buy their way out of the situation so that five out of the six States would not be claimant States. He was hoping that the Commonwealth Government would buy the Queensland and Victorian State Governments out of their approach by granting them increases in tax under a new formula in lieu of pursuing the course to the Commonwealth Grants Commission. Hon. members will remember the triumphant return in June, 1959, of the Treasurer and the Premier. Our two heroes returned from Canberra. Hon. members will remember the Press photographs of them, waving satchels out in front of them as they

got off the plane with the millions chalked across the sides, and the theatrical performance that was given by the pair of them on their return from Canberra at that time. I am sure hon. members will recall the emotional cry of the Premier although the terminology was a straight quote from the Treasurer because it was his majestic turn of phrase that was used. He said, "The star of Federation is in the ascendancy." Three years later, we know it is like most of the stars that this Government have brought back from Canberra. On sober reflection this one is now very dim indeed. Indeed, it was considered remarkably dim when the Treasurer in 1959 brought down his No. 3 Budget only a couple of months after his return from Canberra. On that occasion he told us that the improvement was sufficient to change the picture of State finances from one of gross insufficiency to one of barest sufficiency. And note this well! He proceeded to tell Parliament that the Government had decided that with the improved basis of tax reimbursement the State should endeavour to present a balanced Budget. In other words, at that time it was the Treasurer's expressed opinion to Parliament that 1959, or the end of 1959, was the point where the script provided for the exit of deficits, and not from increased Commonwealth reimbursements only because "Taxus Tom", if we can refer to him in that way, was not only "duffing" a few from the Commonwealth paddocks, but was also riding the range in Queensland to the tune of substantial increases from stamp duties, and a most vicious sectionally-directed tax on the transfer of Crown leases which the Government, under pressure from the Country Party, particularly from the hon. member for Somerset, who is now Minister for Public Works and Local Government, later were obliged to modify substantially. Indeed, they were obliged to accept the amendment put forward from the Opposition by the hon. member for Port Curtis to ensure that a most vicious principle would not apply whereby a man was obliged to pay a proportion of something that could amount to a loss rather than a profit when compared with the asset value of the property. This all added up to an anticipated surplus of £15,467.

That was back in 1959. The Treasurer told us that the plan was deliberately to guide ourselves to the point of going broke whereupon we would get a new taxation formula, and after that we would draw on our own resources. The point had now come when he should endeavour to present a balanced Budget. He anticipated a surplus of £15,000. He has been so discouraged since that he has not even attempted to anticipate another though he has had one or two tries at producing one. However, the anticipated surplus of £15,000 turned out to be a deficit of £164,000. For the following year, the financial year ended June, 1961, he anticipated a deficit of £216,000 and it turned out to be £618,000, almost three times as much.

I want to reiterate some concern I expressed recently when I directed a question to the Premier. I believe the revealed deficit of £618,000, which we are examining now, is still very much clouded by the Premier's statement to the Loan Council on 14 June, 1961, which, after all, was only 16 days before the close of the financial year. I asked the Premier whether he had said, as reported in the Press, "It will mean in spite of all the restraint we can practice that our deficit for the year will approximate £1,250,000." That statement was made by him to the Loan Council. It was a responsible statement from a prepared case and not just one given off the cuff as in debate. The Treasurer was sitting with him at the Loan Council table in Canberra. When I asked the Premier about the great discrepancy between the anticipated deficit of £1,250,000 that he gave to the Loan Council on 14 June and the actual deficit of £618,000, he told me that this estimate had been supplied by the Treasurer and, to quote the Premier's actual words, that it had been "based on collation of the estimated receipts and expenditure, respectively, by each Department for the month of June." He went on to say—

"As reported to the Treasurer, on July 4, by his officers 'the improved position, compared with forecasts, is due to an improvement in receipts of £365,000 and a saving in expenditure of £284,000'."

He went on to set out some of the ways in which these improvements had been brought about. One was an amount including an adjustment of £152,000 consequent on the winding-up of the Workers' Homes Fund. I do not believe that would have come like a bolt from the blue to the Government in the last day or so of the financial year. They would have been in a position to know it well and truly 14 days or 16 days before the end of the financial year. In the past we have often been chided by hon. members opposite for allegedly throwing a few thousand pounds one way or the other when speaking in debate in the Chamber. In view of that, let us hear no more complaint from them. Their own Treasurer was 100 per cent. out in his estimate of the deficit only 16 days before the end of the financial year and, as I pointed out, it was not in a casual statement in a discussion in a club or in similar informal circumstances, but it was part of a specially prepared case submitted to possibly the most important body in Australia at the moment.

To put it most kindly, when I look at the explanation given by the Premier I can only whistle a tune which I think most lyrically matches most of this Government's face-saving statements and that is, "It all sounds like sawdust to me." I regret to say that I think the Premier has been politically dishonest in the matter. I say "politically" because no-one has a greater respect for the Premier's personal honesty than I have and for his absolute integrity as far as personal

profit or aggrandisement is concerned. But political honesty is a horse of a completely different colour and in this matter he has been politically dishonest in one of two ways. Either he has, on the one hand, deliberately given false figures to the Loan Council in Canberra, or, alternatively, if he has not been politically dishonest there, he has been politically dishonest in this Chamber in bringing down a budget that misleads the House by suggesting that the deficit last year was £618,000 when it should have been approximately twice that amount, if we rely on what he told the Loan Council.

I reject the explanation that was given by the Premier. It was quite a plausible explanation in a large measure, but we cannot accept that the amount from the Workers' Home Fund, to which he referred, suddenly flashed into the Budget in the last 50 yards like a horse coming home in a race. I reject it particularly because I have too much respect for the officers of the Treasury Department and the Public Service of Queensland to concede that they were responsible for such a gross miscalculation as apparently occurred—if we accept the Premier's explanation. We have been fortunate in the past, and still are, in having public servants of such high calibre. One of the best assets of the State is the number of most capable devoted public servants in key positions, and not the least of those would be in the Treasury Department. Indeed, they displayed their capacity and ability by producing some sort of an explanation when called upon by the Premier to produce a face-saver for him. I emphasise that it was a face-saver for the Government, for the Premier, and for the Treasurer, not for the officers of the Treasury Department.

When we come to the question of political dishonesty—again I stress the word "political", because I am not suggesting any personal dishonesty—both the Premier and the Treasurer are on record in "Hansard" as self-confessed political chefs in the art of cooking up face-savers for their Government. We recall the statements that were made voluntarily by them in the Chamber about the exit of the hon. member for Fassifern from Cabinet.

However seriously we regard the difference between the figure given by the Premier to the Loan Council on 14 June as the anticipated deficit and the figure of approximately half that amount given to Parliament by the Treasurer, I do not intend dwelling on that because I am more interested in finding out what financial tune the Government are marching to now. In my opinion, the Treasurer did not tell us that in his Financial Statement. I believe that this was because he does not know what tune the Government are marching to. He is still swinging along to his 1958 style tune "Dig Me Dem Deficits", which he made popular in that year but which has long been off the hit parade. Indeed, the band that used to "Hear, hear" so much behind him has ceased to play altogether.

I will grant him that he did not blunder into those deficits in 1958. As I pointed out in 1958, when the Government originally adopted this policy of deliberately budgeting for a deficit, the Treasurer made no secret of the fact that he was going into it with his eyes open. I agree that he did not blunder into deficit in 1958, but I say, "Brother, he is certainly bogged down in them now."

**Mr. Hughes:** Calwell wants Australia to budget for a £100,000,000 deficit.

**Mr. HANLON:** That is something that we could go into if we had the time. The hon. member for Kurilpa says, "Calwell wants Australia to budget for a £100,000,000 deficit." I should like the Treasurer to tell us, as he more or less pointed out in an address to the Queensland Division of the Australian Society of Accountants last year, the surplus that actually exists in the Commonwealth Government's funds. When we talk about the Commonwealth Government budgeting for a deficit of £15,000,000 or £16,000,000, if we take it on revenue rather than capital works and the amounts they have voted to fill the gap in the loan programme, they have a surplus almost as large as Mr. Calwell wants to increase expenditure. The Treasurer used to accuse a former Treasurer, the hon. member for Bundaberg, of confusing revenue with loan funds and capital works, and so on. One of the first things he did in the Budget he brought down after the present Government took office was to remove from the section of the budget relating to the Co-ordinator-General's Department certain capital works that were being classed as revenue. I am not going to take up time with that but I think there is more than a £100,000,000 surplus in the Commonwealth Treasury that Mr. Calwell or any other Labour administration could use if they had the opportunity, and will use, when the people give them the opportunity on 9 December next.

Let me return to the Queensland Budget because, after all, we are interested primarily in our own Budget rather than in Commonwealth matters. However, later on I hope to show that that is where the secret of success lies for State Governments and local authorities. As I look at our own Budget and the history of the Queensland Government over the past three or four years I am reminded of a serial I recently followed on A.B.Q. It was a fine B.B.C. teleproduction of "Bleak House" by Charles Dickens. In "Bleak House" there is a character by the name of Richard Carstone who has a very similar role to that of the Treasurer in State finances over the last three or four years. In the pursuit of his rights to an entitlement in the case of Jarndyce v. Jarndyce Carstone resolutely follows a monument of chancery practice through the courts, eating up his assets until he is reduced to a complete financial wreck. He betrays his loved ones and dependants. When I say "loved ones" and make a comparison with the Treasurer, I do not

make the comparison on a personal basis. I refer to the local authorities who are virtually his children after all. By the time Carstone goes through the Court to get his entitlement and proves that he has a substantial entitlement, he finds that the whole of the assets of the estate have been eaten up in costs. I think the Treasurer is following the same course. He has gone broke voluntarily. He has been looking all the time for the light on the hill and where this extra money is going to flow back. But what do we find? He is still in debt. He is going to be more and more in debt. Whatever rhyme or reason there was for the policy he originally adopted in 1958, he is going to be like the character Carstone. Under his financial directorship all the benefits will have been eaten up in the costs and disadvantages that have accrued in the meantime.

**Mr. Hilton:** What benefits are likely to come?

**Mr. HANLON:** That is what I wanted to know. I suggest that any benefits that might arise from the Treasurer's deliberate go-broke policy have already been received through the new formula; there is nothing left to come. Again this year, for the fifth time, he is going into deficit to the tune of some hundreds of thousands of pounds. He is not only doing that on the past revenues available to his and previous Governments, but this year the phantom horseman, "Taxus Tom," again rides the range for vastly increased taxes from liquor, racing and motor-vehicle charges. He is going to impose motor-vehicle charges on people who probably are less equipped to pay them than any others, the youngsters going through school at the moment who will be applying for driving licences in the years to come.

If he is going to impose additional taxation in the form of extra fees through the Licensing Commission he should ensure justice to the consumer of the product. Even though there are those who say it is not a good product to consume, we have to face up to the fact that a big proportion of the community are consumers of liquor. They are paying very substantial taxes already to the Commonwealth Government, and to a degree, to the State Government. If the Treasurer is going to make this additional impost by way of licensing fees I think his Government should ensure that it is borne by the people who can very well bear it—the breweries. Only recently the Carlton Brewery from Victoria, already well established in Cairns, thought it worth while to come to Queensland and take over the Rockhampton brewery. Of course, the biggest one they took over was the Queensland brewery. If these people think it is worth while to come to Queensland and suck away profits from Queenslanders who were the shareholders of the breweries, taking over for the second-class Z shares that they handed out, I think the Government, in the interests

of the people of this State, should ensure that if it is necessary to impose this additional tax by way of liquor fees, these vested interests are the ones to pay it.

If one looks at Castlemaine Perkins, the other major brewery, they are disclosing record profits. I suggest there is much more room there for the Government to get revenue than from the ordinary man in the street who has his couple of beers after work. I think the Government should watch this matter closely through the Licensing Commission or the office of the Commissioner for Prices and, if prices should rise to pass this tax on to the ordinary consumer, as is usual, they should take action to see that prices are controlled.

I agree with what the hon. member for Cook said, that hotelkeepers, particularly those operating under lease or heavy mortgage, are working to a comparatively fine margin, looking at it from the point of view of what the Liberal Party regards as a reasonable profit. Certainly, the breweries are in a far better position to pay than is the man in the street.

The Treasurer told us—and there is no doubt that it is true—that times are particularly bad, and he has to go on with this deficit business because he must face the responsibility of maintaining employment in the State. He puts his deficit budgeting now not on deliberately going broke to get more money from the Commonwealth Government, because that issue is over, but, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, to avoid unemployment. He sails merrily along year after year, with both deficits and unemployment, but there is no indication that it will not get worse in this coming year as a result of increasing unemployment. It is all very well for him to say that if Queensland's record so far as unemployment is concerned more than matches that of any other State in the Commonwealth. He has this deficit and he is making virtually no impression on the unemployment position at all, or, if he is, it is not noticeable because the State is in a parlous position with unemployment.

What is going to happen to the people involved in seasonal lay-offs, added to the thousands of young people leaving school next year—the school-leavers who will be seeking employment, mingled with the existing pool of unemployment? What will be the position in this State then? What help is the Treasurer's tiddly-widdly deficit of £600,000 if we believe him, or £1,250,000 if we believe the Premier? It will not have very much effect, and I believe the position will be absolutely chaotic so far as unemployment is concerned. Heaven knows, it is bad enough now, with all these young people going to school, having looked for jobs and not having got them. There is nothing more dispiriting and nothing that will contribute to juvenile delinquency more than for a young fellow to see his mates getting jobs and he not able to get one himself. Eight hundred would he cut expenditure, if in his Budget

of them are still looking for work after having left school last year. In addition many hundreds of others did not leave school because, when they could not get employment, their parents were fortunate enough to be able to send them on to Senior or the University, even though their examination results did not merit the additional schooling.

**Mr. Smith:** You know 26,000 were placed in employment?

**Mr. HANLON:** That is what we complain of with hon. members opposite. If one looks at the figures from a human point of view and not from the point of view of pounds, shillings and pence that dominate the views of this Government and particularly those of the hon. member for Windsor the position is not good—that is, from the point of view of the fellow who is having a bad time. That is what the Government do. Year after year the Opposition has sought to raise the matter of unemployment and the Government deliberately turn their face on the unemployed and say, "Look at all the people who are employed." That has been the answer given by the Minister for Labour and Industry time and again. It is only in recent months or the last 12 months when the credit squeeze reached its zenith that the Government turned their face and looked out of the corner of their eye at the unemployed.

**Mr. Mann:** With thousands starving.

**Mr. HANLON:** Thousands, yet until now they have refused to look at them. We have at least forced them into the position of having to acknowledge the fact of unemployment. Going back through "Hansard" we find that the Government never even acknowledged a reasonable amount of unemployment, although they were consistently warned of it by the Opposition, who told them that the position was deteriorating. To that end the Leader of the Opposition moved on numerous occasions for the adjournment of the House and amendments of the Address in Reply and Budget, and we were ridiculed by Government members. They said, "It is a lot of wishful thinking. You people live on unemployment. You are always talking about unemployment. It will never be as bad as you are making it out to be." Today they have to eat their words, and they are not very good at it.

With my colleague the hon. member for Belmont I ask the Treasurer to tell us where in his Budget he is making a dramatic effort to meet unemployment. It is easy to refer to majestic figures, to use a term favoured often by the Treasurer, in referring to loan raising, local authority expenditure and so on. Admittedly, local authority expenditure particularly is the keynote, but where is the really dramatic impact on unemployment in the Budget? Where would the Treasurer cut his expenditure if unemployment was only half what it is today? What section of his Budget would be pruned? In what way

he is deliberately over-spending to relieve unemployment? If he is overspending to meet unemployment, let him tell us in what way he would cut expenditure if the unemployment position was better.

To be fair I concede that if the general economic position improved he would certainly be getting more revenue and in that way reduce the deficit. He would be receiving extra revenue in stamp duties and so on. After the way he has jiggered round stamp duties, after raiding the suspense account, and after the way he has juggled stamp duties from one year to another, it is impossible for anybody to tell in regard to stamp duties what the position is. It goes up and down and round about like a yo-yo. As he once told us, it is impossible, once we start monkeying around with figures like that, to tell what the position is, as the picture is completely destroyed from one year to another. I concede he could get extra revenue if the overall financial position was not as tight as it is but, even recognising that, if he is making any great gesture to meet unemployment by deficit financing, he must be deliberately over-spending in a number of directions, and I challenge him to tell us where they are. I challenge him to tell us where he would cut expenditure if unemployment was not as severe as it is today.

**Mr. Hiley:** Would this answer help you: the deficit is one-quarter per cent. of the Budget.

**Mr. HANLON:** The Treasurer states that the deficit is one-quarter per cent. of the Budget. That is a matter of opinion. The Premier thought it was one-half per cent.; he said it was twice as much. Even conceding that it is one-quarter per cent., I remind the Treasurer that great things from little beginnings grow, as he knows. If it is only one-quarter per cent., other deficits have been one-half per cent. and perhaps others three-quarter per cent. over the five years of the Treasurer's administration. The position may be similar to that of the person who goes to the races with a roll of £10 and starts to make 5s. bets and thinks he is going to have a cheap day out for £2. If he starts to chase his original 5s. bets he will end the day going home by Shank's pony. The Treasurer could easily find himself in the same position if he relies on the argument that the deficit is only one-quarter per cent. of the Budget.

**Mr. Duggan** interjected.

**Mr. HANLON:** I did not mean to refer to matters involving additional taxation. The Leader of the Opposition says that even when the racegoer goes home by Shank's pony the Treasurer will have got his cut out of him before he starts to walk the long road home. If the racing stewards were in charge of the Treasurer's Budget they would fine him for excessive use of the spur. It is only about two years since he raised taxation imposed on the racing fraternity.

He raised the tax 100 per cent., from 3d. stamp duty on a paddock betting ticket, to 6d., and raised the other taxes proportionately, and now, a year or two later he comes back for another bite.

Because the hon. member for Nundah is in a bit of a hot spot the Treasurer yesterday gave him the opportunity to make his speech. The Hendra district is in the Nundah electorate and the racing fraternity have been led up the garden path. The Liberal branches in that electorate have been filled with trainers and strappers who have been told quietly, "Leave it to Tom and he will bring back the mid-week racing." The only thing that Tom is doing is putting his hand into their pockets and taking money out. The hon. member for Nundah realised his position with the racing people in his electorate and that is why the Treasurer gave him a brief yesterday to try to get him out of that difficult situation. It is all very well for the Treasurer to hand these things over to his officers—if they are given enough time they can prove anything—and it is all very well for the hon. member for Nundah to say that things will be all right because they will not be paying as much as is paid in South Australia. It comes back to the same principle as the quarter per cent. of the Budget the Treasurer referred to. If it was doubled in 1958, and a 2 per cent. turnover tax, now and it is something else next year, it will not be long before they are paying more than the racing fraternity in the other States of the Commonwealth. Do not let us imagine that the figures quoted by the hon. member for Nundah accurately reflect the position, because in the southern States they have mid-week racing and night-trotting, and with the large populations in Sydney and Melbourne more people go to the races.

**A Government Member:** And one-armed bandits.

**Mr. HANLON:** That is not reflected in the racing figures. The Treasurer will have them here next. When the hon. member for Bulimba raised a question about artesian bores, and the amount of water left in them, the Treasurer knew all about it. He said, "Go to the Library and you will find all the records showing how much water is there." I could not help thinking that he might even be coming up with a tax on artesian bore-water. He is desperate enough to do anything.

With regard to other increases in taxes, I mention briefly the charge of £1 for drivers' licences. The Treasurer was fairly shrewd in the Budget statement because he dismissed it off the cuff, and said that there would be a paltry £60,000 gained from that source. However, he has in mind the waves and waves of children coming through the schools. We know how many high schools the Government have had to construct for secondary school pupils. The increased post-war birthrate is being reflected in high school attendances, and just as surely as the students are coming through high school large numbers soon will apply for driving licenses,

and whilst this is a comparatively small amount of £60,000 now, it will steadily rise and may go as high as £150,000 or £250,000. The Treasurer should clear up this point: if an applicant has a test and fails, does he pay £1, or will he finally pay the £1 when he passes the test? It has been suggested that £1 each test could lead to revenue hunting by the department and a deliberate failing of people on the borderline.

**Mr. Ramsden:** Surely you are not accusing the departmental officers of stooping to that level?

**Mr. HANLON:** Of course I am not accusing the departmental officers of it but I am accusing the Government. They have been accused by members of their own party, including the hon. member for Fassifern. I do not say the police will do it off their own bat but police officers have been told such things about tickets for traffic offences and other matters. Policemen who have not a good enough record for issuing tickets have been told they have got to do better. I challenge the Government to deny that. In this State police have been called in under this Government and told they have got to issue more tickets.

**Mr. Ramsden:** By members of this Cabinet?

**Mr. HANLON:** By the Government. It is not the block I am after: it is the butcher. That is why I wish the hon. member for Merthyr would leave me alone and let me get on with my speech. It is the Government who decide these things. The officers of the Public Service, whether they are the police or anyone else, are there to carry out the duties assigned to them under the policy of the Government. The fee of £1 for a driving licence could tempt the Government, particularly in the borderline case where it is a matter of judgment whether the person should be failed. If at the end of the financial year the Treasurer, or the Minister in charge of the department, is given the figure and he says, "We did not get £60,000; we got only £40,000" he might say, "You had better fail a few more." We all know how easy it is for some people to arrive at a decision to match their conscience. One of the ways to do it is to say, "By jove, Tom Aikens has got something. He is always talking about road accidents and dangers on the road. These licences are being got too easily." So they might adopt the moral attitude of instructing the police to adopt a much more severe approach to people applying for licences, indirectly following an apparently noble course in the pursuit of ill-gotten gains for the extra revenue.

**Mr. Ramsden:** I think you are over-estimating the influence of the hon. member.

**Mr. HANLON:** We are only estimating the Government. We have heard stories that have been told in this Chamber, not in the corridors of the House, by members of the hon. member's own party, by people who

have sat in Caucus with him. Some of them, I know, he does not let sit in Caucus with him; but people who have sat in Caucus with him have told these things in the Chamber.

To return to more serious aspects of the Budget—let the Treasurer not attempt to hide behind the excuse of the credit squeeze, and the dreadful thing Uncle Robert has done to him in imposing it. This Government are intimately tied up with the credit squeeze in two ways. Firstly, both Government parties are political blood-brothers of the corresponding parties that are the Government in the Federal sphere. Secondly, the Country Party conference early this year, attended by the Premier and numerous members who occupy the Government benches, as delegates, overwhelmingly carried a vote of confidence in Mr. McEwen and his credit squeeze when he addressed the meeting. As the Premier has just entered the Chamber, I ask him through you: is it true that the Country Party overwhelmingly carried a vote of confidence in the Federal Leader, Mr. McEwen, and in the policy the Commonwealth Government were following? It was in the course of the debate initiated by a delegate to that conference who wanted to censure the Federal Government on the way they had gone about introducing the credit squeeze for its effect on the economic programme. When we bear these things in mind and when we realise how the Nicklin-Morris administration and the Menzies-McEwen administration are so intimately tied up, we ask: where is our economic future? Surely we in this Assembly should be able to expect of the Treasurer in his Financial Statement some indication of a sound future for the State's economy. What is he going to do about these deficits? How long are they going to continue? As I mentioned earlier, he is still waltzing along to a tune that he said in 1958 aimed at getting a new tax reimbursement formula. He got that two years ago; it is over and done with; but he is still going along to the same tune and conditions have changed completely.

The Treasurer has pointed out the dangers of funding deficits from loan moneys. I hope he is not going to do that. We are entitled to know more of his plans in this direction, because these things must ultimately be bound up with the future of Queensland. If we are to have deficit after deficit after deficit, somebody must face up to the problem. I suppose it will be left to an A.L.P. administration to get the State out of the mess that the present Commonwealth Government and this Government have got it into. The Treasurer has already raided the Suspense Account of the Succession and Stamp Duties Office to match a deficit. He cannot do that again because it can be done only once. I think he should tell us in this Budget whether he intends making any new approach to the Commonwealth Grants Commission. It has been suggested by the hon. member for Bundaberg that the Treasurer

has already surrendered his right to approach the Commonwealth Grants Commission as part of the deal that he made for the new tax reimbursement formula a few years ago. Technically, I do not think that is quite true. I think the announced arrangement was that he would put forward another claim only in the most desperate circumstances. The circumstances are extremely desperate now, but I agree with the hon. member for Bundaberg that the Treasurer would probably receive a cold reception from the Commonwealth Grants Commission, at least until the six-year period of the new agreement expires. We have never been a claimant State, although we did make approaches some years ago, but it is unlikely that our application would be approved if "teacher's pet," South Australia, which has been told that it can no longer be a claimant State, could not come back to the party with us. South Australia's finances are reasonably sound, because, as we told the Treasurer when the new formula was agreed upon, South Australia, on whom we were to make ground, came out on top. Although they were told that they were no longer a claimant State, their basis of reimbursement was established on what they received as a claimant State. It was similar to the millionaire's son being sent out into the world with £100,000 and being told to work his way up from the bottom. South Australia's exit from the Commonwealth Grants Commission was on the basis that their new entitlement was based on what they had been receiving as a claimant State. In my opinion, if the conference decided that South Australia should stand on its own feet and no longer be a claimant State, their base entitlement should have been worked out on what they would have received had they not been a claimant State instead of their income as a claimant State. South Australia actually received a considerable start in the race under the new formula.

We also pointed out to the Treasurer at that time, and the Treasurer agreed, that population growth was an important factor in the new tax reimbursement formula. Under this Government, a net migration loss has been recorded in Queensland in the last three or four years because many people have left the State to seek employment in New South Wales, where they can get three weeks' annual leave and better working conditions under a Labour Government. That net migration loss does not help us under the tax reimbursement formula. The shocking failure of the Government—I say that advisedly—to secure a reasonable deal from the Commonwealth Government, in comparison with other States, in the Mt. Isa rail project negotiations is even more discouraging for the future, particularly if we consider the precedent set in regard to sinking fund entitlements. I do not intend to dwell on that matter because I did deal with it in the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I look forward to the opportunity to have a more detailed debate on the Mt. Isa matter

when the Treasurer brings down the agreement. I think we are entitled to an answer from the Treasurer when I ask him when is that agreement to be brought before Parliament? It is a most important matter, one that has been dragging on for years, one about which the Government have a very poor record, and one that will not be very much to the advantage of the Commonwealth Government in the Federal elections. We are entitled to be told whether the agreement is going to be held over again, as it has been for years, and whether we are not to be given the exact details of the agreement until after the Federal elections. After all, the Labour Government will be returned at the Federal elections, so possibly it might be to the advantage of the State if the agreement were not finalised until after the elections! If the Government do not intend to debate the matter until after the elections, they are not doing the right thing by Parliament.

The Government say, "These things are confidential. It is on a Government-to-Government level." That is all we got about the Mt. Isa line for about four years. The Premier asked the Leader of the Opposition not to ask any questions because the matter was strictly confidential—the World Bank and all that sort of thing. "Don't say anything that might upset the apple cart." It was all piffle. That went on for four years. We still have not got the agreement before us. That confidential business is very much overdone. It is happening now with the electricity undertakings in Brisbane. They are public assets and public arrangements are being made. The people will be paying the money; the people are concerned, yet they are told nothing because negotiations are on a Government-to-Government level. After all, what is Government-to-Government level? Is it not people-to-people level? If the Government are a real government it is a people-to-people level. If it is Commonwealth Government to State Government level the people cannot know anything about it. It is just a lot of piffle. Nobody is allowed to study these things. Parliament is given no information. Even the Government back benchers are not given any information until the die is cast. When it is too late to do anything the matter is no longer confidential. What is the use of making it not confidential then? They may as well not say anything about it once the matter is decided. I object to the practice very strongly. It is one that has grown enormously under the Menzies Government. It is the typical Menzies approach. He says that he is examining the matter and not in a position to say anything more, because it may destroy the delicate negotiations that are being carried on. To describe the Mt. Isa negotiations I should not use the word "delicate" but a much stronger word that I should not use in your presence in the Chamber, Mr. Taylor. The Treasurer should tell us when the matter is going to come before Parliament. What happens in the Federal Parliament is not our business



—they have to look after their own affairs—but we want to know when the agreement is going to be brought down here.

Returning to the overall position and the Treasurer's lack of any economic plans for the future, let me say that if there were any grounds for the Treasurer's adopting his go-broke policy in 1958 with the idea of getting more money from the Commonwealth Government, surely there must be grounds, indeed, even stronger grounds, for a similar approach to him by the local authorities. If it was good enough for the Treasurer to weep and wail in Canberra about the poor deal he was getting and say that he had to get additional taxation reimbursement, it is good enough for the local authorities to put a similar case to the Treasurer. Although some are better off than others, all local authorities are in a desperate position. They are unable to gather racing and liquor revenue as the Treasurer envisages in his Financial Statement. He is gathering that for himself and pushing the local authorities out of the door the other way. He is gathering those funds for himself by way of the increased taxation reimbursements formula, gathering our revenue from racing, liquor and so on and pushing the local authorities out the door with the other hand. I pointed out previously that the local bodies are the creation of the State. They are not something that was there and the State grew afterwards. They have been established by the State, or imposed by the State, if I may put it that way, in avenues that the State itself would have to follow if they were not there to do it for it.

**Mr. Walsh:** The local authorities were there before there was a Federal Government, too.

**Mr. HANLON:** That is correct. One would think the Federal Government had been there first. The States were there before Federation and they created the local authorities. I do not think the Treasurer can logically adopt the attitude of shrugging them off and saying that it is their own business, that they are spending too much and that they are majestically spending on water supply and sewerage. He said, "They are eating up too much of our loan funds." I emphasise, "our loan funds." Loan funds used by the local authorities are used by the people of Queensland, and they are not far removed in many ways from a Government department.

This Government's attitude is different when it comes to exercising their will on local authorities in policy matters. There is an amendment of the Traffic Act currently before the House. I will not spend much time on that but in that there is great authority given to the traffic engineer to override local authorities on policy matters such as parking meters and so on. On the other hand, when it comes to a responsibility to them the Treasurer and the Government say, "Go and paddle your own canoe; we cannot

do any more for you. We have not enough funds ourselves. You are a distinct section, a Government in a municipal sphere or a local authority sphere and you have to look after your own revenue." I do not think those positions can be reconciled.

If the Treasurer or the Government want to adopt that attitude on finance I do not think they are justified in giving these powers to a State servant to the degree they have under the Traffic Act for the domination of local authority policy.

I will refer only briefly to this matter. I shall have a better opportunity of doing so when the traffic engineer's department, under the Department of Labour and Industry Estimates, is being discussed, but I should like to comment on the Empire-building that is being set up by the traffic engineer.

**Mr. Walsh:** A real dictatorship.

**Mr. HANLON:** As the hon. member for Bundaberg interjects, we are creating a dictatorship. I am not saying that in a personal manner; we are creating a dictatorship bureaucratically and, as I say, it is growing to Empire-building proportions. It will swamp that Department's Budget if it keeps going.

Traffic is a terrific problem and we are sympathetic towards the Minister and the Government charged with the responsibility of controlling it, but we must keep a balance in these things and, if it is good enough for the Government to say to the local authorities, "We cannot afford to let you go on in the fields of water supply, sewerage and other matters"—which are, after all, more fundamental than traffic—it is good enough to say to Mr. Leitch and his empire-building department of traffic engineering, "You do the work we created you for and within reasonable bounds so far as this Budget is concerned."

However, that is not his plan at all. He is reaching out into other towns in the State and he will be virtually a dictator on traffic matters in every town in Queensland. He will undoubtedly become in his own right the head of a separate department. Eventually the hon. member for Merthyr or the hon. member for Nundah, who are fighting hard to get into Cabinet, will be given the lolly in the way of the extra portfolio of Minister for Traffic. When that happens the Minister will be just an offside to Mr. Leitch, Dictator of Traffic Control in the State.

**Mr. Knox:** This is the only State in which road deaths have been reduced, as a result of our policy.

**Mr. HANLON:** It is like revenue from racing; one can prove anything with figures, depending on what attitude is adopted. Some figures do not mean anything. I challenge the hon. member in this way: let him take credit for reducing the road toll if he wants to, providing he is prepared to take the

responsibility for killing people if the toll in any year or over a period of years should increase.

He has to accept it both ways. If the road toll goes up in the next two or three years, he has to take the responsibility, and he will then not have so much to skite about. If credit is taken when the road toll is reduced, responsibility must be taken for an increase if any in the next two or three years.

What has the Treasurer done in regard to local authorities? Having received extra revenue himself, he has completely disregarded local authorities and has cut down their revenue. His action bears out the plaintive cry of the Local Authorities Association on their treatment by the State and Commonwealth Governments that they are disowned by one and disregarded by the other. That is very true. If the Treasurer's claim for extra assistance from the Commonwealth Government for the State Government is justifiable, the claim of local authorities is even more justifiable. I cannot deal fully with the subject in the limited time still available to me; perhaps I shall have an opportunity to do so when discussing the local Government estimates. Ratepayers in local authority areas, particularly Brisbane, have reached the limit of endurance in providing increased revenue for their local authorities, as the Lord Mayor, Alderman Jones, has pointed out, and that applies equally to those who do not pay rates directly. Some people suggest that a tenant does not pay rates, but he pays them equally with ratepayers. He sends his rent to the landlord and out of it the landlord despatches his cheque to the local authority. We have reached a fantastic position. A pensioner on £5 a week does not have to pay any income tax. Anybody who suggested that a pensioner should be taxed would be regarded as a rat-bag, but the same pensioner is called on by another sphere of Government, and that is what local government is, to pay £40 or £50 a year or 15s. a week in rates. If we are going to increase expenditure, as the Lord Mayor of Brisbane has pointed out, there will have to be some form of co-operation between local authorities and the Government. The 15s. a week paid in rates by the pensioner is just another form of taxation. If a pensioner on £260 a year had to pay income tax, he would have paid last year £5 8s. 4d. Take a pensioner couple on £500 a year. If the husband was subject to taxation, he would be allowed a deduction of £143 for his wife and £60 or so for medical expenses and rates, which admittedly he can claim as a deduction, and he would pay only £7 18s. 4d. in income tax, but we do not ask him to pay even that amount. We say that in the Federal sphere we could not possibly ask him to pay income tax, but in the local authority area the same person will get a half-yearly bill for rates of £17 or £18. To take the matter further, a wage-earner such as a tram-conductor or someone else, would with overtime earn

possibly £800 a year. If he has a wife and two children he is allowed a deduction of £299 for them, and, if he has other general deductions of £200, which would not be unlikely or unreasonable for a man with a wife and two children, his taxable income would be reduced to £300 on which he would pay income tax of £7 18s. 4d., but on top of that he gets his rate notice of £30 or £40 or approximately six times what he is reasonably expected to pay as income tax. It can be said that for his rate payment he gets certain services such as a water supply and sewerage, but in the same way he receives services in return for paying income tax, child endowment and hospital benefits being among them. The position has reached such a stage that something will have to be done. In New South Wales the Labour Government have given a lead in the matter. The Minister, Mr. Hills, has called a conference of local authorities, action that has not been taken by the Queensland Treasurer. Leadership in that regard in Queensland has been left to the Lord Mayor of Brisbane.

**Mr. HODGES** (Gympie) (12.30 p.m.): I listened intently to the speech made by the hon. member for Baroona. On previous occasions I have listened to far more intelligent and more constructive speeches by him.

Although much criticism has been levelled at the Treasurer about the preparation of this Budget, we must remember all the aspects that have forced the Treasurer into bringing this Budget before the Assembly. No doubt he would very much wish to be able to bring in a Budget providing for far greater expenditure, but still and all this Budget, presented in these times, must instill confidence in the minds of the people of the State. The Treasurer's attitude when bringing it down proved that he, and the Government, have great confidence in the future of the State. It is a credit to him and the other Ministers that he is able to present such a confident Budget after the State has gone through 3½ to 4 years of extreme drought. It proves what could be done if we had enjoyed three or four normal seasonal years. Although these conditions have been detrimental to our economy and well being, to a point, they are uncontrollable, and I will elaborate on that later.

It is shameful to all Queenslanders that a handful of men in the State can jeopardise not only their future and security, but place the whole State in a dangerous position by adopting tactics and following men whose approach to these matters does not reflect the true principles of the Australian worker. If these men do not realise the folly of their ways they will have to accept full responsibility for the hardship that will be caused to many other workers and their families throughout the State. I am hoping now that common sense prevails amongst these men. They are responsible for jeopardising the future security of other workers in the State, in the railway and in other industries. They are jeopardising their own position and the

future of the State. Over the years they have received from the management of the firm very reasonable conditions. They have come to their decision to gain something for themselves, and even if they do happen to gain something, if this strike is prolonged to the extent that is threatened, they will be responsible for bringing hardship to many people in the State.

There are two aspects I wish to discuss in my speech. It has been said repeatedly that we are living in a remarkable age—the most remarkable age in the history of mankind. Never before have so many remarkable things happened within a short period as have taken place in the past 40 years. As a matter of fact, science has advanced so far that in future only scientists who have specialised on a very narrow front and know more and more about less and less will be able to reach the frontiers in their fields. However, our future is such that we will require to maintain a very strong field of scientists to assist us to get out of the age or the era that we, or that they, have created, and that is an age of unprecedented and accelerating population growth.

Medical science has achieved a very high degree of death control which has not been counterbalanced in any way by birth control. It is having a very dramatic effect. Although far more than half of the world's population now is perpetually hungry, improved means of transport have tended to reduce the frequency and severity of the famines that once claimed millions of lives and that had a counterbalancing effect on the increasing growth of population throughout the world. So our scientists and engineers have in some small way been responsible for this potentially disastrous death control and there is very little that can be done in this field towards averting the threatened ultimate calamity being brought about by this population growth.

The present figure for the population of the world is approximately 2,850,000,000 which represents a density of 50 persons to the square mile over the whole of the land area of the globe. Of that land area 20 per cent. is permanently frozen waste and only 30 per cent. can be cultivated. At the present rate of population growth—and the rate is increasing—by 1975 the population of the world will be 3,828,000,000 and by the year 2,000 it will have increased to 6,267,000,000. So it can be seen that in a relatively short space of time—not in our lifetime, of course—there will be only one square yard of land per person throughout the world. It is very obvious that long before this density can be reached some cessation of present progress must occur, through war, plague or some means of voluntary birth control.

However, we can help to prolong the period that is left to us before this disaster will face the world, and we have a limited amount of time in which to do something about it. It is impossible to estimate just how

long our supplies of mineral resources will last, but, as they are not replaceable, we should turn our attention to a more vigorous programme of developing our industries with replaceable materials. For example, hydro-electric energy should be fostered as an alternative to coal and oil generating power. However, that needs water, a commodity of which we have only a limited supply, but at least it is replaceable. So important is water to our civilised way of life, and so important is the supply, that a water shortage could be one of the factors to take charge of our destinies and also take care of the problem of overcrowding that is developing in the world, not that the increasing population, or the increasing rate of population growth, will be limited by the lack of something to drink, not that the world population will be faced with a fate of death from thirst, but that the availability of water will in future control industrial development of the State and the country, and the distribution of population, as well as our standard of living. It is necessary when thinking of water supply to bear in mind the purpose for which the water is to be used, that is, for irrigation, for industrial purposes, or for purely domestic purposes. Costs of storage of water for irrigation must be kept low, especially while food prices remain at their present low level. Even though the price of water for irrigation must be lower than that of water for industrial and domestic purposes, that is not to say that irrigation is less important. With an ever-increasing population, more water will be required for food production to enable us to stave off hunger, which is a more imminent danger than thirst.

It is fairly obvious that if the present rate of population growth is maintained, our population in 100 years will be at least 60,000,000. Therefore, future centres of population must be in areas where there is a plentiful and cheap water supply. Many of the areas in Australia today in which there is a vigorous growth could provide a water supply for a six-fold increase in population only at a cost that would retard any development or expansion of industry. This is where I believe Queensland, and particularly North Queensland, will come into its own. Because of the distinct advantages it has for water conservation and because of its very heavy rainfall, I think that North Queensland will become the chief industrial area and centre of population in Australia in a very short space of time. We shall be able to store there a plentiful and cheap supply of water for industry and population.

There are several things that we must do if we are to avoid this threatened water famine, not only in this country but throughout the world. Authorities will have to adopt some measure of control in the very near future. Measures such as the augmentation of supply, the elimination of waste, and the control of use, must be taken at a national level.

Dealing first with the augmentation of supply, this will not be unduly difficult at first. But in water conservation, as in other fields, the law of diminishing returns applies, and additional storages will cost more and more. The cost of storage for an acre foot will increase, and the increasing cost of irrigation will overtake the value of the crops unless the crops increase in value, as I think they must, under the pressure of an increasing demand for food from an increasing population.

The second point is the elimination of waste. Undoubtedly a large quantity of the water delivered to consumers, whether for domestic, industrial or agricultural purposes, is wasted. When I say "wasted," I mean that it is used without producing any significant result. Our careless attitude to water has been engendered by the fact that we have always regarded it as a cheap commodity, and any attempt by authorities to restrict or control the consumption of water would cause considerable public resistance.

However, be that as it may, this envisaged water shortage is fast approaching, and some drastic action must be taken to meet a very desperate situation. We can defer the full embarrassment by using all measures at our disposal to impress upon Governments the seriousness of the position. When all possible steps have been taken to augment our water supply and when all avenues of waste have been eliminated recourse must be had to the diversion of water from unessential to essential uses, because it seems to be inevitable that in the very near future, possibly in the lifetime of our grandchildren, most of our rivers will have ceased to flow except in very wet seasons when there is a surplus run-off of water.

I suggested earlier that this approaching disaster should be fought at a national level. The Federal Government's defence Vote this year exceeds £202,000,000. If any Government are prepared to spend millions of pounds as a defence measure in preparation for the killing of thousands, would it not be far better to spend much of that money on water conservation so that the lives of thousands could be saved, production increased, and industry sustained? What a far more effective defence measure than the conventional methods that become obsolete in a very short space of time. The conservation of water should not be a State responsibility but a national responsibility because the States have very limited financial resources to carry out this very important work. In Queensland we have not achieved as much as I should like to see achieved although we have gone a long way towards encouraging the conservation of water. Throughout the lifetime of the Government a very definite approach has been made, not so much with large schemes, but with small schemes and at the farm water supply level. Even though that has been very successful and we are doing a little in that direction, a good deal more should be done

to encourage the conservation of water which in turn would encourage industry and population so that the State could be developed to the extent it should be developed.

The Department of Irrigation and Water Supply is restricted in the amount of work it can carry out by the small Vote it receives. I should be pleased if the Treasurer could increase that department's allocation by 50 per cent. or 100 per cent. in the next Budget, after the reasonable seasonal conditions we hope to get this year. In the last two years the State has had below-normal rainfall, which has resulted in increased demands for the construction of small dams in many areas of the State. The Department of Irrigation has carried out investigations into the possible storage sites on the Upper Herbert, Upper and Lower Burnett, Logan, Albert and Coomera Rivers and the Macintyre Brook. But the shortage of funds and the staff position has not permitted construction to commence on any of those projected works. In addition investigations have been carried out at the request of the State Electricity Commission into water supply for thermal power stations at Callide Creek, Bowen and Broken Rivers and Pelican Creek.

Even though a great deal of construction work has not been carried out for the conservation of water on a very large scale, the Department of Irrigation is carrying out investigations that will enable it to pursue a very progressive policy for the conservation of water in Queensland when money becomes available. One very big advance in water conservation has been through the Farm Water Supplies Assistance Act, which was introduced in 1958. Since the Act has been in operation the demand by producers for assistance has been outstanding. The bringing in of an Act that extends assistance to the producers of this State in the manner in which this one does has been something of a credit to the Government. Much has been achieved under this Act, as was intended, and I shall quote figures that will indicate the extent of what has been achieved during the last three years.

It is considered that what has been achieved merely serves to indicate what can be achieved when the scheme is fully developed, when staff are available throughout the State and funds available for loans to provide the service and finance required to continue the improvement of water supplies for stock, domestic and irrigation purposes, on individual holdings.

At 1 July, 1960, there was a carry-over of 192 applications for technical assistance and 45 applications for technical and financial assistance under this Act. At 1 July, 1961, the carry-over was 420 applications for technical assistance and 92 applications for financial assistance. That is, the Department was 228 applications further back in technical assistance and 47 further back in financial assistance than it was at the beginning of the year. So far as applications for

financial assistance were concerned the department had actually expended, with the Treasurer's approval, more than was allocated for advances during the year—£165,501 actual advances against £150,000 allocated.

Unexpended approvals carried forward at 1 July, 1961, totalled £215,112. Further, for 1961-1962 an amount of £240,000—the amount asked for for the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission under the Act—has been allocated for advances, and for the first three months the amount advanced has been of the order of £70,000—more than one-quarter of the amount allocated for the year. Monthly approvals—as distinct from advances—have averaged about £27,000, so that, with the carry-over of £215,112 of unexpended advances from the previous year, it seems likely that the £240,000 allocated will be fully expended before the end of the financial year. However, that is another problem.

I have quoted those figures to emphasise the demand there is for the services available under the Farm Water Supply Assistance Act. Landowners have indicated, in the most practicable possible way, their appreciation of the service thus made available to them by the Government under this Act.

In this financial year, applications for technical assistance are coming in at the same average rate as they were last year. Applications for financial assistance are coming in at a greater rate—95 for the first three months of this year against 68 for the first three months of last year.

It has been shown that last year the available staff were unable to cope with the demand. There has been a small addition to staff this year by transfer from other branches, but, inevitably, new staff, from wherever it may come, cannot become immediately effective in the department, because they must undergo a certain period of training in the work before they can become very effective as a work force.

However, to permit this department to be carried on effectively as it should be, to meet the existing and potential demand for this service of providing improved water supplies, there are three points for which provision must be made—

1. Staff to cope with the present demand.
2. Staff to replace losses in trained staff.
3. Staff to enable further development, which, at the present time, the department is not able to contemplate. There is no point in endeavouring to develop new areas when we are quite unable to cope with the existing demand.

**Mr. Davies:** Can the hon. member suggest why the Government do not appoint extra staff to help the farmers?

**Mr. HODGES:** Extra staff have been appointed. It is most desirable, and very much desired, to establish additional district offices so that the service may be brought closer to the land owners who need it. It

would make the service more readily available and greatly help the land owner. It would save much waste of time and money in travelling, time that could be used to good advantage in giving assistance and advice at the point where the farmer requires the work to be carried out. But this would require additional field staff, office staff and office accommodation in new district offices, and these can be provided only if funds are made available to pay for them. In the present financial year it would appear that such funds have not been made available to the department. As I said before, I am hoping that with reasonable seasonal conditions this year the Treasurer may be able next year to increase greatly the allocation for the conservation of water generally and for assistance under the Farm Water Supplies Assistance Act.

Splendid work has been carried out under the Act, resulting in the conservation of water on farms or at the point of production where producers require it. Storage facilities on farms are not very costly to the individual farmer, but they enable him to irrigate at a time when irrigation is needed for production of the crop he is growing.

So far the work has of necessity been confined largely to the southern half of the State. Of the £300,000 approved for advances in 1960-1961, approvals have been in the larger areas of the State such as—

Area	Approval £
Rockhampton (mainly Callide Valley)	73,000
Roma	59,000
Gympie district	29,000
Bundaberg	26,000
Longreach	21,000
Warwick	19,000

The balance has been distributed between Theodore, Clare, St. George, Mareeba and Charleville districts.

The accepted principle of concentration of forces has made it necessary for the department to confine activities to the districts I have mentioned.

A preliminary survey has been made of the area extending from Townsville through Charters Towers and then north and east to Innisfail, where the potential is very considerable, but the department just has not the staff to consider providing the service required in those areas. There is no representation west of Townsville. Some jobs have been done there, but they have been done by staff temporarily released from head office.

Assistance under the Farm Water Supplies Assistance Act has been applauded by producers and sought to such an extent that the department, owing to a lack of trained personnel to carry out the work or fulfil the demands on it, has been placed in an embarrassing position. As hon. members know, we have achieved quite remarkable results under the Farm Water Supplies Assistance Act. That is not to say that this is the complete answer to our problem of water

conservation in this State. The services provided in the Act are greatly appreciated and fully used by the landholders of the State. The only adverse criticism that can be offered is that we take too long to provide the services, and that criticism must be accepted in the circumstances that I have already described. The demand is already much greater than can at present be met with the present staff and funds available. It could be increased still further by extension work, but the department is not prepared to undertake that because it would be quite pointless to seek more business when the officers cannot handle what they are already getting.

As I have just said, much has been achieved under the Farm Water Supplies Assistance Act and the Government are commended for introducing such an Act to enable the producers in the State to conserve water at the point of production where it is most essential. It is growing more and more essential, and more and more money must be allocated every year for water conservation in the State so that we may meet the ever-increasing demand from primary and secondary industries.

I cannot conclude my remarks on water conservation without paying a tribute to the Nestle's organisation in Gympie for their very close co-operation with the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply. Apart from that very close co-operation, they have done a remarkable job to encourage water conservation in the Gympie district for the benefit of the producers in that area and for greater production of milk and cream. They fully realise the urgent need for the conservation of water so that our primary and secondary industries may be encouraged to expand at the very high level that is necessary for the full development of the State. I am sure that each and every hon. member in this Chamber realises that we are facing a very serious position with water conservation throughout Australia. There is no need for me to stress the point that with the exception of the air we breathe water is the most vital requirement for our existence. It takes 1,100 tons of water to produce 1 ton of wheat, 6,500 gallons of water to produce one ton of steel, and over 10,000 gallons of water to produce one ton of paper. When all that is coupled with the ever-increasing demand of the population—and as I said earlier today, it is a rapidly increasing population in the State, Australia and the world—we will see that this demand is reaching frightening proportions. I believe that all sections of the community must launch a campaign whereby public opinion can be aroused so that Governments, whether State or Federal, are forced to accept the responsibility to do something, and do it quickly, before we have a frightening water famine brought about by the ever-increasing population and the increasing demand for supplies made by that population. If that cannot be achieved, at least we should endeavour to pursue a policy to ensure that this generation passes

on its natural resources in such a condition that the economic welfare of the next generation will be assured.

I venture to say that very few hon. members are fully acquainted with all aspects of the pineapple industry and of the work of the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing, so to fully acquaint them with what the C.O.D. is and with the Pineapple Sectional Group Committee and the cannery agreement, I should like to outline the history. The cannery agreement that brought about the establishment of the Northgate cannery in Queensland was signed on 2 June, 1948, by three parties. Those parties were the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing, the Pineapple Sectional Group Committee and a trustee of those growers who subscribed to the funds for the establishment of the cannery. He is known as the subscribers' representative on the Board.

At the outset it was agreed that funds were to be provided by the C.O.D. for the establishment of the cannery, that the industry policy was to be exercised by the Pineapple Sectional Group Committee and that the management of the cannery was to be carried out by the cannery board of management through the general manager of the C.O.D. The Board was to consist of two members of the Pineapple Sectional Group Committee and one elected representative of the subscribers plus three advisory members.

The funds for the establishment of the cannery were to be provided by the C.O.D. from Government-guaranteed loans, Government-guaranteed overdrafts and voluntary loans from growers. Those loans were not a direct investment in the cannery and they did not give the subscribers any direct degree of ownership in the cannery.

At this point I should like to direct attention to a very disturbing element within the industry, which I think could be avoided if common sense were to reign amongst those now directing the policy of the pineapple growers of the State. It has been brought about by a section of the subscribers who feel that their subscriptions were a direct investment in the cannery and that they are the legal owners of the cannery. This distresses me greatly because it has come to my ears recently that certain mercenary-minded people with a dictatorial outlook wish to have a re-valuation of the cannery so that a certain section of the subscribers can gain for themselves monetary rewards and complete control of this very valuable asset of the fruit and vegetable growers of Queensland. It must be remembered that Northgate Cannery was never established, and never at any time regarded, as a subscribers' cannery; it has always been regarded as a fruit and vegetable growers' cannery established for the benefit of all fruit and vegetable growers in the State. But it is very disturbing that some selfish people have caused, and are causing, quite a deal of unrest in the pineapple industry today, more so now that representatives of this school of

thought have been recently elected to executive positions in the industry. For the pineapple industry, and the Northgate Cannery in particular, to have an executive with such ill-considered and short-sighted views, especially at this stage of the industry, is a bitter disappointment to the majority of growers and subscribers. A majority vote on the Pineapple Sectional Group Committee would not, and does not, represent a majority vote or a majority opinion of all the growers and subscribers in Queensland. I think this is the beginning of the end of a sound, progressive, practical financial policy that has operated over the years and has made Northgate Cannery a landmark in the progress of the pineapple industry in Queensland.

Let us see how this industry began and how it has progressed over the years. As I said before, with the assistance of Government guarantees, with sound advice from the General Manager of the C.O.D., managed by the cannery Board of Management, and backed by the total assets not of the pineapple growers but of the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing, the pineapple growers and subscribers have enjoyed many benefits. They have gained security for themselves and the future of their industry, and they have created employment for hundreds of people in Queensland. This could never have been achieved if, as is stated now, the policy is wrong and the management is wrong. Why is it wrong? Only because a small section of disgruntled subscribers in the industry wants to pursue a policy that has its origin and future in the restriction of the pineapple industry for the protection of a section of the growers rather than for the welfare of the whole industry. If it develops to that extent, I venture to say that the C.O.D. can exercise its powers under the agreement and run it successfully as a C.O.D. venture.

**Mr. Bennett:** Do you think the industry should be socialised?

**Mr. HODGES:** I do not think that the industry should be socialised in any way.

Any agitation for a change from the present set-up and the present progressive policy of the Northgate Cannery, or any steps taken to form an independent co-operative outside the control of the C.O.D., is doomed to failure and will cause nothing but hardship to the pineapple growers and the pineapple industry in general. The fruit and vegetable growers of Queensland have invested £734,305 in the Northgate Cannery, which today, through prudent management, stands as a beacon illuminating the progress that has been made in the industry and valued on the books at £2,500,000. The pineapple-growers of Queensland have subscribed £666,338, the papaw-growers £25,802, the strawberry-growers £17,297, the citrus-growers £13,946, the fig-growers £3,430, and the balance has been subscribed by growers of various other types of fruit

and vegetables. However, whilst I recognise the substantial contributions made by the subscribers and the very important part they have played in the industry, they cannot be, and I believe that the majority do not wish to be, the overlords and control the cannery.

For this total investment of £734,305, up to 30 November, 1960, the subscribers have received benefits totalling £1,163,554, made up of interest, £297,079, profit, £586,214, and bonus shares, £280,261. Is that wrong? Do you think that a policy and management that can provide such benefits should be overthrown or handed over to a section of disgruntled subscribers who wish to gain control of Northgate Cannery? No doubt Northgate Cannery could be taken over by the subscribers because the cannery agreement makes such provision in Clause 36 which states that—

“Provided proper arrangements are made for the liquidation of the whole of the Committee of Direction’s liabilities and for the payment of the value of certificates of those subscribers who do not wish to join the co-operative . . .”.

Just imagine what a burden that would place on the subscribers who were foolish enough to follow those agitators. It can be imagined where the whole of the industry would finish up. There are other aspects that should be taken into consideration such as if we had a restricted intake into the cannery they would not benefit or be protected by the powers of direction, and taxation would be payable. Apart from all that the other sectional groups of the C.O.D. and many other pineapple-growers and subscribers would be bitterly opposed to subscribers taking over the cannery, just as much as the pineapple sectional group committee and a large section of pineapple-growers would oppose complete control by the C.O.D. However, that point has never been raised. Even though the C.O.D. has been the major investor in this venture they have never at any stage adopted a tyrannical attitude in that regard because they fully appreciate their responsibility to the fruit and vegetable-growers of the State. But it may be well worthwhile at this stage to remind the pineapple-growers not to lose sight of Clause 19 of the cannery agreement which states—

“The C.O.D. shall set aside out of profits each year a sum for the possible liquidation of the amounts of any registered holders of certificates.”

So far the circumstances have not arisen to endanger the C.O.D. and they have not been forced to protect themselves under this clause. However, as long as no real financial risk to the C.O.D. arises every endeavour must be made to see that the present arrangements continue, because they have been most satisfactory in the past. As recently as the last annual meeting of subscribers held in Nambour the first move was made to upset the present very satisfactory control of Northgate, when it was decided to increase

the pineapple subscriber representation on the Cannery Board. This is in total opposition to the views expressed by one of the signatories to the agreement, Mr. Clayton, who, in 1946 said—

"The group have to realise that it was responsible for a considerable sum of money to be used in the interests of all growers. The suggestion that the Board should consist of two growers outside the P.S.G.C. meant handing over control of P.S.G.C. funds to people outside the control of the Committee. They would be in a position to wield an enormous influence upon the policy of the industry, but would be outside the control of the elected representatives."

That is what Mr. Clayton said in 1946, and it still stands today. That may have some merit in it, but when you come to consider that the subscriptions by pineapple-growers constitute less than one-third of the funds required by the cannery, it could be considered that any increased representation on the Board should come from one of the other sectional groups within the C.O.D. setup. In my opinion, because of the very important part that the papaw-growers play in conjunction with the canning of pineapples at Northgate, very serious consideration should be given to allowing the papaw-grower subscriber representation on that Board. I am sure that the unrest in the industries is based on a misunderstanding, played very skilfully upon by that section with designs for complete control for a small section either of the industry or the subscribers. That misunderstanding is between the two words "equity" and "security". I think that the main concern of most pineapple-growers in this State is for further security in their investment in Northgate cannery and I know for a fact, after discussing the matter with several growers in my area, that they would be very pleased if some ways and means were devised whereby they could be given added security for their subscriptions.

I feel that security could be obtained in several ways but there are two very important points that must be considered by the management at a very early date. One would be, to give the subscribers greater security, to create a redemption fund on an economic scale so that subscribers have the right to redeem their certificates when they want to or when they are leaving the industry, however, with certain safeguards to the C.O.D. they will have reason to limit it so that, say, £50,000 or £60,000 would be the limit that could be redeemed in any one year. I am sure that a simple plan could be worked out on that basis when one considers the very large reserves already held by the cannery.

The second suggestion for security is based on the establishment of a stabilisation scheme that would serve the whole of the industry and not any particular section of it or any particular section of subscribers. I consider that responsible officers from the

C.O.D., the Department of Agriculture and Stock and the industry itself could work out a very sound stabilisation plan based on one that has been used in the peanut industry for quite a number of years. I feel that if subscribers in the pineapple industry in this State were to acquaint themselves fully with that plan they could evolve a stabilisation plan that would be much to the satisfaction of both the pineapple growers and the subscribers of Queensland.

Of course, we must realise that there are no other industries in this State with the history of fluctuation on the production side and the market side that our primary industries have and for that reason alone some very serious consideration must be given to the establishment of a sound stabilisation plan within the industry to cover not only subscribers but all pineapple growers and all aspects of the industry.

Every endeavour should be made and I appeal principally to the sensible men and women who make up the C.O.D. When I refer to the C.O.D. I do not mean Flewell-Smith or anybody else. The C.O.D. is all the fruit and vegetable growers of this State who go towards making it up. I appeal to those men and women who make up that organisation not to overthrow the high ideals and principles that they have worked for so long, and, while they have a sound organisation let it continue to pursue the policy that has earned a reputation for soundness and good judgment. Whilst, no doubt, they have at times had some very difficult situations to face the present spirit of co-operation, protected by the Fruit Marketing Organisations Act, patiently applied by the general manager and his staff, must not be thrown aside lightly by the pineapple industry or by any small section of mercenary-minded, disgruntled subscribers within it.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON** (Salisbury) (2.40 p.m.): Opposition members are most anxious to support the amendment so ably moved by our Leader. Their attitude is in distinct contrast to that of Government Members, who by their attitude have earned for the Government a reputation of laziness and indifference. We have witnessed from the Government benches an indifferent approach to an indifferent Budget by indifferent persons.

Before dealing with particular subjects, I voice strong objection to speeches framed on the lines of the introductory remarks of the hon. member for Gympie. At that stage he spoke in obscure terms of people who are holding the country to ransom and endangering the security of the State. The hon. member is one of those who do not have sufficient of the commodity used by those who enjoy the piscatorial art to name the persons to whom he was referring. After a careful study of his remarks and his vague and obscure attack, the only heartening conclusion I can reach is that he was referring to the owners of the Mt. Isa mine or the new owners of the Collinsville mine.



Undoubtedly those persons are holding the country to ransom. I repeat, however, that I have very strong objection to speeches of that nature. If an hon. member is going to attack someone, let him have the fortitude to name the person.

**Mr. Pizzev:** Are they not offering work in terms of the award?

**Mr. Houston:** No. They locked us out.

**Mr. Pizzev:** No.

**Mr. Houston:** What about the A.W.U.?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** If the Minister curbs his impatience, I will have much to say later in my speech on the matter. If he has the decency to remain in the Chamber and take a bit of what I intend to give him, he will be somewhat enlightened. Perhaps in my humble way I may be able to educate the Minister for Education. I do not intend to be sidetracked.

**Mr. Sullivan:** It would be a much better speech if you were.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Possibly, but what amazes me is that those who say my speech in those circumstances would be a much better speech have not to date risen to defend the Budget presented by the Treasurer. Their history is one of speeches by interjection.

It has become fashionable when talking of various Commonwealth and State Budgets to use descriptive adjectives based on the interpretation by the person using them of the contents of those budgets. We hear phrases such as "Horror Budget", "Little Horror Budget", "No Hoper Budget" and so on. But for the requirement of parliamentary decorum I could apply the term "No Hoper" to some hon. members on the Government benches. On reflection I find it is very difficult to attach a label to this Budget before the Committee because the descriptive adjectives that are accepted to preserve the decorum of parliamentary debate, do not seem to adequately describe its contents or its structure. It is very difficult to realise—

**Mr. Windsor:** In other words, you have no—

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Don't you start. Your contribution to this House has been your worry and concern about the magpies at the Ithaca school.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** It is very heartening for me that I, who do not at any time claim to be a financial wizard, or to have risen to the heights of some of the great Labour politicians over the years, have stirred the Minister for Education and Migration, and the Minister for Public Works and Local Government from their inactivity by the few remarks I have made so far, and I assure them that I have not reached into the meat of the subject yet.

It is very difficult to realise that this Budget was conceived by a Treasurer of sartorial elegance, complete with carnation, of scholarly being, in studious contemplation in the sanctum of his Treasury office. It is not only I who have been impressed by the scholarly being of the Minister because "The Courier-Mail" of 1 October contained an item headed, "A Pink Carnation and Tax Slugs."

**Mr. Sullivan:** Why don't you wear one yourself?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I suggest, Mr. Sullivan, that your floral emblem—

**The CHAIRMAN:** I remind the hon. member that he must address the Chair and not address hon. members by their name across the Chamber. I am interested in what the hon. member has to say and I will listen very attentively. I ask him to please address his remarks to me.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I agree, Mr. Taylor. I say to the hon. member, through you, that I too have an eye for the beauty of the floral world, and knowing that the hon. member for Condamine comes from the country, I suggest to him that he designates his rank and his attitude in life by the use of the flower from the well known weed the Stinking Roger.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope that the hon. member will not continue to use such remarks.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** The Minister for Education and Migration says that it is time I grew up. At least, I am growing up, but I doubt very much if he will ever grow up.

After having been interrupted by those unintelligent interjections it is difficult for me to conceive that this Budget was drawn up by a person with the calibre of the Treasurer. I think it could be more readily accepted as a decision of one of the financial wizards who haunt the precincts of Kelly's poolroom. Just as one pictures the financial manoeuvres of the experts at the S.P. shops to stave off economic ruin during a losing trot, so one sees in this measure the Government are scratching the bottom of the barrel in an endeavour—if one could be pardoned for the use of the vernacular—to grope for their last "zac".

The Treasurer said that during the past financial year the Government's finances were affected by a combination of adverse factors; another dry year continued to depress primary output and export, while the national counter-inflationary pressures caused a decline in activity in industry generally which has continued into the current year.

Nobody would dispute the disastrous effects that a continuing drought can have on the State's economy and in particular on its finances, nor can one deny the catastrophic

results of 12 years of the Menzies Government, and more so, the effect of their financial and economic policies on State finances during the past 12 months. In the light of repeated declarations by the Premier that the State would "go it alone," we can dispute most emphatically that this Budget, framed at a time of serious unemployment, offers any hope for arresting the drift towards a depression, far more that it shows any real hope for the recovery of the State and subsequent full employment.

Some 12 months ago the Treasurer budgeted for a deficit of £216,286, despite the fact that he claimed then that unemployment was continuing to fall, that building activity was at near-record level, that mineral production was remarkably buoyant, and that wool production showed a substantial expansion in quantity and value, but now the Government have found that for the 12 months just ended their Budget estimates have fallen far short of the requirements of the State.

The continued demand for educational facilities has been a serious drain on the State's financial resources and hon. members have found that in the final three months of the last financial year the Department of Public Works has been forced to curtail expenditure on its works programme. Indeed, I have received many letters from the Minister for Public Works and Local Government and the Minister for Education and Migration telling me that work on projects about which I have made representations could not be proceeded with at that time through lack of available funds.

Apart from the fact that the allocation for education is insufficient to keep pace with the demand for more schools and for the extension and improvement of existing buildings, it has contributed to the unemployment situation because of the inadequacy of the vote to provide for a full year's employment for the department's employees, let alone the absorption of portion of the additional work force left unemployed following the slump in private industry as a repercussion of the Commonwealth Government's disastrous credit squeeze of recent months. If we are to believe that this policy was designed, among other reasons, to reallocate some of the work force which was being employed in what are termed luxury industries, then how can it be effective if such essential works as education, health and electricity cannot, by reason of inadequacy of the Government's financial reserves, absorb the employable persons displaced? When presenting the Financial Statement on the last two occasions, the Treasurer has drawn attention to what he calls Queensland's inequitable share of the Government loan-borrowing programme. It seems strange that Queensland, with its huge area and its great need for educational facilities, electricity generation and transmission, and other essential public works, receives only £27.6 million from the loan programme, compared with £51.9 million received by Victoria, a State

far smaller in area, with a population only 1,250,000 greater than Queensland's, a State that is largely developed. It would seem that a new formula for loan allocations must be found if States such as Queensland are to achieve development comparable with the development of New South Wales and Victoria, which continue to receive between them year after year about 60 per cent. of the total loan allocation.

I mentioned earlier that the amount allocated for education was spent in the first nine months of the financial year, and there is a similar situation in most State departments. As reported in "The Courier-Mail" of Friday, 24 February, 1,587 employees in the Transport and Main Roads Departments alone had been dismissed, and in the period from September, 1960, to February, 1961, the number of Main Roads employees had dropped by 1,201. In explaining the increase in the number of employees dismissed, the Minister said that the long drought had made it possible for work to proceed for longer than usual, that his department had employed seasonal workers who had lost their jobs because of drought conditions, and that, as a consequence, the Main Roads Fund was overdrawn by approximately £570,000. Here again we find that departments are operating on the barest minimum, with no real margin to aid employment or give any impetus to development.

It could be argued that it is not the State's responsibility to find jobs for all employable citizens who are thrown on the labour market. Nevertheless, the prosperity of the State depends on the measures taken at Government level. One of the industries that reflects the condition of the State's economy is the building industry. Any slump in this industry immediately sets off a chain reaction in the many allied industries that depend so greatly on its uninterrupted progress. As a matter of fact, I understand that about 25 or 30 industries are allied with the building industry. It is remarkable that Queensland, with a population of 1.4 million, received only £3.3 million for housing, while South Australia, with a population of 964,000 received about £8,000,000, and Tasmania, with a population less than that of Brisbane, received £2.7 million for its housing programme.

Queensland's housing allocations compare very unfavourably with those States. I am not saying for one moment that they are obtaining more than their needs but from the number of applications received by the Queensland Housing Commission for advances for home building and for rental homes, and the number of persons who have been unable to obtain rental accommodation from the Commission, it is obvious that Queensland is not getting a share commensurate with its needs. Again it is very indicative of the shabby treatment meted out to Queensland at the Loan Council meetings. A study of the Financial Statements shows that in 1958 the Queensland Government requested for housing

£3,899,000, of which only £3,310,000 was approved. In 1959 the State requested £4,743,000 and approval was given for only £3,480,000. In two years alone the loan allocation fell short of the Queensland requirement, as assessed by the Treasurer, of some £2,000,000. Obviously disheartened by the cavalier treatment suffered at the hands of the Menzies Government, and at the hands of the Loan Council, the Treasurer in his 1960-1961 Financial Statement apparently conveniently avoided reference to the loan borrowing programme submitted to the Loan Council, but merely contented himself with saying that the amount obtained by Queensland was its usual 12 per cent. One can only construe that the Treasurer wished to avoid drawing attention to the Government's lack of interest in housing in Queensland. A perusal of the summaries of the last four Budgets shows very little reference to the contribution to housing by this Government except for their claim in 1958 that they were concerned with the resurgence of State landlordism and their determination to increase the percentage of homes constructed by the State which would pass into the hands of home owners, and their claim that this plan had met with a measure of success in reducing the number of State rental homes. Economic circumstances in the past two years have been such that an ever-increasing number of persons are requiring rental homes. Therefore it could be that special reference to the Government's policy on housing has been purposely conspicuous by its absence in the last two Financial Statements. The only reference to housing in the current Budget is that a further agreement has been reached between the Commonwealth and the State, which will operate until 1966, with a brief summary stating that the 1956 principles are retained. By no stretch of the imagination does it offer any hope for the large number of people who have lodged applications with the Commission for accommodation and who cling hopefully to the thought of obtaining a home by this means. Of course, the niggardly treatment by the Loan Council in the matter of housing is also a feature of the allocation for public works. In the year 1958-1959 the Loan Council fell short of the programme submitted by the Government by some £18,000,000. Again in 1960-1961 no reference is made in the Financial Statement to the borrowing programme submitted by the Government to the Loan Council. Yet, by way of a question yesterday, I gained from the Treasurer information that shows in addition, that in the last two years, 1960 and 1961, the loan allocation has fallen short of what was requested by the State by another £14,000,000. So, in the last four years the Loan Council have been responsible for denying this State a sum of £32,000,000, estimated by the Treasurer as being required for the development of the State.

It takes very little imagination to realise how much work could have been done with £32,000,000 extra. Is it any wonder that the Premier once flashed into open criticism of the Federal Government when he said

that the loan allocation for this year was totally inadequate and went on to say that, having regard to rising costs, the increases would enable very little more than the bare maintenance of the existing level of works. He forecast also that it would be difficult for the Government to avoid dismissals in 1961-1962.

"The Courier-Mail" aptly put it, on Friday, 16 June, when it said that Mr. Nicklin had failed to convince the five Premiers from other States that Queensland should have a bigger share of the loan moneys. So Queensland, with its 14.23 per cent. of the population, continues to receive only 12 per cent. of the loan moneys.

With continuing deficits by its greatest financial obligation, the Queensland railways, it is reasonable to assume that the ensuing year will see a further tearing up of branch lines. Despite the Minister for Transport's avowed intention to make the railways a stable institution this year, there has been a deterioration in their earnings—in fact, a record deficit in that department. So, it would now become a question of how much longer this State can afford the costly experiments of the Minister for Transport, or conversely how much longer can this State afford Mr. Chalk?

Referring to some of those costly experiments, I draw attention to this article—

"In a drastic bid to win the road transport war, the Queensland railways last week added to their losses by slashing rail freight charges on the Goondiwindi line.

"Under the new charges which came into effect last Monday, the normal rail concession freight of £19 3s. 3d. per ton on certain goods has been reduced to £6 10s.—a cut of almost two-thirds.

"The railways have been running at a loss on £19 per ton—what will they lose freighting goods at the new rate of £6 10s. per ton?"

That is why it becomes a matter of how much longer this State can afford its Minister for Transport. The Government, having failed to convince the Commonwealth Government of the full loan requirements of the State, and as a consequence failing to raise the additional loan moneys, having failed to arrest the deficit in the Railway Department, having suffered a decline in the amounts received from stamp, succession and probate duties, now find that in the ensuing year they again must turn voracious eyes on the wage plug. The Brisbane "Telegraph" in my opinion hit the nail on the head when it said that the people of Queensland cannot be expected to feel happy about a budget that sets out to pick extra revenue from the pockets of the average citizen who already is paying heavily to the Canberra tax-gatherer. Is it any wonder that it added the comment that a growing State such as Queensland should not be obliged to scratch around amongst liquor sellers, bookmakers and car drivers for a few extra pounds to stave off bankruptcy? That prompted my remark that the

structure of the Budget gave the impression that it was framed by one of the financial wizards who haunt S.P. shops.

Repeated suggestions have been made by the Prime Minister that at no time have the Queensland Government submitted any concrete plan for the development of the State so that consideration of the necessary financial assistance could be undertaken. That view is borne out by an article in "The Courier-Mail" which states that the Government should prepare a plan and then seek aid. That was the opinion of the Federal Parliamentary delegation that visited North Queensland during the winter recess. The Premier has never denied that he has not submitted a plan to the Federal Government for their consideration. In these times of economic recession, depression or whatever it is called, bold moves are required to extricate the State from the chaotic state into which it is rapidly descending.

I gather from the report on the development of electricity in Queensland that during the next 10 years approximately £170,000,000 will be required for electrical development. Expenditure of this magnitude would entail injection each year of fresh capital of £17,000,000 into the State's economy. Could this not provide the stimulus needed by the State? I note that the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity has just entered the chamber. He is very interested and I shall be glad to help him on this count at any time. Very little imagination is required to realise the impetus to the economy of the State of expenditure of this magnitude, and it cannot be denied that the requirements for electricity are requirements of the very near future. With the completion of the Snowy River scheme in the immediate future, is not the time opportune to interest the Commonwealth Government in financing work of such a national character in Queensland? For far too long the southern States have received the lion's share of national work. As the Premier stated during the year, Queensland was being left behind in the matter of financial consideration for development. It is completely futile for the State Government to carry out long and costly investigations into the needs of the State, whether they be railways or electricity, if on finalisation of the investigations and recommendations the Government are not in a position to carry out the recommended works. I suggest that now is the time for this Government to prove to the Federal Government that we will need £170,000,000 in the next 10 years for electrical development. Work of this magnitude must be financed by the Federal Government. The State is not in a position to implement one-twentieth of the report submitted by its consultants. That is why I believe that we should now urge the Commonwealth Government to provide the necessary finance for the electrical development in the State to progress at the desired level. It requires very

little imagination to envisage what the injection of another £17,000,000 yearly into the State would mean to the State's economy and progress.

The Treasurer's summary of the Budget contained 26 points. Of those, 17 dealt merely with the procedures to be adopted by the Government, ranging from the announcing of a new racing tax to the statement that increased costs will continue to be absorbed by the Railway Department, with proposed expenditure to be less than the previous year. However, one of the 26 points deals with the provision for the purchase of 12 diesel locomotives, so only eight of the points enumerated by the Treasurer show where additional employment may come from. The breakdown of the points is as follows: provision for an increase in the Police Force. This is very laudible, particularly in the light of the recent report of the Commissioner pinpointing the increase in crime in the city. However, the Minister for Labour and Industry does not accept the advice of a responsible member of the Police Union, and an effective increase this year in the Police Force seems hardly likely. The construction of the Barron Falls hydro-electric scheme at an increased tempo is a desirable feature, but there is no indication of the absorption of an extra amount of labour. The expenditure on the Mt. Isa railway line is proceeding, but the hon. member for Belmont has already told us that with the increased use of mechanisation it is doubtful that there will be any substantial increase in the number of men employed. Reference is made to work on the Leslie Dam and Borumba Dam, but again it is obvious that because of the Government's policy in letting this work out on contract they are merely transferring employment from day labour employees to contract employees. If I may digress at this stage, in my opinion, that is one of the worst features of the Government's action. It is regrettable that they are dispensing with the day labour force for dam construction in the State. It is to be regretted that this Government, by their action in letting the work out on private contract, have destroyed this labour force of men who have become very competent and expert in their work. When I visited the Moogera Dam I was told that the concrete poured on it was completed by day labour in nine months. Anybody who has seen the magnitude of the task will realise that those men must have been expert at their trade to accomplish so much in such a reasonable time. It is to be regretted that the policy of this Government seems to be to dispense with them.

There is a reference in the Treasurer's summary to reclamation work to be carried out at Bulwer Island. That will not be an avenue for many employable persons because most of the work on such a project will be carried out by the use of dredges and pumping plant and by the use of bulldozers for the spreading of filling and levelling the

site. So once again there is no evidence that the work will mean additional employment.

Increased expenditure on main roads could provide a source of additional employment but I have already drawn attention to the fact that the Minister said last year that, because of conditions, he was overdrawn by some £500,000, so that he starts off this year £500,000 behind scratch before he provides the level of employment that he was forced to provide last year. There again, although it is heartening to see that roads are to be constructed farther and farther into the interior of the State to open it up for development, there is nothing very startling about the statement that increased expenditure will be carried out on main roads.

The final point of the Treasurer's summing up dealt with provision for additional home-building. Having obtained his usual 12 per cent. for some £3.3 million, it would seem that the extra finance that he might be able to provide from other sources is not going to be anything to write home about.

So a fair and just resume of the 26 points enumerated by the Treasurer in his summing up would be to liken it to the ringing down of the curtain on a very dispirited performance. This is the summary that brought forth from a few members of the Government who were in the Chamber at the time the monosyllabic "Hear, hears!" of uninterested hon. members.

**Mr. Smith:** Do you really think that is monosyllabic?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** My very unlearned colleague, the hon. member for Windsor, has seen fit to interject. During his Address-in-Reply speech he made very good use of alliteration in describing hon. members on this side and, so that I might be free to continue my speech in peace from his interjections let me tell this babbling barrister from the back benches that instead of bashing the binaural bearings and badgering the brethren with baragouin baloney he would be better beating the air with his bandalore. In case you might think that I have been unparliamentary in my expression, I will quite generously assure you, and say for the edification of the hon. member for Windsor, that the literal translation of that is that this babbling barrister from the back bench, instead of bashing the ears of hon. members and interrupting them with unintelligible baloney, would be better playing with his yo-yo. I hope that this will silence him.

As I said, the Treasurer's summary brought forth a number of monosyllabic "Hear, hears" from hon. members on the Government benches. I have no doubt from the interest they showed that if the Treasurer had concluded by saying, "This document was printed by the Government Printing Office," they would have said "Hear, hear" to that,

also. As a matter of fact, I think the Treasurer's summing-up was the greatest exhibition of mass ventriloquism since the days of Charlie McCarthy. The only difference was the undoubted talent of the Minister in throwing his voice to all members on the Government benches instead of using only one dummy.

I now wish to make some comments about a situation that is exercising the minds not only of trade unionists but of the whole population of Queensland. The action of the Federal Minister for Social Services today in refusing unemployment benefits to the workers at Mt. Isa must cause grave concern and make every person in Queensland say to himself, "Where do we go from here?" With the printer's ink hardly dry on the new Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, it is crystal clear for whose benefit this legislation was framed. It is beyond all doubt that the interference of the Minister for Labour and Industry and his team of inept advisers on industrial matters has brought about a situation that has not only deprived workers of their just entitlement, their weekly wage, but has also brought the Industrial Court to a position of impotence. It has also been responsible for a loss of revenue that the State can ill afford. Members of the Australian Labour Party opposed the amending Bill in this Chamber and warned the Minister of the consequences of the meddling by himself and his inept advisers. What better proof does the Minister for Labour and Industry want of the correctness of our warning than the situation that exists at Mt. Isa now?

There is no doubt that the owners of Mt. Isa Mines are engaging in a lock-out. The craft unions and the Australian Workers' Union carried out all their obligations under the Act. They took legal ballots and notified the Industrial Registrar of the results, and the company has never contested the validity of the ballots. The answer it gave was to close its doors to men who were offering to work the 40 hours provided under the award. There is considerable doubt about the legality of the action taken by the company. Section 98 (1) provides—

"No person shall take part in, or do or be concerned in or instigate or aid in doing, any matter or thing in the nature of a strike or lock-out unless or until a strike or lock-out has been authorised by the members of the industrial union of employees or the employers in the calling concerned."

It provides further—

"... no strike or lock-out shall be deemed to have been authorised unless or until the result of the secret ballot or voting thereon of the persons concerned, together with the details of the voting have been communicated to the registrar."

At no time have Mount Isa Mines Limited given an indication that a ballot was taken between themselves and the sub-contractors,

nor have the results of any such ballot been conveyed to the Registrar. Commissioner Harvey has given the opinion that the company has not breached the section of the Act, as the definition appears, but this point has not been argued. It is merely a statement by the Commissioner that in his opinion the Act has not been breached. There can be no doubt whatsoever that in reality the employers at Mt. Isa are attempting to compel their employees to agree to terms of employment. It is obvious that by the action of the company in locking out the employees of sub-contractors are assisting another employer to compel employees to agree to terms of employment which, in itself, is contrary to the provisions of the Act. "Lock-out" is defined as being—

"The act of an employer in closing down his place of business or suspending or discontinuing his business or any branch thereof, . . . with intent—"

The definition continues in paragraph (d)—

". . . to assist any other employer to compel or induce any employees to agree to terms of employment or comply with any demands made by him;"

So it goes on, the complete flouting by the company of the industrial laws of the State.

Section 101 (1) provides—

"An employer shall not refuse employment to any person or dismiss an employee, or injure him in his employment, or alter his position to his prejudice, by reason of the circumstances that the employee—

(d) being a member of an industrial union which is seeking better industrial conditions, is dissatisfied with his conditions;"

Here again the company is blatantly treating the provisions of the Act with undisguised contempt. As I said before, where does the Minister for Labour and Industry stand in this regard? In answer to a question I asked recently referring to the alteration of the Act whereby the Commissioner can no longer act in an arbitrary manner, unless requested by both parties, the Minister replied—

"As the principle which the Honourable Member desires to have re-inserted is not accepted anywhere in the world as a desirable function of an Industrial Court, nor do I, the answer is no."

Just as all trade unionists ask the Minister, or are entitled to ask him, I ask: where in the world do we have an arbitration system that allows a court to decrease a bonus yet cannot increase it? Where in the world do we have a conciliation commissioner who is unable to take the necessary action to resolve the deadlock that exists today?

On his introduction of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill the Minister said that the Government believed in the payment of bonuses but they were definitely of the opinion that payment of such bonuses should not be subject to the determination of the Commission. He said, "It is indeed

a matter of negotiation between employer and employee." Yet the previous system stood the test of time. It has stood for 34 years. It has acted to the benefit of the unionists employed at Mt. Isa and has not reacted against the company, because year after year they have gone on showing increased profits. All this talk in the advertisement the other day about how much the company has ploughed into its industry in the last few years is so much baloney. It is merely to disguise the fact that the money has been put back out of profits; it has not been put in under a system whereby the company has been forced to borrow it.

The Minister went on to say—

"Many employers will not give bonus payments under the Act because they feel that if they do so then quickly there will be an appeal to the court for their wide extension. With the provision removed the fear is removed. Consequently, there will be a considerable extension of the principle of voluntary sharing of profits."

To complete this fallacious prediction he added—

"I have reason to believe—indeed, I know—"

the Minister always knows—

"that the employers will be encouraged to negotiate such arrangements on the passing of this measure."

**Mr. Smith:** The Minister knows more than you do.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** The hon. member for Windsor again interjects. He says that the Minister knows more than I do. The record of the Minister for Labour and Industry in this Chamber shows him up in a very poor light. Indeed, if he is the god whom the hon. member for Windsor worships, I have reason to believe that he is largely misplacing his confidence.

**Mr. Smith:** Haven't you another ditty for me on this occasion?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I could spin a "dit," but not about a nit-wit.

Despite the company's expressed willingness at any time to negotiate bonus payments, in 1959 they offered the employees a miserly £1 2s. 6d. increase yet, on application to the Court, the Court granted a bonus of £8, again not to the detriment of the company because in 1959-1960 they showed a profit of £5.3 million and last year, £5.9 million. So the Minister says, "We will take away this power of the Court and peace will prevail!"

Immediately the Bill is passed and the Act amended there is the greatest industrial upheaval at Mt. Isa in its 34 years of history.

As I say, despite Mt. Isa Mines expressed unwillingness to share its profits, it is quite obvious that they do not, at any time, intend to carry out increasing bonus payments to the men. Only yesterday the unions

offered, in reply to the company's offer to re-engage them, that they would resume work on condition that bonus payments were referred to a mediator. The manager, Mr. Foots, had this to say—

"The company is not prepared to go to a mediator and reserves the right to manage its own affairs on this matter. It is the responsibility of the company's management and directors to determine what shall be done with its funds."

Yet, the Industrial Court in Queensland for 34 years has protected the interests of this company in its application of bonus payments to employees.

The Minister is reported in last Wednesday's "Telegraph" as saying that he had powers under the arbitration law but he did not intend to use them indiscriminately. He further said that he did not want the unions to think that Ken Morris was having a crack at them, because he also was concerned about panicky bosses.

I say that the Minister full well knows that the company is acting contrary to the arbitration laws of this State. He also knows that the unions have carried out their obligations but he lacks the intestinal fortitude to take this company on, to see that the industrial laws of the State are obeyed by employers as well as by employees.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. HUGHES** (Kurilpa) (3.40 p.m.): I oppose the amendment. The passing of what amounts to a vote of no confidence in the Government would in my opinion be detrimental to the progress and prosperity of the State. During the debate I have heard a great deal of hypocritical criticism of what I describe as a worthwhile document, a document that does have regard to the progress and prosperity of Queensland. It portrays not only a figurative picture of the past, but also the hopes for the future. In almost every direction we can read of tremendously increased expenditure by all departments, not only for the purpose of effecting natural development but also for the provision of worthwhile works and services demanded by the citizens. I have heard other criticism of the Government for budgeting for a deficit, although admittedly a small one. How hypocritical can hon. members opposite be, or are they off-side with their Federal colleagues? It is about time they put their thinking in the right perspective. On the one hand we hear from them criticism of the Queensland Government for budgeting for a deficit and on the other hand we have their Federal leader, Mr. Calwell, urging the Government of the Federal Parliament of Australia to budget for a deficit of £100,000,000. Such fantastic differences of opinion make one doubt not only the wisdom of hon. members opposite but also the accuracy of their remarks. In budgeting for a deficit the Government are making a worthwhile contribution towards overcoming the very vexed

subject of unemployment. Unemployment is exercising the minds of those in authority, and deficit budgeting is one way of overcoming it. Public works expenditure provides a great deal of employment and gives the greatest degree of development. Consequently the people of Queensland get stability, the possibility of further employment and therefore a direct benefit.

I do not intend to go through the Budget in detail, as I wish to deal with a particularly important matter. Wherever we look in this document we see expenditure indicating progress and development. The Budget reveals that the expenditure by the Department of Education for 1960-1961 was £17,814,587, an all-time record. In fact it is more than double the Budget figure six years ago, prior to the accession to office of the Country Party-Liberal Government. It was then something over £8,000,000. In the coming year the Estimates provide for £19,191,118.

The accent today to a great extent is on education. I pay tribute to the Minister for Education. He has done a wonderful job. The people of Queensland owe the educators, the department and the Government of Queensland a great debt of gratitude. Queensland is one State where every child who desires higher education, or whose parents desire it for him, is afforded every opportunity and facility to obtain it, irrespective of his mental ability and qualifications. The position here is not as it is in other States such as Victoria and New South Wales where the entitlement of a child to higher education is governed by qualification and enrolment. There is a very big problem down there and they have not overcome it. Yet we in Queensland, by good government, have been able to overcome it.

**Mr. Houston:** On the foundation laid by the Labour Government.

**Mr. HUGHES:** All right, I will agree, on the foundation laid by past Governments. I am quite happy to hear that and I am prepared to give credit where it is due. I think the hon. member who interjected must admit that this Government have done a singular noteworthy thing by coping with the tidal wave of students entering high school. The immediate post-war surge of students now requiring education in the high schools and through to tertiary level has been accommodated. If the hon. member is prepared to be as impartial as I in this matter then he too will give credit to this Government for overcoming this problem in the last few years that no other Government in Australia have been able to overcome.

**Mr. Houston:** You must admit that we have never used education as a political football.

**Mr. HUGHES:** I admit that, too. I believe that this is a worthwhile way for the Government and Opposition to work together for the ultimate good of the citizens of the State.

There is a most vexed matter that I believe should be brought to the notice of the Committee. We spend so much on education, over £17,000,000, yet, having spent it on education, I often wonder what it is worth, if we teach a boy to earn a living but do not teach him how to live. I used that theme in an address at the speech night of the Yeronga State High School in the City Hall last night and I will develop the theme today. I wish to bring to the notice of the Chamber that certain unscrupulous people, certain midget-minded morons in our community and overseas, are pouring filth into this country to the detriment of the minds and education of our young people. It is for that reason that I intend to launch an attack on this filthy trash, this obscene pornographic literature, that we see on nearly every bookstall throughout the country. Hon. members know that following the immediate post-war years, since the 1950's particularly when the paper-back and cheap editions of dirty novels came on to the market, there has been an avalanche of the paper-backs coming into the country. They are in the form of glossy varnished covers that sell filth and sex for shillings. At various bookstalls we see this type of literature. I have many of them here to show to hon. members who may not have put into this matter the study and research that I have. Hon. members should see, and must know, what is being displayed on the book-shelves because we are dealing today in our Budget with the expenditure of money, and some of that money is to be spent by the Literature Board of Review. It is to that end that I really aim my remarks in supporting not only the work they do, but in fact in believing that it should go much further. We are responsible people. I believe that we who are the legislators in this State have the responsibility to discharge that obligation properly. While I believe that the Literature Board of Review has done a very good job with comics and such things, I do not think its members are properly equipped by law for the job, or if they are equipped, in some way, the job is not being done properly, in its entirety. I believe that the weakness lies in the fact that they are not properly equipped to deal with this pornographic filth, this obscene literature which is so readily available to teenagers.

**Mr. Smith:** How can we further equip the Board?

**Mr. HUGHES:** The hon. member for Windsor asks how can we equip the Literature Board of Review. I hope he will remain in the Chamber until the conclusion of my speech and then not only will he have the benefit of my suggestions, but knowing him to be a good barrister I will be very pleased if he can find there is any proper criticism of them.

It is an indictable offence to purvey obscene material yet we see it about and I am wondering why we have this slush, this printed garbage, which decorates the shelves of our

bookstalls. Some of these portrayals—and I have a few here—are along the lines of small paper-backs with glossy, varnished covers. One I have here portrays on the front cover what might, to use an Australianism, be described as a voluptuous blonde and it bears the title, "Gutter Girl." It is obviously designed to appeal to immature adolescents and it sets out to tell what girls have to do to be initiated into the gang. It says, "Gutter Girl—A fierce novel—for the first time telling the whole story of the wild and wanton girls who run with the street packs and throng the cellar clubs..."

**Mr. Houston:** Is that in the Parliamentary Library?

**Mr. HUGHES:** Certainly not, and the Parliamentary librarian deserves the highest commendation for the manner in which he conducts the library. The hon. member has been in Parliament longer than I have and he should be well aware of that. As a matter of fact, with certain types of books that might be described as being somewhat on the borderline because of their content, also as works of art and similar forms of literature, there is a little cross at the back, which indicates that it is up to the member to be his own censor and judge and to decide whether the book is likely to get into the hands of his wife and family or friends. That is a form of classification, which I will further expound in the course of my address.

**Mr. Houston:** No wonder we could not find any there; you had them all out.

**Mr. HUGHES:** Which proves you have been looking for that type. No, I have not got them all out. However, each person who takes books from the library has the titles recorded on a sheet bearing his name and I am sure that a glance at the list of books taken out by the hon. member for Bulimba from time to time would be a revelation.

On the back cover of this paper-back, "Gutter Girl," the sort of thing that is sold to young and impressionable people, this appears—

"She honeymooned at the Club . . . the Cellar Club!

"It goes on all the time but who knows anything about it? Young girls by the thousands in every sizable American city are introduced to degenerate codes of conduct which they adopt as their own. Vicious young punks, roaming the streets and parks or congregating in cellar clubs, induct the girls into lawlessness and depravity . . . And if any won't learn willingly, they are taught by force . . ."

That is the type of filth that is to be found on the shelves of bookstalls.

I wholeheartedly support the Literature Board of Review and I propose to quote from their seventh annual report.



In one section they have this to say—

"A great deal of time is expended by members of the Board examining publications which appear to come within the statutory ambit of the Board's charge."

It is well to bear that phrase in mind as I continue my speech. They go on to say—

"Only in a few instances has the Board found it necessary to issue prohibition orders."

Further down they say—

"There is no evidence of any slackening off in the large volume of publications which make their contributions to the reading appetites of the multitude. Sensation, sex, violence, crime are commonplace themes exploited with dreary and monotonous sequences not in the interests of literature or culture or even entertainment but crudely as means to exact from the masses the paltry but multiplying shillings which provide the only purpose of their ephemeral existence."

Again—

"Mischievous enough is done by the obscenities that occur in the portrayal of illicit love (by literary hacks who never learned what the genuine artist knows instinctively that, though art may 'say all', there are certain things it is never allowed to say explicitly.)"

That is the difference between a more adult, worthwhile volume of literature in a hard back cover and this filthy, pornographic garbage from America.

The report goes on to say—

"But here sex is at least rescued from full profanation by its tenuous connection with love, as love is still resident in lust. However, when sex is associated with, and becomes symbolic of, the hatreds and hostilities, the angers and cruelties, that lie deep in men and women, the profanation of the most sacred thing in sex—its relation to love and to the hope of human life—is almost complete."

It goes on further to say what violence and perversion is instanced and shown in this type of literature. I have quoted to hon. members from the book titled "Gutter Girl." I have other books here. I shall not give the title of the next one, but it says on the back—

"She fiddled while men burned—until the flames consumed her!"

It goes on to say—

"Her wild beauty drew men as a candle draws moths. And while her insatiable desire, like the candle's fire, seared and destroyed the flesh—it also gave ecstasy

So when Sullivan met her, he knew that no other woman, not even his own wife, could still the mad pounding in his blood."

It goes on with the type of descriptiveness that is held out as a lurid carrot to induce the perverted not only to buy it but to further circulate it.

In the back of this book there is a long list of other volumes, and this is an example of the synopsis of each book—

"Drink turned her into a sex-crazed animal! A novel which probes the lusts of a lush."

"She had the morals of an alley cat! To learn all she could about love, she got off to an early start."

**Mr. Bennett:** Where did you get hold of these books?

**Mr. HUGHES:** I got hold of some of them by following those that the hon. member had fingered. These books are readily available at almost every bookshop. Another one is—

"The poignant story of Ellen, a girl used—bruised—abused! They carried her into the hidden valley and held her prisoner of their fanatic desires!"

Another description says—

"Turbulent . . . tempestuous . . . uncontrollable love! A lusty novel of violence and passion set in the primitive backwater country."

Last example I quote, but not the least, there is this one—

"A rich and compelling tale of love-starved women, beset by the wicked temptations of cosmopolitan life. A shocker to be read and remembered."

**Mr. Bennett:** Do you keep these books at Liberal Party headquarters?

**Mr. HUGHES:** The hon. member may scoff, but I do not want to see the slush gates of obscenity opened to this filthy, salacious trash, a concentrated tide of horror, violence, and sex. I sincerely hope the hon. member will support what I am saying rather than ridicule a state of affairs that is known to exist.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You are in government and you are allowing them in, or your colleagues in the Federal Parliament are.

**Mr. HUGHES:** That is the essence of a vexed question—divided control. The Federal Government want to do something about it.

However, my prime consideration is, the possible damage which may be done to the minds of young people. We should have a sense of duty to the young, the immature, the impressionable people in the community.

**An Opposition Member:** Where can we get these books?

**Mr. HUGHES:** On the bookshelves of almost any bookseller who carries a reasonable stock of volumes. One can buy them in shops in Queen Street and elsewhere. They are on display for public sale.

**Mr. Bennett:** Do you say that the Literature Board of Review is not doing its job?

**Mr. HUGHES:** I am saying that it should be fortified so that it can perform its work more effectively. We should not sit idly by

and watch the slush gates open and pour this flood of obscenity onto the market. It is nothing more nor less than cheap, filthy American trash that is flooding our bookshelves.

**Mr. Aikens:** Do you believe in the censorship of books for adults?

**Mr. HUGHES:** I shall deal with that later. It is more than a controversial question. There should not be one person as a censor; there should not be one person as his brother's keeper. I believe that there should be a classification of books. I shall expand that a little later on. With the type of literature that is being displayed for sale there is a tendency to destroy our sense of values. In the young it has the tendency to destroy their respect for parents and their respect for the law. Some of these books should be seen by hon. members. I mentioned the young losing their respect for the law. Take this one, for instance, "The Black Leather Barbarians," available at a cost of 4s.

**Mr. Aikens:** Is that about the Labour Party?

**Mr. HUGHES:** No, I do not see them wearing black leather. They would more likely be embraced by "The Untouchables". This is the type of book I am referring to. On the cover it reads—

"They call themselves the Night Hawks. Six teenage toughs on motorcycles, they can make any chick, take any cop. Read their story and you'll never rest easy again."

It is nothing short of pornography. The hon. member for South Brisbane is interjecting. If he is desirous of looking at these books I hope it is for his mental edification so that he will be able to make fair and impartial criticism of them.

**An Opposition Member:** How long did it take you to read them?

**Mr. HUGHES:** I have not read them. I should not want my mind turned into a receptional cesspit of literary garbage. I am an adult with sufficient wisdom to be able to judge whether a book is worth reading or not. I did not read the books but I am afraid for the young people into whose hands they are falling. They offend all sense of decency and tolerance. There seems to be such an interest in these books on the part of hon. members opposite that I shall pass them over. I hope that it is not because of their pornographic value but because they want to judge the fairness and accuracy of my statements.

**Mr. Aikens:** Can you read extracts from them?

**Mr. HUGHES:** The hon. member for Townsville South surely has an idea of what some of these books contain. I know that he is interested in the welfare of young people. I will read an extract from a

book titled "Call Girl" to give hon. members an indication of the type of thing that is being published.

**Mr. Aikens:** Did you say "Calwell"?

**Mr. HUGHES:** It could not possibly apply to him because he wants to budget for a £100,000,000 deficit. These call girls are on the make for £100,000,000 in revenue. Just listen to this—

"Diane, when asked about the attitude of respectable people towards prostitution, replied:

What do you mean so-called respectable members of society? They're the worst freaks (perverts) of all. The more respectable they are, the freakier they are. Take that professor, I've got to beat him with a whip, and sit on his face and get him a black fag (homosexual). It's the only way he can get his kicks. I'd love to see that society dame's face he's married to. Then she's most likely as freaky as he is. You know those respectable women give me a pain in the ass. They look down on us and yet they're the biggest whores of all. When they think they've been pursued enough they condescend to go to bed with their husbands. Poor husband really feels good. Boy, did they get lucky. They made it with their wife.

Let the poor bum figure up how many times a year she lets him have her, divide it by what he gives her, and she'd see if she's not the higher-priced whore."

"No wonder men step out. They like to feel human, wanted and loved even if they have to pay for it and nine out of 10 of these women are trying their friends' husbands along with trying other men too."

That is the sort of garbage and filth that is readily available to teenagers and adolescents. I say that the State should exclude that filthy, obscene and pornographic literature.

I know there is a difficulty and I will deal with it as I proceed, but we should move to tighten the laws that are not giving the desired measure of protection to our youth.

We have in Queensland a Literature Board of Review with the power to ban publications. Hon. members have probably heard of Carter Brown's publications being banned but with this type of literature, which is American trash, coming into the country, the Literature Board of Review have not within their ambit of responsibility, power to do anything about it. They are not fortified by legislation to do so. So, it is coming in in its tons and pouring out its filth and our Literature Board of Review in Queensland is hamstrung. I believe that we should do something to further fortify the Board.

This book from which I have quoted is allowed into this country by the Customs Department and, having been allowed in, it is on open sale throughout the country.

Once a book is allowed by the Customs Department to have entry into the country, it then has free and full circulation, especially in Queensland. The danger too, is that a costly hard-back of this type can be reprinted in Australia in a glossy paper-back and sold with impunity for 3s.-4s. I said at the outset that we were spending over £17,000,000 this year on education and that we aimed at high standards of education. The accent is on that at all levels. Educators are saying, "Study, and develop your minds." We are doing that in the school curriculums yet we are allowing this type of book to come into the country.

Surely we do not need to have this filthy garbage, permeating from an apparently morally depraved and sex crazed country, sweeping over a clean, healthy nation.

I say that there is no subject that cannot be written about vividly yet decently. I believe that life in other parts of the world can be accurately portrayed in an adult and mature form to allow adults in this country to judge for themselves of life in other cities of the world and so as to allow future generations to judge of the conduct and manner of society throughout the world in these times.

**Mr. Bennett:** Do you say that the Minister for Education and Migration is not putting out good literature?

**Mr. HUGHES:** I do not mind dealing with worthwhile interjections but that attitude is irresponsible and facetious and is the type of interjection which would appear to me to condone youth resorting to this form of literature. I should say that we should do everything possible to fortify our form of education and our Literature Board of Review and in every way clean up this unhealthy and unsavoury mess.

There are decent paper-backs and forms of literature that will cope with the demand in an economic form. These paper-back books are rather worthwhile literature. There are many that do cater for the majority, and not this minority of, as I say, midget-minded morans. These paper-backs are being produced in Australia under the Pacific label. They are published by Angus & Robertson a company that, as we all know, has at all times espoused a high degree of decency and ethics. We have, in this new Australian form of paper-back, worthwhile novels that essentially of an Australian background. They are good, clean and interesting. The future encouragement of the Australian product is the responsibility of the buying public. Parents have a great degree of responsibility and should supervise as far as possible the literature read by their children. While this junk and trash, which I have mentioned, is on sale, they are not always able to do so but if they encouraged their children in the reading of the Pan and Fontana series, they would be making sure their children read worthwhile literature.

**Mr. Aikens:** Do you realise that if you put that in a hard-back, charged two guineas for it and called it a classic, the snobs would rush it?

**Mr. HUGHES:** The book "Call Girl" is the only one I have read almost completely. It is a scientific analysis presented by a psycho-analyst and I read it dispassionately.

**Mr. Bennett:** Who is the psycho-analyst?

**Mr. HUGHES:** If anyone needs a psycho-analyst, it is the hon. member.

As the hon. member for Townsville South said, if this book was put in a hard cover, classified as sensible literature and put on sale for two or three guineas, probably not very many copies would be sold, but present it to the public with a glossy cover portraying a voluptuous, sexy siren and put it on sale at a cheap price, and millions of copies will be sold. The danger lies in that there is no differentiation in law between adults and minors. Something should be done to prevent the entry of this American series of books—for obvious reasons I will not name the series on the books—and other American trash and garbage which is nothing more than perverted, salacious filth. It should not be available for ready sale on booksellers' shelves. It surely has a very harmful effect on the impressionable minds of our young people.

How is it that these books are allowed into the country? I invite all State and Federal members to interest themselves seriously in the subject. Today much emphasis is placed on education. Governments have a high record, particularly the Queensland Government. They provide opportunities for education at all levels. They have undertaken the building of many schools to cope with the tidal-wave of students in post-war years. But while so much emphasis is placed on education, we do not do as much as we should do to stop the entry of this perverted filth. We spend astronomical sums of money on universities and on all aspects of education, yet we do little to check the entry of pornographic filth.

**Mr. Aikens:** Have you ever read any of the so-called classics such as "The Golden Ass"?

**Mr. HUGHES:** I have here one of the of the works of Rabelais, but this is a hard-backed book and costs a considerable sum of money. In fact, it was purchased from the Queensland Book Depot. The reading of it takes some effort. It is listed as a work of literary art and merit.

**Mr. Aikens:** For pure filth it makes these paper-backed books look like peanuts.

**Mr. HUGHES:** That depends on the quality of the reader's mind. He is his own judge and jury.

**Mr. Aikens** interjected.

**Mr. HUGHES:** Evidently the hon. member knows every pornographic reference in it. The book is classified as a work of art.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Dewar): Order! There is far too much levity in the Chamber.

**Mr. HUGHES:** It is presented as a literary work of art to be studied and read as such. The view taken of it depends on the quality of the reader's mind. If it was reproduced in a cheap paper-back issue by one of these American firms, it would find its way into the hands of our young people. This has been allowed in by the Customs, and if it is reproduced in a cheap issue, with a glossy front cover, that is where the damage lies because then, and only then, would it find its way into the hands of the adolescents with immature minds. We should do everything to develop a far better standard. I make no apology for raising my voice in this place, at this time, because I believe I am speaking for a large majority of the people in the community in an attempt to obtain better literature, and stop this money-grabbing trade in purveying filth. This trend has reached the stage where I should not be surprised to see a large sign in front of a bookstall saying, "Sex for sale." This is the trend being created by these pornographic publications. I see in Australia the modern phenomena in society to follow an American trend. May God help us if we follow it too slavishly. I will cite some examples to the Committee to show what may happen if we follow this trend too closely. I believe it is one of the contributing factors to the menace of violence and juvenile delinquency that we know is so rife in America. If our young people follow these trends we will find that this type of literature, to some degree, marked or otherwise, has some influence on perverting their minds. We received the report of the Commissioner of Police the other day and hon. members must have been shocked to read—

"The total number of offences cleared up during the year amounted to 12,377, and of this number 4,705 or 38.01 per cent., were committed by juveniles; the percentage last year was 33.47."

That is an increase of 4 per cent. in one year in juvenile crime. The report continues—

"It is apparent that the incidence of crime among young people is steadily mounting; and although Police throughout the State have been directed to take firm but fair steps towards curbing youthful activities suggesting criminal tendencies, it is incumbent upon the community generally, and particularly parents, to set a lead to these young people and assist them towards law-abiding citizenship, if any degree of success is to be achieved in overcoming this social problem."

If we are to live up to our responsibility as realistic legislators we must fortify our law-enforcement bodies, or we will have ever-increasing juvenile crime. I have here a report of the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Attorney-General, on crime prevention, in California. It is a photostat copy taken from the report and it shows that the

increase in crime from 1957 to 1958, particularly for sexual offences was very marked and for forcible rape the increase was 13 per cent., which was the highest. I come now to offences known to the police in 2,703 cities with over 2,500 residents, with a total population of 84,872,159. For all types of crime between 1953 and 1958, there has been an increase of 26.2 per cent., and this case rape showed the highest increase, 32.1 per cent. Those figures show the trend in America. God help us so that in this country we never have such fantastically deplorable figures. I believe that, unless we take some positive measures, in some way this obscene filth and trash in paper-back mass media is going to add to the present trend of setting young feet on the road to juvenile crime. We must look at the lesson in these reports.

**Mr. Bennett:** What do you say is the cause of juvenile crime?

**Mr. HUGHES:** There are many contributing factors, and the greatest responsibility lies with the parents in the home.

Further in the report of this committee, after quoting statistics, they say—

"On one point, however, all members of the Committee and all experts appearing before it were agreed: that there has been a distinct and alarming change in the nature of juvenile violence. This change is not merely an intensification of hostile and resistant attitudes towards authority of all types. The most shocking forms taken by juvenile violence are the acts of insensate and, at times, seemingly sadistic cruelty inflicted on other juveniles and adults, and on the very young and the very old. This type of cruelty well-nigh reaches its nadir when a group of boys beat a helpless old derelict, who has nothing worth stealing, to the point of insensibility or even to death. It reaches its absolute nadir in the all too frequent occurrences when three or four boys in their mid-teens or late teens converge on a middle-aged or elderly woman and, not content with snatching her purse, knock her down and kick her brutally."

It is this type of garbage from America, this "Black-Leather barbarians" sort of thing, as exemplified by this book, that helps incite young people to do such things today.

**Mr. Mann:** They have gone too far when they reach that stage. They are not very much subject to its influence then.

**Mr. Bennett:** Most delinquents don't read anything.

**Mr. HUGHES:** That shows just how far the hon. member for South Brisbane is out of touch not only with everyday living but with the young and old in the community, and I will prove that as I proceed.

Hon. members and the general public are entitled to ask what can be done and I put my views forward for consideration. I preface my remarks by saying that I am not

advocating a complete and all-embracing censorship of literature, but I am principally concerned at the possible harm obscene literature can do to minors. I do not advocate setting up an autocratic censor or a bureaucratic group of censors but I contend the adult community have a right and a responsibility. As an analogue to the expressed thought I say that, while I personally may not agree with the content, or with certain passages, of a book, I do not think that gives me the right to censor or stop my fellow adult citizen from reading and judging it. I do not think any one man should be the censor. I think the proper place to test such cases for obscenity is the court.

In my research into this subject I read many books. These included "Obscenity and the Law", and that goes back to early English times of ward societies, Censorship Boards, libel cases, and so forth and explains how they dealt with the matter. Then I read, "The Right to Read" and also a number of questionable books, such as—

"Jimmy Brocket", which I think is literary garbage.

"Fraulein", which is horrifying, seamy and sexy.

"The Philanderer", which is vivid, vital, and to use an Australianism, sizzles from page to page. It tells with candour of the realities of human passion.

"The Wine of Life" by Balzac, which doubtless portrays the licentiousness of the temperamental artists and writers set in France in the era depicted.

Then there is the book "The Best of Everything", written with a bold frankness.

**Mr. Houston:** Are they in the library?

**Mr. HUGHES:** The hon. member for Bulimba will probably be the first to take it out of the library when I return it. "The Best of Everything" reveals the life and loves of a set of office girls in an American city in the 1950s. I read "God's Little Acre" and was sickened by some of its pages. I have read the unexpurgated version of "Lady Chatterley's Lover".

**Mr. Bennett:** Have you read any decent books?

**Mr. HUGHES:** There is one thing; at least I read and at least I think and at least I make a worthwhile contribution, not like the hon. member for South Brisbane. I could say of him that sometimes he sits and thinks; most times he just sits. I have done a good deal of positive research in order to make a worthwhile contribution on this subject, and I hope that the views I am putting forward will be supported.

I have read the unexpurgated version of "Lady Chatterley's Lover." I believe that this book rightfully should be banned in Australia because of the frequent use of certain four-letter words that are not in

drawing-room usage by healthy and considerate-minded adults in Australia. I have spoken to many people in the course of my research, and world travellers have told me that these words are in constant use in some countries and are not out of place in certain parts of the world, including England, where a jury passed the book. Yet I believe that any jury composed of decent Australians would ban the book here.

In fact, one of the books that I have quoted, "The Philanderer," might well be a literary description of your life or mine. It portrays the life of a person in an American city, and although it is fiction, in reality persons of that type live in all countries in the world. It became the subject of a court case at the Old Bailey in 1954, and I quote from a report of the case of Regina v. Secker and Warburg and others, which was tried by a jury before Mr. Justice Stable on 2 July, 1954, and is the most important case of its kind since Regina v. Hicklin in 1868. The three defendants were charged with publishing an obscene libel in the novel "The Philanderer," by Stanley Kauffman. A jury of nine men and three women, after a retirement of 50 minutes, brought in a verdict of not guilty. For the information of hon. members, I shall quote from a photostat copy of the judgment that I have obtained. In summing up, Mr. Justice Stable made these comments—

"Your verdict will have a great bearing upon where the line is drawn between liberty and that freedom to read and think as the spirit moves us, and licence, which is an affront to society of which we are all, each of us, a member."

He went on to say—

"The test today is extracted from a decision of 1868, and the test of obscenity is this: whether the tendency of the matter charged as obscene is to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences and into whose hands a publication of this sort may fall."

He also said—

"Your task is to decide whether you think that the tendency of the book is to deprave those whose minds today are open to such immoral influences and into whose hands the book may fall in this year, or last year when it was published in this country, or next year or the year after that."

In this case the book was cleared, and rightly so, thus allowing mature adults to use their own judgment. But I do project the view that this and many other books allowed to be sold to the public should be subject to a code of classification. I am all for the Literature Board of Review, as I have said, and I have given credit to other Governments for what they have done. The former Labour Government are to be commended for their forthright thinking and for taking up the challenge. However, we must go further and deal with today's problems.

It should be possible for the Literature Board of Review, in co-operation with the Publishers' Association and the Australian Booksellers' Association, to effectively and fully classify the literature coming forward. The problem is not as mountainous as it may seem. It is not insurmountable, because I shall explain further how we can classify books. It is possible to do this without frustrating the trade, as "reading copies" of books are available which come before printing and the affixing of covers.

In conjunction with this action, I submit that there should be an amendment to the Criminal Code along the lines of the introduction of a "Harmful to Young Persons Act," making it an offence to sell or distribute to young people—minors—literature classified as "adult only." I suggest that the hon. member for Windsor might give further attention to this. I contend that we should legislate to deal with two totally different groups of people. At the moment there is only one law covering all ages in society. That is where I think the real weakness lies. There is probably sufficient scope in our present law to deal with obscene literature as it affects adults. Obscenity and pornography is an indictable offence. There are books such as I have quoted that the adult population may choose to read, yet many such books could be harmful to minors. I read extracts from "Call Girl," of which I have made some degree of analysis. It deals with the psycho-analysing of 20 call girls in an American city, portraying a cess pit of vice, pimps and prostitution. But it did not cause me to go out on a rampage of rape. I read it somewhat dispassionately as a scientific study, yet I fear for what that book would do to the mind of many a young girl or boy.

**Mr. Burrows** interjected.

**Mr. HUGHES:** We would not have to worry about you. At your age you could not go out on such a rampage.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope the hon. member is not addressing the Chair.

**Mr. HUGHES:** In looking at you, Mr. Taylor, I will give you the benefit of the doubt. Today in the community there is in some cases a mental laziness. Years ago mother and father would inquire what children were reading. These days parental control cannot be taken over by the State. There is still that degree of responsibility, even more so, on the parents. Much can be done to prevent the purveying of obscene literature to young people. I suggest that Queensland could well follow the lead set by England where in 1955 the House of Commons passed a criminal law under the Children and Young Persons (Harmful Publications) Act. Reading from a photostatic copy it states—

"An Act to prevent the dissemination of certain pictorial publications harmful to children and young persons.

"1. Works to which this Act applies.—This Act applies to any book, magazine or other like work which is of a kind likely to fall into the hands of children or young persons and consists wholly or mainly of stories told in pictures (with or without the addition of written matter), being stories portraying—(a) the commission of crimes; or (b) acts of violence or cruelty; or (c) incidents of a repulsive or horrible nature, in such a way that the work as a whole would tend to corrupt a child or young persons into whose hands it might fall."

Time will not permit me to quote further from this document but I commend a study of it to hon. members. That law could well apply here. Our local law should be strengthened. I suggest the most successful complete way of dealing with this matter in its entirety would be to have an all-States uniform law, because without it the States are almost powerless.

**Mr. Smith:** Have you not got that with films classification?

**Mr. HUGHES:** Yes, but the responsibility under film classification is on the parent. I think that we should have an all-States uniform law to deal with the problem. Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution has to be considered. If the Customs allows this type of literature to come into the country it can be reprinted here and distributed. The Post Office Regulations would permit it to be sent through the post if it were not declared to be obscene. Let me quote a case that occurred in Victoria last year—the Carlotta McBride case. A report in the "Sunday Mail" reads—

"The Commonwealth book censorship following a Victorian court case last week, is facing a crisis which could end by its complete abandonment.

"The Court held that the novel Carlotta McBride passed by the Federal Censorship was indecent, and ordered the confiscation of copies held by a Victorian distributor. The case emphasises, that despite efforts to rationalise Federal censorship, it is provisional only.

"It shows that censorship is subject to over-ruling by any of the States, misleading to the public and liable to involve importers, who accept Federal rulings in good faith, in substantial financial losses."

I cannot read it all because of the limitation on my time but it particularly shows that this is a case where the Federal Government releases a book and the Victorian Government say, "No, we will not have it distributed in our State." It cannot be distributed in Victoria, but it can be in Queensland and the other States and even go back to Victoria by post. That demonstrates the anomalies between Federal and State laws and those of the different States when compared with each other.

I believe that we are as legislators charged with a very definite responsibility to

strengthen local laws and to devise a just and workable uniform all-States law through the Justice Ministers of all States in conjunction with the Commonwealth. I know there has been a meeting on this, and I commend them for it, but something positive will have to emanate from these discussions. First they should meet and in co-operation draft legislation common to every State.

There should be devised ways and means to ban objectionable obscene literature, particularly the varnished-cover, pulp, paper-back variety which is now flooding the country and in which the emphasis is on sex, crime, horror, brutality and violence. Once an imported book comes into the country it can then be redistributed in other forms and in Queensland the Literature Board is powerless.

The hon. member for South Brisbane has said by way of a previous interjection that young people do not read them but I know of young people in the college 50 yards from where I am now speaking who are buying this stuff out of their pocket-money and reading it. I will not name the person, but even the daughter of a most prominent minister of religion in this city is buying, out of her pocket-money, this pernicious filth, and she is only 15 years of age.

I call for a more vigilant police force with adequate courts to hear and judge and, where necessary, deal with these cases. There should be an effective section of the vice squad. I urge the fullest and most urgent consideration of all factors relating to this matter.

It is the business of parents and teachers and the environment of society that ultimately guides the path of the child. The church, service organisations, schools and libraries have a definite responsibility. We should do all that is possible to uplift the cultural life of the community. Libraries and book-stores should provide books that assist. The Brisbane City Council can help by providing non-fiction books free of an issue or membership charge. In this regard I commend the Chairman of the Council's Library Advisory Committee, Mr. Sid. Jones, of Annerley Junction, and their slogan. He has set a lead. Their slogan is—

"Follow our lead—read, read read."

It is worthwhile and effective and, generally, that slogan should apply to everyone, but let us see that it is quality literature, not obscenity, violence, and filthy trash.

In conclusion I urge the fullest and urgent consideration of these matters. There should not be any procrastination. Someone must grasp the nettle and I have decided at this stage that if I am to do my duty as a member for the electorate of Kurilpa and the people of this State I must put these matters before this Committee and we, as legislators, must, with wisdom and justice, face up to our responsibilities.

The hon. member for Brisbane is chortling away over there as if this was a great joke.

He might be the president of the Girls' Guild at the lower end of Spring Hill, but I am talking of the people of this State who look to us as responsible legislators to deal with matters of moment, matters affecting the children of decent society who live at a high cultural level.

In the short time left at my disposal I urge the strengthening of the powers of the Literature Board of Review and the passing of uniform laws that will classify our literature under a decent label. I should like the Vice Squad to be brought into it. They have proved effective; they closed down the brothels.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. DEAN** (Sandgate) (4.40 p.m.): I support the amendment moved by my Leader on behalf of the Opposition to reduce the salary of the Aide-de-Camp by £1. That is the traditional method used to draw attention to and amplify the weaknesses of the very poor Budget presented by the Treasurer.

The Financial Statement reflects anything but optimism for the future. In the preamble of the Financial Statement, the first paragraph, the Treasurer used the words "combination of adverse factors" for the purpose, in my opinion, of clouding the main factors affecting the economic position of the State. When he said that the finances were affected by a combination of adverse factors, he was using a cunning device to cover up the main factor, the Commonwealth Government's neglect of Queensland. He used the word "combination" to cloud the main issue, that is, the Commonwealth Government's attitude to Queensland.

**Mr. Windsor:** Are you finding it hard to say it?

**Mr. DEAN:** It is never hard to speak the truth or say what is in one's mind. After using the word "combination" the Treasurer went on to say, "The national counter inflationary measures caused a decline in activity in industry generally." In that instance again we have a covering-up of the savage credit restrictions imposed by the Commonwealth Government, a covering-up to such an extent that we could be hoodwinked about the devastating effect on the workers of Queensland. In other words, his phrases are a covering-up of the present state of unemployment.

In "The Courier-Mail" of 18 July this year it was said that Queensland still had the highest percentage of unemployment in Australia, 3.3 per cent. In May the percentage was 3.5. Those figures speak for themselves. That is why I say at the outset that the Treasurer endeavoured to cover up for his colleagues in Canberra, their weaknesses and attitude to the State of Queensland. That is apparent from the Commonwealth Aid Roads Grant, apart from anything else. We find from the Financial Statement that, of the allocation of £46,000,000 to the States of Australia, Queensland received only

£8,427,577, an inadequate amount for a State that is trying to develop its great arterial and inland roads and to encourage industries, including our great pastoral industry, to expand and take advantage of the new markets that we are hoping to supply in the near future, so that the State can be kept on an even keel economically. On that count alone we could talk for hours or even days. The figures prove conclusively that Queensland is not receiving an adequate share of Commonwealth allocations. It has been said many times that we are in need of great all-weather roads that will enable us to take our products to terminal ports for export. If we do not get adequate assistance we will find sooner or later that our economy will be in very dire straits. All the excuses about what may happen in Europe or Great Britain are becoming rather tiresome and monotonous, and to a certain extent nauseating, for the average Australian. Personally I am thoroughly sick and tired of listening to Commonwealth politicians screaming throughout the countryside why Britain must enter the European Common Market. You know as well as I do, Mr. Taylor, that Great Britain will do what is good for Britain; she will do what is best for herself. It is time that we adopted the same attitude for Australia. I am not being disparaging when I make that remark about Britain. As Australians, we ought to speak for Australia first and it is time that the Commonwealth politicians got down to business. They are paid to look after Australian interests and the sooner they do it the better it will be for Australia. The Australian taxpayers pay heavily, in some cases, to keep Federal politicians as their representatives in Canberra and we expect more from them than we have received in the past. Instead of minding Britain's business they should be minding Australia's business. We need have no fear, as I said before, that Britain will take the traditional line and look after Britain, so let the Federal Australian politicians wake up to the questions facing Australia and busy themselves finding new markets and solving Australia's problems. To amplify what I have just stated, we saw in the "Telegraph" of 2 October, 1961, a perfect example of this type of political hypocrisy. We saw a clear example given by the glittering, shining knight, Sir Arthur Fadden. He strongly advocated that everyone should carefully examine all articles before they made a purchase to make sure that they are locally manufactured. He said that if you purchase a foreign or imported article you could be purchasing yourself out of employment. Just how two-faced can some people get? I know of no Federal politician in this country who has done so much to encourage overseas articles to come into this country than this gentlemen during his period of service in the Federal House.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. DEAN:** I know that hon. members on the Government side would be disloyal

if they did not show some reaction to those remarks. At the same time, I make it clearly understood that I do not disagree with the principle of buying Australian products. I believe in it 100 per cent. But this comes from the lips of a person such as Sir Arthur Fadden, who was Federal Treasurer for many years and who in many people's minds, is responsible to a great extent for the tremendous flow of foreign imports into the country which in no small measure has been responsible for many of our local economic and industrial disruptions. The present Liberal-Country Party Federal Government are today putting into force part of his policy, and I say, without equivocation, that I believe that he and some of his Liberal colleagues should hide their heads in shame when he makes such utterances as he made in the last few weeks. It does him no credit.

**Mr. Ewan:** Do you disagree with them?

**Mr. DEAN:** I do not disagree with the principle he propounded but he did not put it forward in sincerity, I consider.

**Mr. Ewan:** You cannot see any good in anyone unless he belongs to the A.L.P.

**Mr. DEAN:** If Sir Arthur Fadden and some of the Federal politicians would try to preserve the living standards of this State that have been established over the years by previous Labour administrations we would think a little more kindly of them. Instead of that they return to the fold, and what do they do after they retire from the political sphere? They link themselves and associate their interests with service-station racketeers who work in conjunction with the great landholders who further work along with their brethren, the real estate agents. We all know what is happening around Brisbane at the moment. The tragedy about service stations is that they are moving in willy-nilly throughout the Greater Brisbane area and desecrating many residential areas. In all fairness one should not make a statement unless one is able to substantiate, it and I can substantiate mine. In "The Courier-Mail" of 4 October, a newspaper reported that 27 service stations in the first four months of this year had been approved in the Greater Brisbane area.

Moreover, the exorbitant prices being paid for some of the sites for service stations will no doubt influence the Valuer-General's determinations. I know that many fine homes in beautiful suburbs have been spoilt by this mad rush for service-station sites.

The Budget has, not once but many times, been called a boozing and gambling budget. From a perusal of it, as well as from the Treasurer's own statements, one cannot but be convinced that the Government will endeavour to raise extra finance by the liberalising of the liquor laws and that is very bad. At what cost will there be this great increase in revenue! It will mean more broken homes, less family life, and the destruction of many of our young people.



**Mr. Ewan:** You had better wait until you see the Bill.

**Mr. DEAN:** I can only go on the forecasts we have heard about it, and they have not been denied in the Chamber so far. To my mind, and in the opinion of others, the main purpose of the proposed legislation is not to help the working-class people—not by any stretch of the imagination. I do not think anyone in his right senses would believe that. We are not going to legislate to help the worker to get an extra drink or to get a drink any time within the 24 hours of the day. He can get all he wants now, in fact more than he wants. I feel sure you will agree—and many hon. members on my left would, too, if they had the courage to support me in this—that the Government have been directed by the huge liquor combines of the State. There is no doubt about that. The charge of direction has often been levelled at us—we have been accused of being subject to outside influence, to direction from authorities not elected to Parliament—but here we have a classic example of direction if ever there was one. We have seen it over many years. The magnates on the Gold Coast have been screaming for the liberalising of liquor laws, which would enable them to make higher profits at the expense of the youth of Queensland. The temptation to drink will increase, and their trade will increase and consequently their profits also.

One of the principal excuses offered for the liberalising of liquor laws—it is a very weak excuse—is that we must cater for tourists, people who visit the State. These businessmen brand every tourist coming to Queensland an alcoholic and say that all they come to Queensland for is to drink grog. What a shocking thing to say! I do not believe for one moment that it is correct. I meet scores of tourists, and my experience is that that is the last thing they want to do. Some of them drink alcohol as a beverage for refreshment, but to say that it is the No. 1 requirement of the tourist industry, as the magnates on the South Coast do, is absolutely rubbish.

**Mr. Hughes:** Don't you think we should legislate for the general will of the people and the common good?

**Mr. DEAN:** If the hon. member is patient, I will tell him what I think. I think that this proposed legislation casts a slur on the integrity of the tourists and that liberalising of the liquor laws of the State is unnecessary. It will encourage the greedy profiteering practices of those who traffic in liquor on the South Coast and in other parts of Queensland. I should not like to have it on my conscience that my bank account was swelled by money obtained by such means. It appears that the Government are going to sacrifice moral principles completely to satisfy a minority group of greedy, grasping commercial liquor interests. If the Government bring

down this legislation—it looks as though they will—they will offend the public conscience, and I can think of no more serious crime on the part of those who are entrusted with the administration of the affairs of the State.

I was disappointed with the public meeting called by the Queensland Council of Churches and held in the Brisbane City Hall, and I think I would be recreant to my duty if I did not express my views. I attended that meeting to see what went on. The Minister for Justice attended the meeting, too, and his presence seemed to have the desired effect. I have never heard such milk-and-joe speeches as I heard from the men from Sydney. I think they only came up for a free flight and to sample the fresh air of Queensland.

**Mr. Hughes:** Are you suggesting that Walker did not say what he came up here to say?

**Mr. DEAN:** I think they were more concerned about a game of golf that had been played in Sydney. They spent approximately 15 minutes in looking for a golf ball that had been lost and has not been found yet to my knowledge.

**Mr. Hughes:** That is a shocking indictment.

**Mr. DEAN:** I came to the conclusion that they lost their enthusiasm when they saw the Minister sitting in the front row. Perhaps the Minister is a hypnotist, because those men did not use their tongues and their minds in the way they intended to use them.

**Government Members** interjected.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask hon. members to allow me to hear the speaker.

**Mr. DEAN:** You have my fullest sympathy, Mr. Taylor. What I am trying to point out is that that public meeting was wasted because nothing concrete came out of it that night. They could have shown their feelings much more strongly but it was left to the Baptist and Methodist interests in the electorate of Sandgate to bring forward something of a concrete nature. What I presented this morning was the result of these people's reaction, expressing their feelings in a tangible way.

**Mr. Hughes:** How long did it take you to organise that one?

**Mr. DEAN:** It is not a matter of how long it took me to organise anything. I presented that petition as I was requested to do. What must have prompted them was the attitude of the people who came to Queensland to really turn the heat on. It shocked me beyond description when I attended that meeting and heard what went on.

I wish to mention a matter that has troubled me for some time in connection with the great change taking place in the industrial life

of the city. The Government are not showing enough interest in the problem posed by automation. Although automation is progress, it presents a problem. We should all be showing an interest in trying to rectify what is happening and what will happen more when automation makes itself fully felt. The Government should carry out a full investigation to learn what radical changes are taking place and the effect it is having on re-adjustment.

**Mr. Pizzey:** Why are the unions opposed to retraining?

**Mr. DEAN:** I know of no union that is opposed to progress. Automation is progress.

**Mr. Pizzey:** If we suggest retraining, the unions are opposed to it.

**Mr. DEAN:** I have been invited to several meetings at the Trades Hall and other places to discuss the ramifications of this new order in industrial society so I cannot see how the trade unions would be opposed to it. They are concerned about what is going to happen to their members in the near future if somebody does not do something about it. To meet the new trend in our industrial life we must organise labour so that we can insist that the burdens of rapid technological changes are handled with good sound commonsense by ensuring that the Government and commercial interests assume their responsibilities to minimise the social changes and provide adequate safeguards that will protect the people and their families against the hazards of these radical changes.

**Mr. Ewan:** Don't you agree that we have to educate people to use their leisure?

**Mr. DEAN:** I would agree with any sensible suggestion from anybody.

An environment of rapid economic growth and increasing job opportunities is very badly needed in order to minimise the dislocation of a radical technological change. The problem or problems can only be solved on the practical basis of the special conditions that exist in these particular industries or trade callings at the time that automation is introduced. I feel also that the Government should legislate to give protection to all those who work in industry, by making it necessary for a company or business to advise officially the employees and the respective trade unions in advance, of their intention to install new equipment that will introduce automation into the industry or business. It is only fair that they should be given due notice of the intention to introduce automation to bring production up to modern levels. They should be given ample warning and time to get together on the problem. In other words there should be full co-operation between unions and management by law.

In addition, consideration should be given in the proposed legislation to those people

who lose their jobs during the transitional period. This could be done by granting supplemental unemployment benefits. Members may say that that should be done by the Commonwealth. That could be so but we in this State should give it consideration and work in close co-operation with the Commonwealth in regard to this difficult period of transition.

**Mr. Hughes:** Do you support my previous contentions in that regard?

**Mr. DEAN:** I would not know what the hon. member's contentions were and I have known him for a long time. The financial aspect would require the Federal Government's assistance because very few, if any, economically distressed communities can possibly revive their economies adequately without Commonwealth grants and subsidies. I know that will cause another row down below but we will have to face up to the problem.

Consideration will have to be given to assistance for many of our older employees who will be expected to work these machines and new appliances to be installed in factories. They may be past a certain age, too young to retire, but past the stage at which they have their full powers of concentration. They are often not as quick or agile and may not be able to adapt themselves quickly to these machines. They will have to be given special consideration.

All the aspects I have mentioned should be considered now. It may be necessary to review our Commonwealth pension qualifications. I suppose that may be considered a Commonwealth matter but the State should give some consideration to helping these people who are not so quick or so receptive to change.

I briefly raise this important matter because I think it should be considered by the Government of the day. It is to the Government of the day that people look for relief in these important changes in industry.

Finally, it is not usually my lot to take any hon. member to task but this afternoon I must, in order to ease my mind and shed the inconvenience I experienced when I listened to the hon. member for Kurilpa. We should not have to listen to a debate on the subject he dealt with; that could be adequately handled by the Minister. The hon. member would have done more good had he taken his material to the Literature Board of Review. It appears from what he said that that Board has fallen down on its job; he made in my opinion some indirect serious charges against the Board. It is a Board set up by a previous Labour Administration.

**Mr. HUGHES:** I rise to a point of order. I have been deliberately misquoted. I did not take the Literature Board of Review to

task. In fact, my speech in "Hansard" will show that I supported in every way the work being done by the Board and desired to fortify the Board further.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is no point of order.

**Mr. HUGHES:** The hon. member's statement is offensive to me.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair will determine that matter.

**Mr. DEAN:** I mentioned indirect charges. I am really concerned about the printing of the speech in "Hansard". We know that "Hansard", when it leaves this place, is distributed freely, and that is as it should be, but it should be a document of the highest standards and should command respect. If the hon. member's speech is printed as he delivered it, I do not think it will bring very much credit to the Parliament of Queensland, particularly among the young people.

**Mr. Melloy:** He advertised every filthy book that is available.

**Mr. DEAN:** The hon. member may have spoken with good intent and I give him credit if he did, but he has given great publicity to these books and great encouragement to their purchase.

**Mr. Hughes:** I did not mention the name of the series of this American trash or the names of the books.

**Mr. DEAN:** The more you try to suppress something or the more you try to keep it away from people, the more they will try to seek that particular evil.

**Mr. Hughes:** I think you need psycho-analysing.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. DEAN:** I think it is up to someone to express resentment of that type of speech. I am not criticising the hon. member's ability in debate, nor am I criticising him personally, but I think this place is deserving of greater respect. Some of the interjections that took place during his speech, and some of the reflections that were cast, deserved discouragement rather than encouragement.

**Mr. Smith:** Why is it not right to discuss this subject if it is all right to talk about liquor?

**Mr. DEAN:** I am surprised at the hon. member, who is referred to in other places as a learned gentleman. No doubt he is, having had the advantage of great and high education. I am surprised he is taking umbrage at my remarks.

**Mr. Smith:** I am not. I am merely asking you a question.

**Mr. DEAN:** Perhaps some of his children could get hold of this book and put their own wrong construction on its contents.

**Mr. Hughes:** You do not know what goes on in the world.

**Mr. DEAN:** I certainly do, but the hon. member brings very little credit to the Government and the Minister by discussing the subject here, when he could take it up with the Minister and discuss it in the privacy of the Minister's office and so increase the pressure on the Literature Board of Review. The Board could have handled the matter adequately.

**Mr. Hughes:** You read my speech and analyse it.

**Mr. DEAN:** I deplore the type of debate indulged in by the hon. member for Kurilpa this afternoon.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah) (5.14 p.m.): Before proceeding with my prepared notes I should like to say that I, with many other hon. members I am sure, am very surprised at the attitude adopted by the hon. member for Sandgate towards the speech of my colleague, the hon. member for Kurilpa. I agree 100 per cent. with the attitude and action taken by the hon. member for Kurilpa. In my opinion it is very necessary to draw attention to the fact that these books are in circulation, so that those in authority may do something about them. I congratulate the hon. member on his speech.

Another year has gone by and we have reached the time when the Treasurer is called upon to give an account of his stewardship. As can be expected, Opposition members are naturally very critical, and they despair. They are always looking for faults, and people in any walk of life who always look for faults always find something to condemn, whether it is a fault in some fellow human being, or in some venture or undertaking. It is only natural that hon. members opposite are critical. We expect that. They have even gone so far as to move an amendment to the subject under debate. I am sure that I and my colleagues will vote against it.

When speaking on the Budget, I shall comment on the bright side of things rather than look for gloom and despair. I always like to think success, talk success, and believe success, rather than be a defeatist as is common with hon. members opposite.

We, on this side of the Chamber look at the Budget for all the good points to be revealed in the Government's administration and there are many. The Treasurer has used to great advantage the money entrusted to his care and he has used it with great diligence. There are many things that demonstrate how the funds have been used to the best advantage for the State. At all times I have found that the Treasurer has adopted a very practical approach to the problems presented to him. I think of the times that I approached him for guarantees and advances for projects in my electorate. I remember road construction. I think of the abattoir at Murgon. The

Treasurer, with other Cabinet members, agreed to subsidise that and other undertakings.

**Mr. Ewan:** There would have been no meatworks at Roma but for him.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** That is so. That demonstrates the Treasurer's practical approach.

When there was a great deal of over-production in the peanut industry some years ago and the first payment for the growers was difficult to arrange, when the Treasurer was approached he promptly said that he would agree to make the necessary guarantee. That demonstrated his attitude on important issues which led to record progress and development in the State. One would naturally conclude from the speeches of hon. members opposite that we have reached stagnation in the State, that we are confronted with something like a Berlin crisis, or a catastrophe. It cannot be denied that unheard-of progress is taking place before our eyes, that we are on the verge of even greater expansion and development as a result of our administration. There are many things which are obvious to members of Parliament and to the people of Queensland which indicate the progress and development of the State much of which is due to the able administration of the Treasurer. We see it in the long list of developments, in our schools and public buildings, in the new life instilled into the Education Department in Queensland, and in the road construction programme. The improved road construction programme is so noticeable that I sometimes regard it almost with regret. My wife often says to me, "Our roads are getting so good that you hardly need your aeroplane any longer. You can use the car because the bitumen roads to Kingaroy and elsewhere are excellent." I have been a member of Parliament for many years—since August, 1947—and I have never before seen such progress and development in Queensland as has taken place in the last few years. I can speak from first-hand experience of my own electorate.

There are other aspects of progress that are not so evident but nonetheless real. For example, I venture to say that there are not many people in Queensland, perhaps not many hon. members, who can grasp the tremendous potential of Weipa. We know how quickly Mt. Isa Mines became a giant industry. Six years ago we could hardly have visualised the expansion that has since taken place there. Similarly, in the near future, Weipa will have a vast industry to the great advantage and benefit of this country.

**Mr. Lloyd:** Do you think Comalco should construct a similar aluminium smelter at Collinsville?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** We know that Comalco have spent to date more than

£2,000,000 on the project at Weipa and that they have committed themselves to commencing preparation for an alumina plant to cost some £40,000,000, which will mean the erection of a town of some 5,000 people in that remote area. We know, too, that the plant will have a capacity of something like 350,000 tons a year.

**Mr. Graham:** When do you think they will reach full production?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** We cannot expect it to happen overnight but we know that very rapid progress is being made. We know that a contract for some £1,000,000 has been let and is under way for the handling of 5,000,000 tons of material to make a channel to that area and I am glad that a company such as Comalco is operating in Queensland. Together with so many other hon. members I am grateful, and we should do all that we can to encourage its development. I compliment the Minister who has handled all the negotiations. He has been firm in imposing conditions on the company, but on the other hand he has not barred the way for the great project to come to fruition.

We have also opening up before us the possibility of a great coal-exporting industry. It is estimated that 1,500,000 tons of coal will be exported each year. That coal will have to be mined, railed, and then shipped to Japan and naturally we are delighted with all that it will mean to Queensland. We know that the New South Wales Government are straining at the leash to capture the market, to seize the opportunity that we are availing ourselves of in the great market of Japan. The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity and his Under Secretary, when they were in Japan about this time last year, saw the great opportunities there for a market for our coal. They saw and learned that the steel mills wanted hard and soft coal, such as at Kianga and Moura. As a businessman, I am very much in agreement with the Minister's view that to get business you have to seek it and do everything you possibly can to encourage it. That is just what the Minister did on his visit to Japan. He organised a shipment of coal to Japan in order to win that market. We are pleased to have such a great engineering firm as Thiess Bros. in Queensland. They have done something practical by spending hundreds of thousands of pounds in locating and improving coalfields in the Kianga district. I understand that negotiations are now proceeding between the various companies to reach all-round agreement on the conditions for mining, the price, and the operation and construction of a railway line that will go through to the coast at Gladstone. Surely all hon. members will agree that a big coal exporting industry will bring great benefit to Queensland. The creation of such an important asset in the State must bestow considerable benefits on a number of people, and in these negotiations

the Minister and the Under Secretary for Mines, Mr. Clark, have worked tirelessly to promote its establishment.

As I prepared the notes for my speech on the subject of coal, this thought occurred to me: who made the coal miners' pensions rise automatically with the age pension, as they do in Queensland? Was it a former Labour Government? As an hon. member interjects, "Not on your life!" It was the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity and this Government who gave the coal miners that benefit. Who made it possible for the widows of miners who were killed to receive immediately the pensions to which they were entitled? Was it former Labour Governments? No. They gave much lip service to many of these comparatively small things but never did they venture to do anything about them. When conditions caused the closure of the Mt. Mulligan mine, the Minister gave unheard-of conditions and benefits to the people there and assisted them as former Governments had never assisted anybody when they closed down a particular State enterprise.

We know that for many years Queensland was looked upon as a State with no iron-ore deposits of any consequence. No real search was undertaken in Queensland by former Governments for iron ore or any other mineral. A Labour Government many years ago decided to start an iron and steel industry in Queensland based on the Collinsville coal mine. They even appointed a general manager. But we also know that at a later date this venture for a coal and steel industry was abandoned. The obvious reason for that abandonment was that, because of lack of initiative, they believed that there were only small deposits of iron ore in the State. Another factor was that the sulphur content of that coal was probably too high. I have emphasised from the beginning of my speech that with the encouragement of the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, and the Government, large financial groups have come to Queensland to search for iron ore. For three years the giant industrial mining company of B.H.P. have spent £200,000 exploring Iron Range in far North Queensland. Unfortunately results did not come up to expectations. We know that the same company has been carrying out a very intensive search over the Constance Range area. An immense deposit has been found, but something like £500,000 was spent to prove its existence. Unfortunately the area does not lend itself to open-cut methods of mining, and it is 140 miles from the coast. On the other hand, it is hard to visualise the possibilities of that great iron-ore deposit in years to come when we recall the development that has taken place on the Mt. Isa fields. Consolidated Zinc have proved that there are large deposits of iron ore, although perhaps of low grade, available at very shallow depth throughout an immense district around Cracow, Gayndah and Eidsvold. On the other hand, there is the possibility that it could be upgraded and

used in conjunction with the hard coking coal from Moura which is close by. When we think of all these things we cannot deny that the Minister for Mines and the Government have really set themselves out to develop the State's mineral resources much more than previous Governments, who did nothing in that direction. When the present Minister assumed office one of his first actions was to take the geological survey department away from that disgraceful little room in which it was located for so many years at the top end of Adelaide Street. Whenever I went there I always considered it disgraceful accommodation, which showed the Government's attitude towards mineral development. That department is now accommodated in pleasant surroundings on the third floor of the building opposite the Department of Harbours and Marine. The staff and the activities of the department have been increased. The development of the State calls for more and more geological surveys throughout Queensland. I suppose hon. members opposite would not take a great deal of interest in the matter but the Bureau of Mineral Resources, with the geological survey department, is carrying out a very intensive mapping programme throughout the northern and central parts of Queensland to assist in the search for minerals and oil. Very valuable assistance is being provided in the interpretation and evaluation of drilling results in the search for oil. I only wish that at the time I was a member of the syndicate, of which I later became chairman, when we were searching for oil, we had the setup in the Mines Department with the facilities for technical advice that we have available today. It probably would have saved us much money, worry and hard work. Some of the surveys done by the department involve the detailed logging of new artesian bores sunk in Queensland today, a very important work that assists in the technical study of the artesian basin so that the oil geologists can readily determine the value of a particular area for drilling for oil. The Survey Department also drills and supervises drilling operations throughout Queensland at the moment, particularly in relation to the search for coal, together with summing up the reserves of coal available to the State. That is very important work.

Further, the Minister has had included in the department under his control another very important section, an engineering geology section that is also giving very valuable assistance and has recently specially surveyed the available sands, gravels and clay around the city areas, to see that it is safeguarded for future use.

I have already given what is very clearly, to my mind, the progress and development that has taken place in relation to coal and other mineral activities in this State. It shows that something really progressive has taken place under this Government and this Minister. The Minister has decentralised the activities of his office. He has an office

at Charters Towers with a staff to assist in the search for minerals and oils in North Queensland.

So, hon. members can see how this department has been enlarged since we came into office, to cope with the important work that is being done in the State at the moment. We in Queensland have been particularly blessed in many ways. We have rich soils. I think one could say a favourable climate, and many minerals, exploited and being exploited, but unfortunately one of the greatest material prizes for any nation, the flow of a valuable quantity of oil, is still eluding the search not only in this State but in Australia as a whole. Nevertheless, a great deal of effort has been put into the search in more recent years both by local companies and by overseas companies, and I am sure that every hon. member here is appreciative of having these men of experience and knowledge, and finance, from overseas coming to our shores week by week and month by month to join in the search for this valuable commodity. I am pleased, and I know that the hon. member for Roma and others are, to have them here.

The Minister has done much to bring these men to our State today. Shortly after taking up his duties as the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, he found it necessary, in order to encourage these people, to liberalise the Petroleum Act as he did in 1958.

Before this Government came to office, I always felt that other Governments were afraid that somebody would find ores and minerals and perhaps make too much money out of them. They never really gave the encouragement so necessary to get companies and individuals to spend money on these very costly undertakings.

I heard the Minister greatly assisting in this regard, during our three weeks in the United States of America. We went from Tulsa, Houston to Dallas, to Corpus Christi, to New Orleans and other large cities, and I was amazed at the fine organisation of oil men over wide areas. Each day at these places we met men who had flown hundreds of miles to meet the Minister, to hear the conditions under which the Government of Queensland operated, and to listen to the Minister's explanation that Queensland had a Government that kept promises, unlike the Governments of other countries with which they had dealings, and that the Government were prepared to encourage them and give them all the technical assistance we could.

Hundreds of millions of pounds have been spent in Australia on defence—on the land for our armed forces, on the sea for our navy and in the air for our air force. Further millions of pounds are being spent at Woomera and other establishments, but only a few millions comparatively are being spent on the search for oil, per medium of subsidies by the Commonwealth Government.

Yet we are entirely, completely and absolutely dependent on overseas oil. Every drop of it has to be imported. Many people fail to recognise the great importance of this commodity in our everyday life and economy. Our land, sea, and air forces would be completely immobilised or made ineffective if we lost the oil imported from overseas. The country would come to a complete standstill the moment we were cut off from overseas sources.

**Mr. Donald:** Why don't you do something to try to get it from coal?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** It is a matter of economics, as the hon. member will agree. In spite of what hon. members may say, the matter is urgent and vital. Apart from the fact that oil costs Australia in the vicinity of £140,000,000 a year, we are entirely dependent on it. I think many hon. members will agree that one of Australia's greatest failures is the failure of Federal and State Governments to recognise the fact and to do something towards encouraging and assisting in the search for this valuable commodity.

We are not devoid of places where we can search for oil. More than 1,500,000 square miles or approximately half the area of Australia is a sedimentary basin, and we know that is where we are most likely to find oil. The oil men of the world all tell us that this sedimentary basin is the most likely place to find oil. If another war broke out, and I certainly hope and pray it does not, our position overnight would indeed be very desperate, because it is unlikely that we would be able to bring oil to Australia.

**Mr. Donald** interjected.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The hon. member was a member of the previous Government, a Government that did very little by comparison with what the present Minister is doing.

**Mr. Lloyd:** You know as well as I do that encouragement and assistance in the search for oil is dependent on Commonwealth subsidy.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I agree with that point to a certain extent, but I emphasise that the previous Federal Labour Governments did nothing at all for a long time about a subsidy. We all know the position under the State Labour Governments. Their attitude to the officers of the Geological Survey Department was demonstrated by the offices they occupied at the top end of Adelaide Street. Apart from the subsidies, which are very important, our stable government encourages oil companies to invest their money. We can assist by creating good conditions for investment of their money. We have very good markets in Queensland and the whole of our life depends on oil. I know that before subsidies were commenced the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity was pressing for them,

and later on he urged the Government to increase them. He and his department have played their part in encouraging these companies to come to Queensland. I convey my appreciation to Mr. Clark, the Under Secretary, and the very efficient and able officers in the Mines Department. I believe Mr. Clark plays a very important part in encouraging and assisting the Minister and the department in this important work. The Minister for National Development, Senator Spooner, is a man of vision and does all he can to improve subsidy payments and we know that from time to time he has increased them. Many of the ordinary citizens of the Commonwealth believe that a great deal more should be done to provide an incentive for more companies to come forward to assist in this great undertaking. As I said previously, we spend about £140,000,000 a year importing petroleum products to Australia. I believe that the equivalent of 10 per cent. of the import cost of oil should be used to subsidise oil-drilling and research in Australia. Queensland receives the largest share of the subsidies paid by the Commonwealth Government. It is significant that under the Minister's administration there is five or six times as much activity in the search for oil than even in Western Australia which is the only other State with an oil flow similar to the one at Cabawin. There is no doubt in my mind that we will eventually find oil in Queensland; not a shadow of doubt! It is obvious to many people that at Cabawin No. 1 at Tara, where oil was located some months ago, there is a field of oil, not just a pool at one particular point. Those of us who have spoken to oil men, and people interested in the subject, realise that it is quite obvious that had it been a pool of oil at Cabawin No. 1 it would have petered out, or stopped flowing long before the conclusion of the recent tests that were conducted for a long time. We know that it is a very good oil with an extremely high gravity—much higher than the average throughout the world.

I want to put before the Committee the following figures of drilling done in the last few years—

—	—	Total
1956 .. ..	1 hole	91 ft. 6 ins.
1957 .. ..	4 holes	14,569 ft.
1958 .. ..	2 ..	3,731 ft.
1959 .. ..	5 ..	9,334 ft.
1960 .. ..	11 ..	47,030 ft.
1961 .. ..	12 ..	Over 60,000 ft.

If hon. members really doubt that ultimately we will find oil in Queensland, I should like them to meet some of the oil men with experience in America. They are confident and in that spirit they are intensifying the search and spending large sums of money on it. They have proved one or two places now and they say it is only a matter of time before we will strike oil. Finding oil is a matter of great urgency to Queensland.

As we contemplate the progress that has taken place since we took office, the possibilities of finding oil and of exporting coal, the creation of new iron and steel works, and the tremendous potential of Weipa, we can say to members of the Opposition that they should try to dispel their gloom and have a little more courage and faith and look up into the sunshine of the Treasurer's Budget. It shows we are doing something concrete, that we are active, that we are expanding and developing the State. It shows that we are moving ahead to bigger and better things. As I think of the gloomy dismay expressed by certain members of the Opposition, I should like to leave with them words that I like, and that they can read for themselves in the fourth verse of the 35th Chapter of Isaiah—

"Say to them that are of fearful heart; be strong, fear not."

**Mr. MELLOY** (Nudgee) (5.54 p.m.): I rise to support the amendment moved by my Leader. The course he took was the only one open to the Opposition. We could not possibly debate this matter without registering our protest. The amendment is a censure vote on the Government and if ever a censure vote was deserved it is on this occasion. It has been said, and will be said again I suppose, that the Opposition content themselves with criticising the Budget presented by the Treasurer. That is not our fault. We can only criticise because there is nothing in the Budget to commend. We should be only too happy to commend the Treasurer on the Budget if we could find in it something to commend. He leaves us no alternative but to criticise it. It has already been criticised by speakers from this side of the Chamber and it will also be criticised by other speakers on this side. This is a hopeless Budget. It is purely a Treasurer's Budget, certainly not a national Budget. It does not indicate that the Government intend to legislate for the welfare of the State or that they have any plans for the development of the land or of primary industries. There is certainly nothing in it to indicate that they have plans for the industrial development of the State. There is not even any indication that they are aware that unemployment exists. As I say, it is purely a Treasurer's Budget, one to seek ways and means of bringing in a few extra pounds to carry on the business of government. It should contain encouragement for industry so as to provide additional employment, but it is obvious that the Treasurer has given no thought to industrial development. He has given no indication of any desire to boost industry to provide employment. As I said earlier, all the Treasurer intends to do is to have a crack at the working man through amendments to the Liquor Act and the laws relating to betting. Those amendments will certainly react to the detriment of the workers.

With talk of Britain's entry into the European Common Market, we expected to

see some indication that the Government were aware that alternative markets would have to be found for Queensland's products. In the Treasurer's speech reported on page 82 of "Hansard", there was some recognition of the fact that Britain's entry into the Common Market would have a disastrous effect on Queensland's economy, but he gave no indication about what the Government proposed to do about it. He said—

"So, I am in agreement with the Leader of the Opposition that the European Common Market is a matter for diligent study by us all."

There was no indication of the extent to which the Government had studied the problem and no indication of what provision they were going to make to meet it. He went on to say—

"As I see it, the nearer Pacific area is an altogether logically better area to develop our trade."

We know the attitude of the Country-Liberal Government to trade with the Near East, and we also know the attitude of their counterparts in the Federal sphere. But there is nothing in the Budget to show that the Government are aware of such markets or that they intend to explore the possibility of sending our wheat to the Near East. Indeed, there is nothing in the Budget to encourage the people of Queensland to go on producing. We will have to find markets very soon for all our primary products and for the products of secondary industry.

In his Financial Statement the Treasurer states—

"The Government is advised that the traffic available to the Railways will reflect the drought adversity."

That is just to square-off for the position presently existing in the railways, which reflects not so much the effect of adverse drought conditions on railway revenue as the lack of traffic available to the railways because of the poor service being rendered by the department to the country people. It reflects the failure of the Government to keep the trains on the lines and to give a regular and timely service for country people. There is need to provide an adequate passenger service to all parts of the State, particularly the sparsely populated areas with a production potential. Had the railway service not operated in undeveloped areas in the past the State would not have developed as it did under Labour Governments. It cannot be denied that Labour Governments provided a railway service that enabled Queensland's outback to be developed. If we restrict rail services in country areas we restrict development, because we cannot rely entirely on air and road transport. Great loads cannot be carried at present by air. We cannot rely entirely on road transport because road transport provides a service only under normal conditions. Road transport cannot cater for the country people as the railways have done, nor can it offer freight rebates. In times of necessity we

cannot depend on road transport to provide services to the sparsely populated areas. If lines are closed down and rails torn up, the Government will not be able to provide a transport service when road transport fails. As yet we do not know the full extent of the closure of railway lines throughout Queensland. Although it does not affect a country area, I am particularly concerned about the rail service into my own area of Pinkenba. Apparently it is on the books to be curtailed to some extent, but as yet we do not know to what extent. If the Government are going to restrict rail services the department will lose traffic, but the Treasurer suggests that the lack of traffic will reflect the drought conditions that have existed in Queensland for some time.

I move on now to deal with what the Treasurer had to say about the measures the Government propose to introduce. He said—

"The Government proposes to introduce measures providing for important reforms to the Liquor laws of the State and also to the laws governing Racing and Betting."

"It is not my purpose to present the reasons which have led the Government to initiate these changes. However, to the extent that each will have a considerable effect on the budgetary position of the State, it is necessary for me to report the financial consequences which flow from the changes in the law that are contemplated."

**Mr. Lloyd:** In other words, he is after revenue.

**Mr. MELLOY:** Exactly. As I said earlier, this is a Treasurer's Budget not a national one. That is indicated very clearly in that passage of the Treasurer's Financial Statement. He has framed this Budget for the one purpose of obtaining more revenue, and it will come from the workers of the State.

The amendments of the liquor laws and betting laws indicate how the Government depend on the additional revenue to be derived in this way.

Bookmakers who field in the paddock will not worry to any great extent about a turnover tax. They will have a reasonable chance to recover it, but it is the battling bookies, not that I hold any brief for them, in the ledger and the flat who do not at any time hold sufficient money in their bags to hand out an extra few quid to the authorities in turnover tax, who will be hit. Every month bookies in the ledger and flat go broke. Those in the paddock do not.

In any case, bookmakers in the ledger and flat are not inclined to pass these imposts onto the punters with whom they do business, because, in the main, those punters are ordinary working men; they are not race-horse owners or business men and every shilling they get out of a bet means something to them. They do not bet in 20's



and 50's and hundreds, but in five bobs, ten bobs, and, if they are lucky, as high as a quid.

I do not think the bookies on the flat will be inclined to pass the turnover tax on to the punters in that enclosure, but, at the same time, they are not in a position to carry it themselves. Consequently, it will be necessary for them to pass it on to the punter, the working man, who will suffer as a result.

**Mr. Ewan** interjected.

**Mr. MELLOY:** We do not want the graziers in this chamber telling the workers of the State how they should live.

I pass now to the passage in the Treasurer's Statement reading—

"The regulations under the Traffic Acts are being amended to enable the State to recover the costs of testing applicants for Driver's Licenses. The fee will be £1 for each test and is expected to return approximately £60,000 per annum."

Once again the Treasurer exposes his hand. A section of the community already taxed to the limit, is to be further taxed. Only the wage plugs in the community will be hit by the Government. It would not matter two hoots to a man sitting on a bank balance of £50,000 or £20,000 with an income of £30 or £40 a week if he had to pay a fee of £1 for each test for a driving licence. The tax will hit the worker, but, considering the nature of the Government, I am not surprised. We have no indication at this stage how often the fee will be imposed. Some women applicants for driving licences through pure nervousness fail in their tests four or five times. On each occasion the test will cost £1. That is the attitude of the Government to anyone who is not of their kind. We have a heartless Government, a Government that have absolutely no interest in the ordinary people of the State.

The Treasurer had this to say in his Financial Statement—

"But whilst these developments have been taking place, pastoral activity in the remoter North has continued to wage a constant battle against distance from markets, lack of transport, and other natural difficulties."

We must expect that the pastoral industry will operate in remote parts of the State, long distances from markets. We could not have a pastoral industry in the heart of the cities. We must remember that pastoralists and graziers in good times get good returns. Probate notices give some indication of the size of their estates. We do not find that they die broke. I do not suppose the hon. member for Roma is likely to be broke when he dies, but he would squeal as loudly as anybody if he was taxed another one farthing in the pound. Why should the

Government give people in the pastoral and grazing industries treatment that they are not prepared to give the workers of the State?

The Treasurer went on to say—

"The Government has already attempted to make a positive contribution to the problem by undertaking the construction of the central road access stretching up from Mareeba to Cooktown and towards Coen. In turn, the recently announced programme for Beef Roads will be of signal significance to the lower Gulf area and will provide valuable road outlets."

We do not require expert knowledge to sum up the situation; we merely have to read the Treasurer's address to see how little regard the Government have for the people. The proposal is to build roads in the North, but if the economy of the State follows the present pattern there will not be anyone in the North to use the roads; there will not be any cattle to transport over the roads. That is evident from the figures for last year. The value of cattle slaughtered was down by £5,613,000, a clear indication of a decrease in cattle numbers. Apart from providing facilities for the cattle and grazing industries, the Government will have to ensure that markets where the price is reasonable are open to beef slaughtered in Queensland. The Government have helped to make cattle grazing profitable by removing meat from price controls.

**Mr. Ewan:** It is cheaper now than it ever was.

**Mr. MELLOY:** It is not.

The Government boast of their action in relation to probate and succession duties. In an area in North Queensland, defined in the Treasurer's speech, it is proposed to grant concessions of up to 50 per cent. in probate and succession duties. This demonstrates the hopeless outlook of the Government. To obtain these concessions people have to die. It is typical of the Government's approach. The Budget brought down by the Treasurer reflects the attitude and state of mind of the Government towards the people of the State and the progress of the State. There is absolutely nothing in it to commend it to the Opposition; there is only cause for criticism. Incidentally, the members of the Government are very sprightly at chipping in now when a speech is being made from this side of the Chamber, but when the hon. member for Nundah spoke on Tuesday there was not one member of his party here to listen to him. Absolutely no interest is displayed in the Budget brought down by the Government. Not one member of the Government has risen to his feet and referred to it. They all know that they cannot defend it, and that if they attempted to criticise it they would be pulled into line by the Premier.

I come now to the dispute at Mt. Isa, a very topical subject, and one of the utmost importance. Several speakers from this side of the Chamber have expressed their views

about it, but they will bear repeating because the matter is so serious. The workers at Mt. Isa are entitled to every penny they can drag out of the company, and they will have to drag it out. It is significant that in 1952, when Mt. Isa earned a profit of £2,200,000, the bonus was £17 5s. a week, the highest bonus ever paid by Mount Isa Mines Limited. In 1959, when the profit was £4,030,722, the workers received £8 a week as a bonus. That was awarded to them by the Industrial Court. The right to make such awards has since been taken from the Court by this businessman's Government, who have the effrontery to say that they are the workers' Government. They took that right from the Industrial Court, but had they not done so, the workers at Mt. Isa, would now have been receiving a bonus of £11 7s. 6d. a week on a proportionate basis. Mount Isa Mines Limited refuse to concede that and, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Salisbury, they have said bluntly that they are not going to submit the matter to a mediator, knowing full well that if they did the decision would go well and truly against them. No matter how biased the mediator might be, he would grant the workers the bonus they are entitled to. And why should they not get it, in view of the tremendous profits that are being made? Nearly all that money is going out of Queensland. The only money that stays in Australia is that paid in wages to the employees. Money paid as a bonus to the workers will stay in Queensland and will be spent in Queensland and Mt. Isa Mines will then be really worth something to the State. As it is, all the wealth apart from wages is going out of the State by way of dividends. I say the mine workers and other employees at Mt. Isa are justly entitled to the bonus they are seeking.

In 1960 the company made a profit of £5,358,000-odd and the workers still received a bonus of £8 a week. This year's profit was £5,929,000-odd. If the company is able to make such tremendous profits, surely the workers who gouge the wealth from the ground are entitled to a fair return for their labour. But they are not getting it and they will not get it if Mount Isa Mines Limited are left to adjudicate on their own behalf. As the hon. member for Salisbury pointed out, Mount Isa Mines Limited said they would not submit to an arbitrator as they were well able to look after their own affairs. Look after their own affairs they will because they will not look after the workers despite the fact that they are paying them a bonus of £8 a week at this stage.

**Mr. Pizzey:** What about the losses they have made?

**Another Government Member:** Over 25 years!

**Mr. MELLOY:** Every firm has to carry losses in the initial stages of its establishment. If the company had not recouped those losses and made tremendous profits in addition, they would not be able to pay the dividends they are paying their shareholders

today. They have well and truly recovered and every pound that has gone towards that recovery has been provided for them by their workers, and not by their shareholders.

The general manager, Mr. Foots, has said, "We will stay closed forever if necessary." If this Government are going to take that sort of thing from any individual in the State it is time they resigned. No person should be allowed to play ducks and drakes with a vast undertaking with the tremendous resources that Mount Isa has. Mr. Foots adopts an attitude of pique, like the small boy who says, "If we don't get what we want we will close the mine down forever." We should not allow the company to do that with resources that belong to the people of Queensland. The Government should forbid anybody to restrict the development of the people's resources.

**Mr. Pizzey:** Has he not agreed to open the mine under award conditions?

**Mr. MELLOY:** I ask the Minister, are the shareholders under award conditions?

**Mr. Pizzey:** He has offered to open the mine under award conditions.

**Mr. MELLOY:** The attitude of the Government on this occasion is typical of its attitude towards the development of the resources of the State. The Minister for Labour and Industry has said repeatedly that he is very interested in the State's resources and the development of industries and that every encouragement is given to people to bring industries to Queensland. The Government are inclined to boast of the development at Weipa. What have they done? All the value of Weipa will go out of the State. We could have had a £250,000,000 factory here. If the returns from aluminium warrant the establishment of a factory of that size, imagine what the ultimate value of the product itself must be. If we had established the aluminium factory in Queensland that will now be established in New Zealand, £250,000,000 would have been spent on labour and material in this State. If the Government start a one-man factory, they never stop talking about it, but they let the big manufacturing industries go.

I do not intend to speak at any greater length. I have already indicated the attitude of the Opposition to the Budget. If we are to make progress in Queensland the only correct thing for the Government to do is to resign and let the Australian Labour Party take over the reigns of government.

**Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (7.43 p.m.):** I congratulate the Treasurer on the presentation of his fifth Budget, one to give the best possible benefit to the State of Queensland following a drought as severe as any on record. I know that aged people, looking back along the corridors of time, are inclined to think that conditions today are not, and could not possibly be, worse than those of the years that have gone. The old-timers

talk of the terrible droughts of 1902 and subsequent years, as though nothing similar has happened since in the history of the nation.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I am sorry for the absolute ignorance of hon. members opposite. It is obvious that they have not heard of the drought. Most of them would not know what a drought was. In fact, bad seasonal turns of the wheel are just as great, just as long and just as economically damaging in 1958-1961 as they were in days gone by. They just do not seem to be so severe today because the man on the land for the most part has applied new techniques of fodder conservation and water conservation, and the effects of a four-year drought such as we have suffered, and are still suffering in parts of the State, are minimised to a great extent. But as I said, in spite of these new techniques, droughts still take their toll of the economy of the State. In turn, they are reflected in the Budget that we have had presented to us.

A practice has grown up in this Parliament that I personally deprecate. I refer to the practice in the Budget debate of hon. members using the time allotted to discuss any subjects that may appeal to them, as though it were merely a repetition of the Address in Reply debate. If we analyse speeches made in the Budget debate not only this year but in past years we find that very few of them have any relation whatever to the Budget, involving as it does an expenditure of £115,000,000 from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, £87,500,000 from Trust and Special Funds, and £30,750,000 from the Loan Fund. I believe that Parliament as a whole is not facing its full responsibility as the watchdog of the public purse while this practice prevails. Yet I suppose most hon. members will continue to speak on many matters having no relation to the Budget with the possible exception of the hon. member for Baroona, who makes quite an honest attempt to deal with the Budget as a budget. Parliament in a few weeks will approve of the spending of the grand total from all sources of a sum exceeding £233,000,000, but somebody must in fact give close scrutiny to the expenditure of that money, whatever Government sit on the Treasury benches. I suggest to the Government and to Parliament that a Select Public Accounts Committee be set up to scrutinise the public accounts with the detail that Parliament itself is either unable or unwilling to do. I think that the Leader of the Opposition himself is largely responsible for this state of affairs for he primarily sets the pattern for the debate and a departure from the practice of speaking to the Budget itself. He does this in his inimitable way by a swiftly spoken speech, which seeks with clever phraseology and grammatical alliteration to avoid the basic issues

involved in the Budget as presented by the Treasurer. The Leader of the Opposition, indeed, quotes the fact that the Treasurer has on many occasions chided hon. members on that side of the chamber with not making a very detailed examination of the financial tables embodied in the various Estimates and incorporated in the Financial Statement. The Leader of the Opposition's description of the Treasurer's Budget as a "booze and betting" budget is typical of what I meant when I said that he colours his comments with grammatical alliteration, even if his descriptions are not quite accurate. He told the Committee that he intended, not to analyse or criticise the Budget, but as he himself put it, to go through some of the matters revealed in previous speeches of the Treasurer. Having admitted that he was not going to attack the Budget he passed the buck to his fellow party members by saying he would leave the detailed criticism to two or three hon. members on his side of the chamber who would follow the pattern set by the Treasurer when in Opposition. The hon. gentleman then went on to quote extract after extract allegedly from previous speeches made by the Treasurer in past years, trying to belittle the Treasurer and make him appear to be most inconsistent, all the time omitting to mention that extracts out of context, either in time or place, can prove nothing except the gullibility of the quoter! The Leader of the Opposition then went on to give us a very good exposition of what was happening in New South Wales.

**Mr. Bennett:** Did the Minister for Education write this speech for you?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I do not need anyone to write my speeches. What he said was quite enlightening but quite irrelevant; it certainly had no bearing on this year's Budget. He gave us quite a survey on the attitude of previous Labour Governments to the needs of Mt. Isa Mines, followed by his own peculiar interpretation of the present Mt. Isa Mines dispute when he confused, as did the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, a bonus payment, which is a gratuitous payment by way of a bonus, with a wage paid in return for labour spent.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I should like hon. members opposite to listen to this. The Leader of the Opposition then gave some very interesting figures on the result of the ballot, as to whether or not strike action should take place at Mt. Isa. He listed the pros and cons for each union in turn, but when I totalled up his figures I found that out of the approximately 3,000 employees of the mine 1612 voted for and 473 against a strike. That is, according to the Leader of the Opposition, an overwhelming vote in favour of a strike, but what he forgot to tell the Chamber was that the total vote cast, of 2,085, was out of a total work force of 3,000, which means that approximately 1,000

people did not cast a vote. I think it, could be reasonably argued that that 1,000 were not in favour of strike action. Had they been, they would have hastened to record their votes.

Instead of criticising the 1961-1962 Budget the Leader of the Opposition then turned his speech into a fourth reading speech on the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill. Having made this fourth reading speech, he then turned and sneered at the amounts in the Budget for the construction of beef roads, and so he went on.

Time will not allow me to analyse the whole of his highly lucid but entirely ineffectual Budget speech but, time after time, when hon. members of the Opposition carp and criticise this Government, by way of interjection they have been asked "Well, if we are wrong, what is your solution?" Time and time again they come back with the same answer—I can hear it coming now.

**Mr. Davies:** It is your job and responsibility as a Government.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I thank the hon. member very much. That is exactly what they have been saying, time after time—"It is your job; it is not our place to tell you what to do, you are the Government." But, let me say that it is time Her Majesty's Opposition in this Parliament assumed their rightful responsibility. They are responsible to Parliament and to their electors and they cannot hide behind the cry that they must oppose and we are the Government. If they disagree with our methods or principles of raising and spending public revenue, when they express opposition, surely they have the responsibility of saying not only that they disagree but why, and the further responsibility of suggesting some alternative line of action.

I have mentioned all this because I feel that the way the Leader of the Opposition set about the Opposition side of this Budget debate by touching on the State's finances only once or twice, set the pattern and the bad example that the Budget debate was merely another debate similar to the Address-in-Reply.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Tell us what you think of the Budget.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** If hon. members opposite contain themselves, if they keep their ears open and their mouths shut, they will hear exactly what I have to say. If we are not going to debate the public accounts as such then the sooner a Public Accounts Committee is set up to do that job the better.

Now let me turn to the Budget and, taking the theme of development, let us look at the Budget in that light. We all agree, irrespective of party, that Queensland wants as much development as it is possible to give it. Although I have taken the trouble to study at first hand some of the wider problems of the State, it is natural for me as the representative of the near city electorate of Merthyr to say that I am personally interested first in the development of the capital city.

Brisbane has a peculiar geographical position. It is divided into a north and south side by a serpentine river that so winds and twists and turns that one could be forgiven for sometimes believing that he is on the north side when, in fact, he is on the south, and vice versa. To connect these north and south sides of this squirming river we have four bridges—the Indooroopilly toll bridge in the western suburbs, the William Jolly and Victoria Bridges in the city proper, and the Story Bridge at Kangaroo Point. There are four vital arteries through which pass all the traffic of the city which crosses the river. These are the arteries through which pass the main access roads to and from the city and, because of the increasing demand for private transport, we find these arteries, if not clogged themselves, at least lead into bottlenecks which cause serious and expensive delays. We have alleviated some of the worst of it by the dedicated work of the Traffic Engineer and his staff. Although peak traffic is bad now, I venture to say that, if we had not had an active Traffic Engineer's office in these past few years, peak-hour traffic by this would have rumbled to a standstill and the worst traffic jams in our history would have occurred. I said we have alleviated the problem; we have not solved it. So far we have only been able to achieve what can be done by the installation of traffic lights, road channelling and similar mechanical devices. There is little more that can be done in this way unless we spend big sums of money on major civil engineering jobs. Already it has been announced that, when legislative effect is given to the installation of parkatareas, major engineering works will be done at the southern end of the Story Bridge, thus relieving the pressure on Kemp Place, and other major works are believed to be in the planning stage for the next big bottleneck, the Normanby Fiveways. When money is available for these two major works, we will I believe start to see more freely-running traffic in and out of the city proper. I realise that the Treasurer this year, because of the economic effects of the credit squeeze—

**A.L.P. Members** interjected.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** If hon. members opposite would only listen, instead of talking, they would hear what I propose.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! During the last two speeches there was considerable heckling from both sides of the Chamber. I sincerely trust that the hon. member will be allowed to continue his speech without interruption.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I shall repeat what I said. I realise that the Treasurer this year, because of the economic effects of the credit squeeze, now admitted by thinking men to be a necessary purgative of the economic life of the nation, and because of the mounting effects of four years' drought with the resultant fall in railway revenue, has had a most difficult and trying time in trying to

produce a Budget that will give value for money spent with maximum use of the maximum work force. I surely do not want to make his task any harder. I find no provision anywhere in the Budget that would give any indication that thought is being given to the provision of at least another two arteries across the river to cope with ever-increasing road traffic. I think that major works at the southern approach to the Story Bridge and major works at the Normanby, while they will solve some of our problems at first, will in a few years' time, because of the ever-swelling number of vehicles on the road and a bigger density of traffic year by year, ultimately become only palliatives and not solutions of the problem.

I suggest to the Government and the Traffic Commission that urgent consideration be given to the creation of at least two new crossings of the Brisbane River, and possibly three. I have not made any comment on this need prior to the present time, because I had hoped that the results of the origin-and-destination survey carried out by the Brisbane City Council would have been made public by this date. If that had been the case, I could, with a fairly accurate regard for persons' movements, have been able to suggest with a better degree of accuracy just where these crossings ought to be. But in view of the delay in making known the results of that survey, I feel that I must press in general terms for these extra crossings. I have mentioned the peculiar geography of the City of Brisbane, which causes most of the traffic from the north to the south side and vice versa to pass either through the city proper, the Valley or the Normanby. I am convinced after looking at the problem very carefully that there should be a new river crossing across the river by extending Brunswick Street, New Farm, across the river. The Committee are asked to note that I said, "Extend Brunswick Street across the river." I did not say over it. I believe whenever we think of new crossings of the Brisbane River we think in terms of bridges, the orthodox way of crossing waterways in the past, but I suggest to the powers-that-be not only that the new river crossings be created, but that they be under-water tube-ways. Bridges crossing the river, unless they are topographically suitably situated on high cliffs, with long approaches, prevent the use of the river by large vessels, whereas tube-ways lowered into the bed of the river will permit the free passage of vessels. If a tubeway were situated, say so as to be an extension of Brunswick Street, New Farm, then I believe that the traffic presently entering the city and the Valley areas by way of the Story Bridge would be considerably reduced, probably by half, because traffic from Bulimba, Hemmant, Balmoral, Cannon Hill and as far down as Wynnum, and further afield, would find miles cut off the journey into the city and there would be a tremendous saving of time, fuel and tyres and costs.

**An Opposition Member:** How much do you think it would cost?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I am talking in general terms. At this stage I am not interested in how much it would cost. I am pointing out that it is desirable for the city of Brisbane if we are not to have our roads clogged up in a decade.

I believe plans must be prepared to extend Sugarmill Road at Eagle Farm, or a road in that vicinity to another tubeway to take the heavy industrial traffic from the Whinstanes, Pinkenba, Meeandah areas whose destination is the south side, and which could then completely bypass Breakfast Creek, the Valley and the Story Bridge. I point out that when looking at Sugarmill Road we find it is close to Bulwer Island and behind that, the whole of Lower Nudgee will eventually become a great industrial area full of heavy industry. Sugarmill Road is not in a built-up area. It is an excellent position for a north-south freeway for a very small cost of resumption. In this morning's "Courier-Mail" there is a story about the Brisbane City Council's intentions to open up land for a new satellite town which calls for the creation of a new bridge at Kenmore. I say that if money is available, either from the Government, or from local government authorities, to put up new river crossings then the urgent need is to provide priority in the New Farm-Bulimba areas where the greatest immediate relief will be obtained. I suggest that it would be criminal folly and negligence to build a bridge across the river to serve a satellite town which, it is estimated, will not be completed until 1973, and neglect to relieve the burden that is crying out for relief in such a thickly-populated area as I have mentioned.

Since Mark Brunel took out his patent for a tunnelling process in 1818 there have been many improvements both as to the method of construction and the size of the tunnels. Tunnelling or tubeways are not a new revolutionary departure. The Severn tunnel, 4.33 miles long, was completed in 1886, under 104 feet of water at high tide. The Rotherhite tunnel under the Thames provides for a roadway 16 feet wide and two footpaths 4 feet 8 inches wide and is 4,863 feet long. One thousand four hundred feet of this tunnel is directly under the river. Another famous tubeway is the East Boston tunnel built in 1901 extending for 1.4 miles, 3,400 feet of it being under the harbour. Then there is the Queens-Midtown tunnel in New York City which passes under the East River. All these and many others I could speak about are not idle dreams of phantasy, but accomplished and successful feats of engineering. This month, whilst we are here thinking about a tubeway for the Brisbane River, the new underwater Webster Street tube under Oakland Inner Harbour between Oakland and Alameda, California, is fast approaching completion. The casting of the remaining eight segments are to be

completed this month. Work began on 12 October, 1959, and is expected to extend over a three-year period. It will consist of 12 precast, tube segments, each 200 feet long, and a cast-in-place portion of tunnel, 783 feet long.

The Californian Highway and Public Works Department state that the trench system—that is, as I understand it, dredging a trench in the river bed and then laying the prefabricated tubeway in it—is quite feasible if the cost of right-of-ways for approaches is relatively low and if the water under which the tubeway is to be placed is reasonably quiet so as to permit accurate landing of the tunnel segments. Two other factors will help determine the practicability of a tubeway, the first being whether material within the project limits can be readily excavated without the necessity of under-water blasting and whether a sufficient water depth exists to permit the floating of the segments to the proper place.

In the Wester Street tubeway the precast segments are circular in cross-section and have an outside diameter of 37 feet, are 200 feet long and have a shell thickness of 2 feet 6 inches. They are constructed entirely of reinforced concrete. Below the roadway, through vents will be pumped fresh air and through vents in the ceiling exhaust gases and stale air will be sucked out.

I cannot emphasise strongly enough the urgent need for Queensland to face up to the question of tubeways for the Brisbane River if traffic in Brisbane in the next decade is not to come to a complete stop. While I suggested Brunswick Street and Sugarmill Road as two possible sites, I did so mainly for the purpose of demonstrating the idea I am proposing. I am not being dogmatic as to where exactly these tubeways should go. But I am quite convinced that they must go somewhere, broadly speaking, in the neighbourhood of the districts I have mentioned.

**Mr. Davies:** What about telling us where you will get the money to build them?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** If the hon. member for Maryborough would only listen he would know that the whole burden of my speech is directed towards finding the money to enable the State to face up to these responsibilities. I hope that next year's Budget will contain some provision for the first stages of at least one tubeway to relieve pressure on the Story and Victoria Bridges.

Now I want to comment on another aspect of this year's Budget. The Treasurer, in his opening remarks when he presented it, gave a very factual account, largely derided by the Opposition, as again they have done tonight, of the circumstances that prevented the presentation of a balanced Budget. These circumstances were the continuance of the severe drought we have been experiencing,

the lowering of the volume of production of wool, butter, cheese, wheat, beef, and barley, together with the fall in the value of these products.

I believe that with the increased drive in the search for oil in this State, almost overnight the whole economy of this vast State could change. I have interested myself in this matter and have taken the opportunity kindly made available to me to see at first hand the well at Cabawin No. 1 and the drillings in the Roma and Combarngo districts.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** It is very difficult to talk to those who will not listen. At this stage I should like to congratulate the Government in general and the Minister of Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity in particular on their considered and realistic approach to the search for oil in this State. It may not be generally recognised that Queensland leads the other States of the Commonwealth in this regard. The State is almost entirely divided for the purpose of granting an authority to prospect for oil and, because of the wise understanding of the Minister and the Government, oil exploratory companies have found it attractive to continue the search for oil in the State. In Queensland there are now at least six companies exploring on a major scale as compared with only one or two in the other States. Let us look back at the tremendous increase in drilling that has taken place while this Government have been occupying the Treasury benches. In the whole of 1959, oil exploration companies drilled 10,000 feet in the search for oil. In the first nine months of this year, from 1 January to 30 September, those companies have drilled nearly 70,000 feet. Already, in nine months, they have stepped up the search for oil to seven times the depth drilled in a full year three years ago. If we want further proof of the intense search being conducted in Queensland, in 1959 nearly 20 seismic crew months were completed, as against over 60 seismic crew months done in the first nine months of this year. When I tell the Committee that a seismic crew month represents an expenditure of between £15,000 and £20,00, the Committee will realise that there is an expenditure on oil search amounting to £900,000 as a minimum and quite possibly up to £1,200,00 by one company. With six exploration companies exploring on a major scale, it means that something over £6,000,000 per annum is currently being spent in the search for oil in this State. Six companies exploring about 300,000 square miles of Queensland is our proud boast as a Government. Just compare that with one company in Western Australia exploring 285,000 square miles of territory.

In view of this greatly accelerated search for oil, I must express some concern that we

may perhaps not be legislatively ready should an economic strike of oil be made. My understanding of the position is that if a major oil strike were made today, we could be in chaos tomorrow because our oil legislation does not cover such aspects as the control of the marketing, sale and refining of the product. No doubt the company fortunate enough to find the oil in commercial quantities would go in for a swift kill, but we must watch the interests of the whole economy of the State in this matter and have legislation ready for the day when oil is found in commercial quantities in Queensland. I suggest to the Government, the Treasurer and the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity that serious consideration be given to this matter, if that has not been done already, and further that a couple of senior executives of the Mines Department be sent overseas to Canada and the U.S.A. to be trained in the very skilled art of framing oil legislation. If the men who frame the regulations to control the sale, marketing, and refining of oil are theorists only, we will not get the best regulations; but if these men are trained and have made themselves conversant with the practical operation of oil administration in Canada and the United States of America, where experience has ironed out most of the administrative problems, then I believe we shall have regulations gazetted that will not only administer the industry wisely but also prove a source of encouragement for further exploration. Oil men in Queensland have told me that already the Queensland Government's relations with the exploration companies and the amount of exploration being undertaken are streets ahead of those in any other State in the Commonwealth. They are unanimous in their opinion that this is the best Australian State to work in, in the field of oil exploration. By adopting my suggestion for training a couple of Mines Department executives in the overseas methods of petroleum and gas control we can make that record a still better one.

I suggest to the Treasurer that the question of licensed areas might well be reviewed so that, when oil is found in commercial quantities, the State will get the maximum benefit. I understand that in Alberta and British Columbia legislation provides that when a prospecting company strikes oil in commercial quantities, half the area is then put up by public tender to enable any company to come and bid for it. This may not be entirely wise at this stage, but I do suggest that a close study be made of those provisions in the two Canadian provinces that I have mentioned to see whether or not a similar state of affairs could be brought into effect here with benefit. If this is done the State will draw increased revenue by way of the tenders bid.

One other point that worries me a little, and I raise it more in the nature of a question than as a statement of fact. When the Government begin to collect a royalty

on natural gas, such as being supplied at Roma, will the receipt of such royalties bring about a reduction in the Commonwealth Government's subsidy for oil exploration in Queensland? I want to ask has that question exercised the mind of the Government, and if so, what is the answer?

Finally on the question of oil exploration I express the hope that the Mines Department of the State has an officer carefully co-ordinating and collating all the available information on oil exploration and conservation for future possible legislative use. I have spoken at some length on this subject of oil exploration in Queensland because I believe that with the increased tempo of oil drilling and seismic exploration, the face of Queensland and the economy of Queensland could be changed almost overnight. I hope, as a legislature, and as a Government, that we will be ready to seize the wonderful opportunities that will then exist.

**Mr. EWAN (Roma)** (8.16 p.m.): I begin my contribution to this important debate by congratulating the Treasurer on the able, clear and concise manner in which he has presented his Financial Statement. It is a record of the continuance of the policy of the Government since assuming office in 1957, which I think can be characterised by their careful, wise, and just handling of public funds for the immediate and long-range benefit of the State and industry generally, and most importantly, enables the scales of justice to be kept evenly balanced between all sections of the people. That this policy has been responsible for the ushering in of a new era of development and progress is readily discernible by those who travel throughout the State and observe the hundreds of miles of newly-constructed roads and bridges, the new and brightly-painted schools in ever area, hospitals, many hundreds of houses, sewerage schemes, new business premises including Government business premises, water and electricity reticulation, not forgetting the hundreds of thousands of acres of freshly-developed land, timber treatment, water facilities, buildings for employees and owners, all creating an atmosphere of prosperity and confidence in the future, which must have its effect on people from other States and overseas. It must create confidence in the investing public and a desire to take part in the development of this great State. All those with brains to think would agree that this desirable state of affairs must play a very important part in the development of Queensland. After all, example and precept play a very important part in progress. Any person who desires to invest money or take part in the development of a new country, seeing what has taken place in the last four years under the administration of this Government, they must be so imbued with confidence that if they wish to invest their money they will be attracted to the State of Queensland. Despite all the aspects I have touched on, during the progress of the debate we have seen speaker after speaker from the Opposition rising, and purely for political reasons,

endeavouring unsuccessfully to decry the efforts of the Government. From the Leader of the Opposition down through the ranks of Labour speakers we have not heard one constructive suggestion. I have been wondering why we have not been honoured with the presence of the Leader of the Opposition tonight. Looking at the newspaper tonight, I no longer wonder because I presume he is at the Trades Hall trying to square off.

**Mr. Bennett:** That is the weakest joke we have heard today.

**Mr. EWAN:** The Opposition speakers in their song of hate seem to attack the Treasurer because he has the temerity to budget for a deficit for the current financial year. Their economic training, if any, makes it impossible for them to accept the economic truism that it is sometimes wise to mortgage the future in the interests of the immediate or long-range overall programme of development and progress. In this case such a course has been found necessary purely as an ameliorative measure to overcome the present temporary unemployment problem which has made itself felt because of drought conditions prevailing in many parts of the State and the slightly restrictive financial measures designed to assist Australia's cost structure in relation to world commodity prices.

Of course, I would not expect my friends opposite to understand my reasoning, because it has been indicated throughout this debate that they are so abysmally ignorant of drought conditions throughout the State.

We know that, with the exception of the hon. member for Warrego and the hon. member for Burke, not one member on the Opposition benches has had experience of drought conditions in the State of Queensland. When I see men like the hon. member for Flinders and the hon. members for Nanango and Condamine, and some others who represent rural and western seats in this Chamber I think my time will not be wasted if I try to describe to hon. members opposite just what takes place in a drought because they have no idea of its effect on the economy of the State.

The greater part of this State is suffering from the effects not of a one-year drought but, in many areas, a drought of six or seven years' duration. May I inform hon. members opposite, through you, Mr. Taylor, that only 60 miles south of Morven men have been known to knock down mulga with a tractor to feed their sheep and cattle for the past six years and many of their properties today are virtually denuded of mulga. Their losses, in stock and cattle have been terrific. They are prudent tenants and with increased prices as the result of the inability of the world to obtain its wool requirements during the war period they laid a store of capital by to tide them over just such a difficult experience.

I notice that the hon. member for Warrego has moved up into the position he should occupy in the Opposition in relation to rural

industry. Let me further traverse the history of the pastoral industry. My one-time employer, the late Arnold Weinholt, in the 1902 drought managed a property outside Bouila. They went into the drought with 57,000 head of cattle and came out with 7,000. The hon. member for Warrego will admit to the Committee and the hon. member for Flinders will bear it out, that many of these people have lost thousands and thousands of head of cattle during the last five or six years and in many cases have exhausted their financial reserves and as a consequence that must be reflected in the economy of the State.

I am only taking this time to indicate to the ignorant members of the Opposition just what effect a drought can have on the economy of this State. Yet, one hears these expressions of opinion from hon. members of the Opposition in relation to both the position we find ourselves in with temporary unemployment and the measures that were necessary in an effort to rectify our economy and bring into line our export commodity prices to enable us to take our rightful place as an exporting nation amongst the nations of the world. Hon. members opposite take great exception to the actions of the Government that tend to bring about stability and permanent employment. I am delighted to know steps are being taken that will prove of tremendous benefit by way of further development in the north and north-west of Queensland. At the risk of boring the Committee I shall quote from the Financial Statement. Although the hon. member for Nudgee said he would not quote from it, I am pleased and delighted to do so and, knowing conditions in those areas, I have great pleasure in referring hon. members again to the following passage from the Financial Statement which shows the very advantageous provisions the Treasurer and the Government have seen fit to introduce—

"There will be one feature of the Budget to encourage the further development of the Cape York and Gulf areas.

"Originally settled for pastoral purposes, North Queensland has seen substantial development with sugar and timber, on the coast, and with the development of permanent mining towns in succession to these sporadic mining ventures of the alluvial and high grading days, a new solidity and quality has shown out in a wide range of important minerals.

"But whilst these developments have been taking place, pastoral activity in the remoter North has continued to wage a constant battle against distance from markets, lack of transport, and other natural difficulties.

"The Government has already attempted to make a positive contribution to the problem by undertaking the construction of the central road access stretching up from Mareeba to Cooktown and towards Coen. In turn, the recently announced programme for Beef Roads will be of



signal significance to the lower Gulf area and will provide valuable road outlets from Normanton to Cloncurry and Julia Creek, and across the base of the Cape York Peninsula, through Croydon and Mount Surprise to link with Mount Garnet and Ravenshoe on the East Coast.

"These improved facilities, when added to the construction of an entirely new deep water Port at Weipa, will bring transport to the best position it has ever experienced but, in the view of the Government, still more is required. The better development of the Far North and the Gulf calls for a higher resident population and for a much greater investment of capital.

"The Government has one proposal which could contribute to both these needs. It is proposed to declare an area in which substantial concessions from Probate and Succession Duties will apply, based on a combination of residence and investment. The area contemplated will start on the East Coast at the 16th parallel continue along that parallel until it turns South down the 144th meridian, and again turns west along the 20th parallel to the Northern Territory border.

"Or, to state it more graphically, starting just north of the Daintree, the border of the Zone will pass somewhat east of the centre of the Peninsula, between Georgetown and Einasleigh, and then heading for the Northern Territory border in a line north of the Great Northern Railway, missing Mt. Isa but including Camooweal.

"The maximum concession envisaged is half the State duties now payable, with proportionate effects dependent on residence and locality of investment.

"The Government considers that the concession will encourage residence and investment in these remote areas and that an enlarged fund of investment in the area will progressively offset the apparent loss inherent in the concessions."

I am very interested in that step. I believe it is in the right direction and I am absolutely delighted with it, but I suggest that the area be extended from Camooweal down to the Haddon corner. For the benefit of hon. members of the Opposition who would not know what I am talking about, Haddon Corner is situated on the border of South Australia and Queensland. In the area I have in mind there are at present 18,000 people, excluding those at Mt. Isa, and the number who may be at Weipa at the present moment. The hon. member for Nudgee said that you have to wait until you die to get this concession. I say it is a move in the right direction that should be followed up. Hon. members opposite would not understand the things that must be taken into consideration in a move designed for the immediate or long-range advancement and development of under-developed areas of the State. There is in Queensland the Northern

Rural Rehabilitation Committee that has functioned for the last 10 years and I was honoured to take an active part in its operations eight or nine years ago. Following the concessions outlined in the Budget for death duties I believe that if approaches were made to the Commonwealth Government for all wage and salary earners in that area to be free from taxation for a period of 10 years, and employers and business men in that area to be given 50 per cent. of their income free of tax, and the other 50 per cent. free of tax provided they reinvested it in that area, in the year in which it was earned, and these requests were granted, a tremendous impetus would be given to the development of that area. When we look across the 26th parallel of Australia there are 9,000 people in Western Australia, 16,000 in the Northern Territory, and 18,000 in the area I mention, giving a total of 43,000 confronted with the people in Indonesia, Portuguese Timor, Dutch New Guinea and Australian New Guinea, which we may not have for much longer, with a total population of 78,000,000 people. We realise that it is essential for us to improve conditions in these areas and provide some major inducement to capital to enter this zone to offset many of the difficulties that we know exist in that country, so that people will be willing to risk their savings and endure the hardships of an adverse climate, high transport costs, lack of amenities, and the like, in the hope of being able to keep any money they may make after overcoming all the obstacles I have mentioned. There are at present only about 18,000 people in the area, but it is essential that it be peopled for many obvious reasons. If such an approach was made to a sympathetic Commonwealth Government, particularly to the Leader of the Country Party, the Hon. John McEwen, who has so ably taken the place of that wonderful Country Party Member, Sir Arthur Fadden, who, I was surprised to hear, was maligned by a rather decent member of the Opposition, there would be a fair chance of success. Following on representations made by the Premier, the Commonwealth Government have agreed to contribute £650,000 during the current financial year towards the expense of the construction of a road from Normanton to Julia Creek, with the provision of £300,000 as a base amount, and £350,000, on a £ for £ basis with the contribution by the State Government. The Commonwealth Government have also agreed to provide a further grant of £4,360,000 over five years for the construction of roads to assist beef production.

**Mr. Melloy** interjected.

**Mr. EWAN:** The hon. member is such a conceited individual that he even tried to make out that because he had seen isolated cases of large probates for graziers' estates they were avaricious and did not deserve any reward for many years of effort. Let me enlighten the hon. member on the operation

of probate and succession duty, which he ridiculed in relation to the area I dealt with immediately before getting on to these beef roads. When a person dies, his estate must be valued as at death. If it is not valued then and probate is not paid for a year or two, he pays interest on that money. It may be no fault of his that probate has not been returned. In many instances the estate cannot be sold or liquidated or converted into cash for two years. If the value of the property increases in that time so does the assessment. In many instances, after two or three years there is perhaps a fall in value. The estate could be reduced as much as 50 per cent. to the detriment of the beneficiaries, in many instances widows. Yet the hon. member suggests that such a benefit is of no significance to those far-flung areas. It only indicates his complete lack of knowledge of the areas.

Of the funds made available under the State Grants (Encouragement of Meat Production) Act there was an unexpended balance of £11,185 at 1 July, 1961. This has been reserved for the construction of cattle yards near Currawilla.

**An Opposition Member:** Where is that?

**Mr. EWAN:** Ask the hon. member for Warrego.

**Mr. Dufficy:** As a matter of fact, I asked you a question and you would not reply. I asked you were you in favour of the present scheme for beef roads in Queensland subsidised by the Commonwealth Government. Do you think they are adequate?

**Mr. EWAN:** I am coming to that. It is a sensible question and deserving of an answer. It is always my desire to endeavour to give information when it is sought in such a fashion.

The allocation from State Loan Funds of £300,000 for 1960-1961 will be required for works in progress on the Quilpie-Eromanga-Windorah Road and the Windorah-Yaraka Road.

The roads to be financed from the Commonwealth allocation of £5,000,000 for beef roads—and this is the answer to the hon. member for Warrego—have not yet been finally determined except for the Julia Creek-Normanton Road, which is top priority.

**Mr. Dufficy:** And you agree with it?

**Mr. EWAN:** Work is in progress on this road. The Georgetown-Mt. Surprise-Northern (Inland) Highway Road is also regarded as having a very high priority.

**Mr. Dufficy:** That is right. Do you agree with the priority?

**Mr. EWAN:** The men in that district—

**Mr. Dufficy:** Do you agree with the priority?

**Mr. EWAN:** Yes, because there is work being carried on

**Mr. Dufficy:** I am surprised at you.

**Mr. EWAN:** As I indicated, on that very important Eromanga-Windorah-Yaraka road—

**Mr. Dufficy:** But we are not talking about that.

**Mr. EWAN:** That is a part of the whole scheme.

The financial arrangements for the first £1,000,000 expenditure on the Julia Creek-Normanton Road are—

(1) The first £300,000 as a Commonwealth grant;

(2) The next £700,000 will be provided half by the Commonwealth and half by the State.

The Prime Minister has stated publicly that, in addition to the £650,000 Commonwealth contribution to the Julia Creek-Normanton road, £4,350,000 will be provided by the Commonwealth as a straight-out grant.

**Mr. Dufficy:** Over what period?

**Mr. EWAN:** Five years.

**Mr. Dufficy:** Oh, that is right. That is not very much. After all, it is no more than they are spending this year over five years, is it?

**Mr. EWAN:** That is rather amazing coming from the hon. member. He knows that for years his colleagues, under the State Grants (Encouragement of Meat Production) Act, had the same terms and conditions and they had £1,360,000 granted to them and they could not even observe the conditions laid down under that Act. Of course, the Commonwealth Government discontinued it. Had the Labour Government of that time behaved themselves and not repudiated the agreement entered into with the Commonwealth, all these roads would have been built.

I think it is only appropriate that I should place on record my appreciation of the wonderful and virile leadership of the Minister for Mines, Development, Main Roads and Electricity, Hon. E. Evans, and the splendid record of the members of the Main Roads Commission and others associated with them. The interjections of the hon. member for Warrego relating to beef roads take me back. It is not often that I quote from my own speeches, but I refer the hon. member to Volume 227 of "Hansard", page 533, a speech that I made in this Chamber on 29 September. It gives me very great satisfaction to quote from it.

**Mr. Dufficy:** What year was that?

**Mr. EWAN:** 1960—just over 12 months ago. I said—

"The Queensland Government are moving in the right direction. It must be realised that effective transport will prove

to be the greatest single factor in developing the fattening potential of the Cooper Channel country to the full. I am strongly of the opinion that the Commonwealth Government should be asked again to co-operate, as they have in the past, in evolving a suitable scheme. I repeat that they have co-operated in the past. Assistance should be sought from them under the provisions of the States Grants (Encouragement of Meat Production) Acts, 1949-1954, many of the provisions of which are rather illuminating. It is an Act 'to make provision for the grant of financial assistance to the States of Queensland and Western Australia for the purpose of encouraging the development of meat production by the provision of improved roads and other facilities for the movement of live-stock'."

As I indicated to the hon. member for Warrego previously, the Commonwealth Government provided £1,360,000, which was spent by the then Labour Government of Queensland on the roads mentioned in the Act.

**Mr. Dufficy:** When was that?

**Mr. EWAN:** 1949-1950 up to 1953.

**Mr. Dufficy:** They are spending £5,000,000 in five years now, which is not as much each year as that.

**Mr. EWAN:** As much as I like the hon. member for Warrego, I cannot give him too much of my time. Before he interrupted me, I was placing on record my appreciation, and the appreciation of my constituents, of the work of the Minister and those associated with him in the Main Roads Department. Listening to the interjections of the hon. member for Warrego puts me into a rather reminiscent mood, and I shall now quote from my maiden speech in this Chamber after I entered Parliament in 1950. It was delivered on 17 August, and at page 109 of Volume 198 of "Hansard" I said—

"Let us consider the contributory causes of the decline in population and the lack of expansion and development. First of all I say to hon. members that the Labour Government stand condemned for their lack of appreciation of the deplorable state of the snake-like, winding, back-breaking, glue-pot tracks—bush tracks—masquerading as main roads, which from time to time cripple and dislocate all forms of travel in my electorate and other western areas . . . I suggest with all the emphasis at my command that the state of the main roads in the western areas of this State, particularly in the Roma electorate, constitute perhaps the most damning indictment of the mishandling of public funds by the Labour Government of Queensland.

"Communications are essential for security reasons, as well as for the development of this State. During the war convoys were continually moving west to Charleville, thence on to Darwin, but they were on many occasions bogged in the gluepots

of mud on the western roads. This Government must have been fully seized of the position obtaining at that time; they must recognise the possibility of a repetition of these conditions, perhaps in the near future. For defence and developmental undertakings I suggest that it is absolutely essential that an all-weather bitumen road be built from Roma to Muckadilla, thence on to Mitchell, Mungallala, Morven and Charleville. That would bring an infusion of trade and commerce to those languishing western towns whose expansion and development are vital if we are to retain a happy and contented population in those areas and provide the necessary amenities of life for the inhabitants out there."

That is what I said in my maiden speech when I entered the Queensland Parliament in 1950. It gives me tremendous pleasure in the year 1961, after being associated with the present Government since their return to office four years ago in 1957, to say that the very conditions I criticised under the Labour Government have been rectified. Today we have an all-weather bitumen road extending right from Brisbane out to Mitchell.

**Mr. Davies:** I wonder why the people turned you down?

**Mr. EWAN:** Because they were misled by the scurrilous propaganda of people like the hon. member. Country members will remember full well under successive Labour Governments how country electorates were denied their rights in relation to the stipulated 40 per cent. of Commonwealth Aid Roads Grant being expended in rural areas. They will remember that the Act laid down that the Commissioner shall spend equal amounts annually in the southern, central and northern divisions of the State. During successive Labour Governments more than half of the available money was spent in the Brisbane and southern areas of the State. In the last four years under a Country Party-Liberal Government the provisions have been complied with, and the people of the outback, after waiting for close on 30 years under Labour administration, have now received equity and justice in road construction.

**Mr. Dufficy:** Would you answer me one question through the Chairman and then I will leave you alone? Are you in favour of the group system of ballots in the West?

**Mr. EWAN:** The hon. member asked me a straight question, I shall give him a straight answer. It is "No"—and a big "No."

**Mr. Dufficy:** Your Government put it on on Nive Downs.

**Mr. EWAN:** So did the Labour Government. They introduced it.

**Mr. Dufficy:** No, we didn't. You did it on Nive Downs.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. EWAN:** I am not allowing the hon. member for Warrego to side-track me for one moment. I have given him an honest answer. Before the hon. member tried unsuccessfully to side-track me I said that the rural electorates were now getting justice. Let me indicate to the Chamber the experience of the Roma electorate which I have the honour to represent. I shall compare its experience under the Labour Government from 1 July, 1953, to 30 June, 1957, with its experience under the Country Party-Liberal Government from 1 July, 1957, to 30 June, 1961. Under the Labour Government in their last four years of office we received for road works—these figures all apply to road works—£710,181 for permanent works.

**Mr. Davies:** That would be worth about £1,500,000 now.

**Mr. EWAN:** Under the Country Party-Liberal Government for their four years in office we received £1,251,252, or an increase of £541,071.

For maintenance for the same period we got £269,741 under Labour. Under the Country Party-Liberal Government we got £317,520, or an increase of £47,779.

Now let us consider the Commonwealth Aid Allocations. For the four years under Labour administration we got £92,825 and under this Government during the last four years, £140,350, or an increase of £47,525. Then, of course, under this Government we got £24,875 from the Roads (Contribution to Maintenance) Allocation, so in the four years of Labour administration we received in the Roma electorate £1,072,747 for roads whilst under this Government we received £1,733,997, or an increase of £661,250.

Hon. members might say that the Roma electorate was generously treated. It was generously treated by this Government but it is only getting justice now because it has been denied it for 30 years under successive Labour Administrations. Similar figures could be quoted in regard to all other electorates.

**Mr. Bennett:** That does not prove a thing, the value of money has so decreased.

**Mr. EWAN:** The point is that we have better roads. I do not want to embarrass hon. members of the Opposition, but, after listening to their cries of utter doom during the last three or four days, and seeing their lack of acceptance of the conditions prevailing after four years of sound administration, stability and permanence, encouraging the investment of capital, I feel that I am justified in throwing some of the darts I have thrown in my speech. I know that they are hitting some pretty sore spots, judging by the response I am receiving from my friends opposite. It is my intention to continue on the lines I have adopted.

Now let us consider the overall position throughout the State. I have indicated the position in my electorate, where justice and equity have been obtained and where we have

decent roads that we could not get under Labour Administration. For a comparable period under Labour and the Country Party-Liberal Government, the figures for roads administered by the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, for the periods from 1 July, 1953, to 30 June, 1957, under Labour and from 1 July, 1957, to 30 June, 1961, under the Country Party-Liberal Government are—For permanent works for the four years under Labour the cost throughout the State was £19,570,000, whilst for the four years under the present Government the figure was £31,891,000, an increase of £12,321,000. For maintenance in the four years of Labour administration £8,647,000 was provided, compared with £10,718,000 in four years of administration by the present Government, or an increase of £2,071,000. Let us consider Commonwealth aid allocations. Under a Labour Government they came to £3,866,350, whereas under the present Government the total is £6,132,500, or an increase of £2,266,150. If we had denied justice to one section of the community, even in the building of roads, we could have balanced the Budget. Hon. members opposite do not understand why it was necessary from an economic viewpoint to budget for a deficit. Take the mileage of roads built by the Labour Government from 1 July, 1953, to 30 June, 1957. In that four-year period 1,100 miles of road were bitumen-surfaced, while 1,600 miles of roads were bitumen-surfaced in the period 1 July, 1957, to 30 June, 1961. Those roads built by the Country Party-Liberal Government were of a much higher standard than the roads built by the Labour Government. We have had to relay many miles of the Condamine Highway that were built by a Labour Government. Some of the engineers told me at the time that the jobs would not last. They classed the road work as painting jobs. The Labour Government were too mean to put sufficient bitumen on the roads. We have had to re-sheet and re-lay many miles of those roads, because of the negligence and parsimony of Labour Governments and their lack of understanding of conditions in the western areas.

Hon. members opposite will ask what the figures denote. They will say, "You know very well that you have become mechanised, or that you employ automation." I call it mechanisation; they call it automation. They talk about the depreciated value of money. They talk about the number of unemployed, automation, and so on, but how many men did they employ during that period by the expenditure of the sums I have mentioned, and how many men have the present Government employed on the tremendously increased road work? Anticipating the arguments of hon. members opposite, I will put their minds at rest. In the years from 1953 to 1957 the Labour Government provided employment for 1,637 men on permanent works and 1,369 on maintenance, a total of 3,006. In 1954-55 the figures were

2,537 and 1,613, making a total of 4,150; in 1955-56 they were 2,474 and 1,690, making a total of 4,164; and in 1956-57, 2,707 and 1,591, a total of 4,298. The average for all employees in that four-year period was 2,339 employees on permanent works and 1,566 on maintenance, or an average of employees over that period of 3,905. I now present the picture under the Country Party-Liberal Government:

Permanent			
Year	Works	Maintenance	Total
1957-1958 ..	2,483	1,612	4,095
1958-1959 ..	2,843	1,700	4,543
1959-1960 ..	3,417	1,624	5,041
1960-1961 ..	2,875	1,597	4,472

Over the whole four years under our administration the average total was 4,537, giving an average increase each year of 632 employees. It must be remembered that under Labour administration the average number of employees was 3,905. That indicates, in no uncertain fashion, the attention paid by this Government to employment, under every circumstance that has arisen, and shows that they have made money available for local authorities to employ as many men as possible to relieve unemployment in areas where money can be spent on roadworks. It shows too, how the Government have endeavoured to handle the present situation that has been created, in no small measure, by the attitude of members of the Opposition who have run around the country dispelling any confidence that investors and leaders in industry may have in the future. This Government have faced up to their responsibilities. During the month of September £1,384,000 were spent on main roads construction and maintenance, and roughly 5,000 men were employed.

**Mr. Bennett:** Not nearly enough.

**Mr. EWAN:** There we see their attitude, Mr. Taylor. The hon. member says "not nearly enough."

I think I have indicated in my speech that the administration of this Government during the last four years deserves the appreciation and congratulations of the sound-thinking people in Queensland. Speaking as a person who travels extensively in this State and in other States of the Commonwealth, I am proud to be associated with a Government with such a record of achievement in the past four years. Wherever one travels in Queensland one sees progress and development. We have had the retarding influence of Labour administration for over 30 years when people with money to invest dodged Queensland and would not come here. Hon. members who have travelled throughout the State have seen these things I have attempted to describe tonight. They indicate a new era of progress and development which, with the co-operation of all sound-thinking people will create confidence in the future of

Queensland, Australia, and the British Empire and will bring, in a very short period, the development that we have been striving for and will continue to strive for, and will gain the confidence of the great majority of the people of Queensland which, I am sure, will be retained by this Government for many years to come.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 9.6 p.m.