

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 19 OCTOBER 1961

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

Rules of the House. Responsibility in other respects rests entirely with the member who proposes to ask the question.

In relation to this question, I should also mention that a great deal of responsibility concerning notice of questions to Parliament, and to Ministers, lies in the hands of the Press. It has disturbed me recently to see notices of questions published in the Press prior to their appearing on the notice paper of this House, prior to their being edited by the Clerks at the table or by myself, and prior to any answer being given by the Minister.

In that connection, whilst not denying the freedom of the Press, my attention has again unfortunately been drawn to the query that raised this question this morning, the question asked by the hon. member for South Brisbane, wherein a local daily newspaper has published the question in full on a prominent page in the paper, but has unfortunately published only part of the answer and that in a very obscure position in the same paper. The question appeared at page 7. The denial, as it was termed by the paper, appeared at page 52.

I have repeated the Minister's answer to the question this morning in the hope that the Press will publish the answer in full.

In reference to this matter, I feel, in view of my concern that many of these questions contain imputations of improper practice not only against Ministers and members of this House, but also against reputable citizens, that this is a very opportune time for me to quote to the House a section of a statement made by the Acting Premier of the day in reply to an hon. member's question regarding question time in this House.

The Hon. V. C. Gair, in answer to a question, raised these points—

"The object of questions is to inform Members of the House on matters on which they seek information; the object of the Press in reporting the questions and answers is similarly to inform the public, not all of whom have access to the published Parliamentary reports. I draw the attention of Honourable Members to the fact that when a question is answered in this Chamber all Members of the House have the question before them when the answer is given, the Member who has given notice of the question rising in his place and drawing the attention of the House to the question on the Business Sheet, indicating it by number. If some days have elapsed before the answer is tendered, an Honourable Member is asked to re-state his question; finally when 'Hansard' is published, the question is not printed in the Report of the Proceedings of the day on which notice of it was given, but of the day on which it was answered. The question and answer are printed together. To do otherwise could be quite unfair, because questions can and have been asked in this Chamber reflecting

THURSDAY, 19 OCTOBER, 1961

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

QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members: It has been my unpleasant duty to disallow a question relating to the issue of liquor licences, notice of which was given by the hon. member for South Brisbane yesterday. My reasons for disallowing the question are:—

(1) That it is my opinion that the subject matter was adequately dealt with yesterday when the Minister for Justice replied to the question stated, in the second section of No. 2 of the answer given—

"However, to remove any misconception that could arise from the asking of this question I might add that, in terms of the Bill at present in course of passage through the House, all questions of the granting of licenses will be matters for determination, not by the Minister but by the Licensing Commission. Furthermore there is nothing in the Bill to permit the installation of a liquor bar in any restaurant whether licensed or otherwise."

(2) That it contains inferences and imputations not only against Ministers, but also against a private member.

I should point out to hon. members that the Speaker's responsibility in regard to questions is limited to compliance with the

on the integrity of individuals, as did the questions under consideration. To publish the questions containing such inferences, disassociated from the conclusive replies subsequently given, creates the danger that an allegation may be made and widely publicised, while the refutation may never be published, or if published may never be seen. The Press would do well to follow Parliamentary procedure in this regard, and in the interests of its readers, apart from any other consideration, to publish question and answer together."

And, I might add, the complete answers to the questions that have been asked.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.7 a.m.): Mr. Speaker, you have raised a very important matter of privilege. I regret that very often hon. members are placed in the position in which I find myself this morning of not having been able to examine thoroughly all the implications of a very important statement such as you have made. At the outset I point out that my personal desire is to accord you the fullest measure of co-operation in seeing affairs are discussed and proceedings conducted in accordance with Standing Orders and the high standard set by this and the Mother of Parliaments. But I should like to point out, however, in regard to some of the observations that you have made this morning, that in my opinion the Opposition should be afforded the opportunity of ventilating a viewpoint so that it may be placed on record.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I trust the hon. gentleman is not going to debate the deletion of the question. I have no objection to his making a statement, but the matter of the deletion of the question cannot be debated.

Mr. DUGGAN: I am dealing with the matter of publication by the Press of answers to questions. I have no desire to enter into any argument with you on the matter of deletion of a question; my desire is to help you. I am pointing out, however, that on this subject considerable rights are involved. For instance, the suggestion has been made that it would be improper to ask questions about a matter that is not contained in a Bill. A Bill does not become the law of the land until it is passed, and, although acceptance by the Government of amendments from this side of the Chamber is an unlikely contingency, amendments may be moved to the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill, so that technically it is within the competence of Parliament to amend or reject the proposal.

On the matter of imputations or reflections on the integrity of Ministers or Government members, I think we should get some clear line of demarcation. It is wrong for people in a premeditated fashion recklessly to cast aspersions on the integrity of Ministers, Government members or indeed on any member of Parliament, unless they are reasonably well founded. I believe

that, if allegations of this kind can be shown by a proper answer by the person concerned, that itself would expose to the public the degree to which some member or members have been responsible for reckless or irresponsible statements and they would be discredited in the public mind, but to take away the right to ask questions of public interest is indeed something which must be viewed with very serious concern.

On the question of Press publicity on these matters I would point out that it may suit the Opposition, on very rare occasions, that questions which may be expunged from the notice paper do appear in the Press but, conversely, there are often occasions when a question that has been asked by the Opposition does not appear in the Press at all, nor even a reference to the person who asks the question. For instance, yesterday I asked a question of very great importance, in my view, for reasons which will become apparent in due course, about some steel supplies to Queensland, and the Brisbane "Telegraph" did not couple my name with the question at all, but merely gave the Premier's answer. Today "The Courier-Mail" acknowledged that I had asked the Premier the question.

There are other occasions when, because of public importance, questions are addressed to Ministers by the Opposition, and the courtesy of answering them in the House has not been extended to us. They are answered outside the House, and we hear about them in Parliament the following day. I concede that in many instances that is done because there are certain situations where considerations of immediacy may justify a question being answered, but very often when that course is taken the Opposition is not given any credit for directing public attention to a matter of importance. Unfortunately that happens very often, and not just occasionally. The question is asked, and we read in the Press that the Minister has virtually answered the question outside Parliament. In addition, although at times I believe we do not receive from the Press as much help as we might expect as the Opposition, nevertheless, I think we must be very careful to see that we do not unduly restrict the Press on what the Press may consider are matters of great public importance. Nevertheless, aggrieved persons, if they are in the Government, have great resources available to them for taking proper action. While on this subject it seems to me, without being disruptive, or talking about a matter that is sub-judice, that there is an action pending against the Minister for Transport.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have given the Leader of the Opposition quite a deal of latitude. The rules distinctly state that these matters cannot be debated. I have made a statement regarding the Press. I have left it entirely open and I have said that I am not attacking the freedom of the Press in any way.

Mr. DUGGAN: I am not casting any aspersions. All I was saying is that if the Minister is affected by this, the very likely possibility is that the Crown will reply, in some cases, as they are entitled to. If the Crown feels aggrieved—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUGGAN: I will canvass this in another way at another time. There are implications involved here. I believe that important matters of this nature could well form a subject for consideration by the Standing Orders Committee, and the Committee could provide us with—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUGGAN: I am not engaging in a dog fight with you personally, Mr. Speaker, and you know that. You have a very difficult job to do and I have received many courtesies from you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUGGAN: I am not involving myself in a personal argument with you, Mr. Speaker. It would be very grave for me to do so publicly and I would not do so publicly, or privately. I have received many courtesies from you and I feel that all these matters of very vital importance might well be the subject of consideration by the Standing Orders Committee. They could calmly and dispassionately consider the implications involved and come to an understanding and make recommendations that might meet with the full approval of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already mentioned in the House that I was considering calling the Standing Orders Committee together to deal with the whole subject of questions and, now that the Leader of the Opposition has given me the green light by indicating his willingness as a member of that Committee to meet, I shall take immediate action to call the members together.

JUNIOR TEACHER SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

“(1) How many Junior Teacher Scholarships were awarded in Queensland in 1957, 1958, 1959 and 1960?”

“(2) How many such Scholarships will be awarded in 1961?”

“(3) On what basis will these Scholarships be awarded?”

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZHEY (Isis) replied—

“(1) The numbers of Junior Teacher Scholarships awarded were—1957, 979; 1958, 1,266; 1959, 539; 1960, 613; 1961, 786.”

“(2) It is expected that approximately 500 Junior Teacher Scholarships to Secondary Schools will be awarded in 1962

on the basis of the Junior Public Examinations of 1961. With the increasing numbers proceeding to the Senior Public Examinations a greater proportion of Teacher Scholarships is being offered at the Senior level.”

“(3) (a) The needs of the Department. (b) Personal interview. (c) Results in the Junior Public Examination. (d) Medical examination.”

ACTION FOR DAMAGES BY LUIGI VOLI

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—

“(1) Is he conversant with the case of Luigi Voli, an Inglewood farmer, who was injured when the stage of the Memorial Hall at Texas collapsed in 1959 and who recently brought action in the Supreme Court of Queensland for damages against the Inglewood Shire Council, the builder of the hall, R. H. Lockwood, Inverell, New South Wales, the architect, and Joseph Colin McLucas, Stanthorpe, the contractor?”

“(2) If so, is it a fact, as reported in the press of October 3 last that although Mr. Justice Brown ruled there had been no negligence by the builder or by the Shire Council his reason for excluding the architect from liability for damages was that plans and specifications for the hall had been checked and approved by the Public Works Department?”

“(3) In view of the foregoing and also of the published ruling of the Judge (‘The Courier-Mail,’ October 3, 1961), ‘The fact that there was an intervening conscious agency, even though not a careful one, relieves the architect from his duty of care towards a person such as the plaintiff with whom the architect had no contractual relationship,’ is it not apparent that Mr. Justice Brown placed culpability for the injuries received by Voli with the Public Works Department and that that Department should consider indemnifying Voli in £1,531 11s. 6d., this being the amount of damages suffered by Voli as assessed by Mr. Justice Brown in his judgment?”

Hon. H. RICHTER (Somerset) replied—

“(1 to 3) I am aware of the case of Voli v. Inglewood Shire Council and Others and am informed that an Appeal to the High Court was lodged on Wednesday last against the decision of the Honourable Mr. Justice Brown. The matter is therefore sub judice. I mention, however, that the Crown is not a party to the proceedings. It was not heard and the legal advice which has been received is that the Crown is not in any way liable.”

**MOTOR CARS SOLD BY DEPARTMENT OF
LABOUR AND INDUSTRY**

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

“With reference to his reply to my Question on Tuesday, October 17, concerning the purchase and sale prices of cars bought for the Department of Labour and Industry, what was the average age of (a) Ford Falcon cars sold and (b) other makes of cars sold?”

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

“The Honourable Member will have noted from the answer to his question on Tuesday last that a total of 268 vehicles was sold. To obtain the additional information he now seeks will entail the examination of 268 separate files, and it is considered that the time involved in such examination is not warranted. However vehicles are now sold—not necessarily at a predetermined age, but before they cease to be thoroughly efficient for Police work. The Honourable Member may remember that, in reply to his exaggerated comments on August 13, 1959, where he said inter alia that the police of Townsville ‘have been given two utilities of ancient vintage and I repeat that a man on crutches could race them,’ I refuted the statement and later advised that I intended to ensure that all police vehicles would be thoroughly efficient. That has now been accomplished and the Police Department now has approximately 54 more vehicles than at that time, and all operating at top efficiency.”

PUNISHMENT INFLICTED ON RAILWAY LOCOMOTIVE DRIVERS

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

“(1) Has his attention been drawn to a reply made in Parliament by the Minister for Justice on Tuesday, October 17, to a Question by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, wherein it was disclosed, inter alia, that the driver of a car, who falls asleep at the wheel without any prior warning of his inability to keep awake and in circumstances in which a reasonably careful driver might not have been aware that he is likely to fall asleep, and that in these circumstances, even if personal injury to another or damage were caused by the sleeping car driver, would not be guilty of negligence?”

“(2) As this is obviously the law in Queensland, will he remit all fines imposed, re-instate those dismissed with payment of time lost and pay for all work done in an inferior grade when such punishments were inflicted on railway drivers in charge of locomotives who fell asleep, as did the car

driver who was the subject of the Question referred to, and were therefore not guilty of negligence in the eyes of the law?”

“(3) If not, will this not infer that there is one law in Queensland for car drivers who fall asleep when in charge of a moving vehicle and another law for railway drivers who fall asleep when in charge of a moving locomotive?”

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

“(1 to 3) In any instance in which a railway driver has been dealt with in connection with an occurrence considered to have been due to his having gone to sleep, the driver concerned would have had the right of appeal to the Railway Appeal Board, the Chairman of which is a Stipendiary Magistrate. Had the circumstances been such as to warrant a decision similar to that referred to by the Honourable Member, no doubt the Magistrate would have so advised the Board. However, if perchance the Honourable Member has in mind a particular railway case in Townsville, I would point out to him that the Magistrate's comment in relation to the road incident, referred to a driver who was acutally operating a motor vehicle at the time of falling asleep and, consequently, such reasoning could not apply to a railway fireman who was reduced for twelve months to a cleaner because during his hours of duty he was found at mid-day asleep in the sand shed at the Locomotive Depot.”

**CHECK OF AXLE-LOAD OF VEHICLES USED BY
DEPARTMENT OF MAIN ROADS AND
LOCAL AUTHORITIES**

Mr. HOUGHTON (Redcliffe) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

“(1) Does the Main Roads Department check the axle-load of vehicles used by Semi-governmental and/or Local Authorities?”

“(2) If so, will he supply the names of the Semi-governmental and Local Authorities that have had checks made on their vehicles?”

“(3) Is any check made on the axle-load of trucks owned by or on hire to the Main Roads Department, and if so, what is the location of the Main Roads job where trucks were so checked?”

“(4) If no check is made on these vehicles, why are they exempt?”

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

“Until recently the Main Roads Department had only three teams of Inspectors equipped with portable loadometers operating in the field and so their area of operations was necessarily restricted. The

strength has recently been doubled and the appointees are at present being trained. The additional teams will enable weighing to be carried out on a larger scale."

"(1) Yes."

"(2) A complete record is not kept of vehicles weighed but it is known that vehicles owned by the following Local Authorities have been weighed:—Boonah Shire, Caboolture Shire, Gatton Shire, Gold Coast City, Ipswich City, Johnstone Shire, Kilkivan Shire, Mulgrave Shire, Townsville City, Wambo Shire."

"(3) Yes. Such vehicles in common with others are weighed at the checking points in those areas in which the loadometer teams operate. The attention of all Main Roads Department and Local Authority officials was drawn some time ago to the necessity for ensuring compliance with the Regulations dealing with permissible loads."

"(4) See answer to Question (3)."

SEPTIC SYSTEM FOR MURARRIE STATE SCHOOL

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

"When will the ever-troublesome earth closet system at the Murarrie State School be replaced by a septic system?"

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis) replied—

"Soil tests have been taken. The establishment of a transpiration area will be necessary for a septic installation at Murarrie State School. As Plans for this project have not yet been completed, I am unable to advise when existing sanitary facilities will be replaced."

ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL OF WATER IN ROSS RIVER

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

"(1) Does the Townsville City Council presently control the waters of the Ross River and, if so, how was the control so vested?"

"(2) Is the Council within its right in denying water for irrigation to those settlers on the Upper Ross River, who have no riparian rights, and severely limiting those who have such rights?"

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

"(1) The Townsville Water Authority Act of 1926 allocated the water in the Ross River and the control and management of

the bed and banks of the Ross River to the Townsville Water Authority, subject to the paramount rights of the Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply."

"(2) The rights of the Commissioner include the right to issue licences for diversion of water for irrigation and other purposes from all watercourses, but when an application to the Commissioner for a licence to divert water from the Ross River is received, the views of the Townsville City Council regarding the issue of the licence are sought. The last request for a licence for diversion from the Ross River was received in August, 1960, and a licence to divert water for stock and domestic purposes was issued in that instance. By the allocation of all water in the Ross River and control of the bed and banks to the Townsville Water Authority, no landholder on the Ross River has riparian rights."

REMOVAL OF SAND AND GRAVEL FROM BARRON RIVER AT KAMERUNGA

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) asked the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation—

"Owing to the unsatisfactory conditions now imposed on contractors removing sand and gravel from the Barron River at Kamerunga, will he have a responsible officer of his Department inspect the area with a view to arriving at a suitable working basis for contractors engaged in removing sand and gravel?"

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

"I am not aware of any unsatisfactory conditions imposed upon contractors removing sand and gravel from the Barron River at Kamerunga. In this vicinity the Barron River is tidal from its mouth to the tramway bridge at Kamerunga and would be under the control of the Harbours and Marine Department to that point. Above the tramway bridge the Barron River is under the control of the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission to the point where it enters the National Park, and upstream from there while within the National Park area is under the control of the Conservator of Forests. Sand and gravel removals have also taken place from Reserve 774 which abuts both banks of the Barron River above the tramway bridge and removal of material from this Reserve would require a Quarry Licence issued by the Forestry Department. I would suggest that the Honourable Member provide a more detailed description of the area concerned and the unsatisfactory conditions complained of. If the matter is under my Ministerial control, I will have investigations made and if not I will refer it to the appropriate Minister."

GRADING OF SAND STRETCHES AND CREEK
CROSSINGS, LAURA-COEN ROAD

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

"Owing to the drought conditions now existing in Cape York Peninsula forcing graziers to transport feed for starving stock, will he have the necessary work of grading heavy sand stretches and creek crossings on the Laura-Coen road carried out at an early date?"

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

"It is futile to grade roads when the material is completely dry. The District Engineer has been asked to ensure that the road is kept in order so far as funds for maintenance will allow."

PAPERS

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

Report of the Minister for Education and Migration for the year 1960.

Report of the Department of Forestry for the year 1960-1961.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under the Schools of Arts (Winding Up and Transfer) Acts, 1960 to 1961.

Order in Council under the Elections Acts, 1915 to 1959.

Regulation under the Public Curator Acts, 1915 to 1957.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 17 October (see p. 810) 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. ROW (Hinchinbrook) (11.31 a.m.): I congratulate the Treasurer upon the presentation of his Budget. It is a realistic and courageous one. I know that, in the political arena, whatever he does will be subject to criticism by the Opposition. If he budgets for a deficit he will be accused of gross spending and wasting public money. If he budgets for a surplus he will be accused of neglecting the development of the State.

In the time at my disposal I wish to say something about a facility that has meant much to the commercial, industrial and personal welfare of all Queenslanders. Whether one has benefited directly or indirectly, the advent of regionalisation of electricity to the State has had and will continue to have a material and good effect on our Australian way of life.

It is true to say that, as with any other idea, electrification throughout the State will always have its problems and it will never reach the stage where everyone will be wholly satisfied. With modern developments, greater activity in industry, and heavier and continuing demand for electric power, the need for constant review of methods of production, distribution and payment for the commodity will continue.

For such a reason—and I give full credit to—the Government of the day which in its wisdom, established Regional Electricity Boards throughout the State, to examine the problems associated with electricity supply, to endeavour to guarantee supply and to bring about more orderly planning of development.

I am very pleased indeed to have been closely associated with the development of electricity in the better part of the State, North Queensland. As most hon. members know, I have been connected with the Townsville Regional Electricity Board for some years. I took the place on that board of a particularly good Queensland, the late Larry Kelly, who was a nephew of the late Ned Hanlon. Larry Kelly was chairman of the Shire of Hinchinbrook for a number of years until his untimely death. He gave particularly good representation on the regional board for our shire council. For some years I have not only taken the place of a particularly good representative and advocate but, I am very pleased indeed to be able to say that I have seen much development. It may be well to relate some of the history of electricity boards, as we know them in Queensland, and their close association with the general public they serve. Local government is well known to most of us. Its varied functions and how it is conducted are matters close to us and matters that affect us as individuals. We take a great interest in it, and from us its members are elected to the executive body, the Council, to carry out those duties with which local government is charged. These are wide and take in a large measure of autonomy.

Electricity Boards on the other hand have not the wide functions of local government. They deal with one thing and one thing only, the making and selling of electric power, and even in this field the members of the boards themselves are limited in their influence, owing to the highly technical knowledge required to manage and operate an electricity undertaking. The responsibility for it is largely delegated to skilled men who are trained particularly for that work.

Whether hon. members agree or disagree with what electricity boards are doing, the fact remains that overall they are operating in the best interests of the general public, and what greater compliment could they be paid than that!

To commence, it would be preferable to give some idea why they were formed. Early in 1945 the Queensland Government brought down legislation "to provide for the extension and co-ordination of the supply of electricity throughout Queensland in the manner best calculated to promote and serve the population, development and industries of the State, and to secure its economic well-being and for purposes incidental thereto." That was the start of electricity boards in Queensland. After the passage of that legislation boards were set up. As most hon. members know, there are five in Queensland—Cairns, Townsville, Mackay, Rockhampton and the Wide Bay-Burnett area Board. Mackay came into being at a later date. They are located along the coastal strip north of Gympie, almost to Cape York. Their regions which extend westward are gradually but solidly expanding to carry out the electrical development of this great State.

The Act under which they operate, the Regional Electric Authorities Act of 1945, was based upon a Local Government Act with which most hon. members are familiar. A number of amendments to the Electricity Act have since been made, and it is apparent, with the great development taking place, that further amendments will have to be made, to conform to the requirements of the regions, in the best interests of the public.

Hon. members doubtless will think, regional boards being separate entities, that members of these boards could carry out the requirements of the law in the way best suited to the industry and to local conditions.

However, there are provisions of the Act that restrict them somewhat. Where boards were set up, electricity undertakings which were administered by local authorities of the particular region were transferred to the boards and private companies operating electricity undertakings were bought out.

So that consumers might have representation on these boards, the component local authorities submit nominations for membership of the board. These nominees are invariably approved by the Government, by Order in Council. As the Government have a financial interest in boards of this nature, principally because of their grant of subsidies and the raising of loans by the S.E.C., they are represented on every board throughout the State by the Commissioner for Electricity Supply. The Commissioner by specific authority in the Act is required to administer the Act, so that on every board, notwithstanding the number of representatives—and this number varies with the

board—the person administering the Act, that is, the Commissioner for Electricity Supply, is a member.

There are personal responsibilities, obligations and duties on members but it is in relation to the effecting of matters required by the Act that difficulty can arise in the implementation of policy covering regionalisation of electricity and associated matters. Although there are matters which members of boards cannot determine, there are others which members are free to determine, subject to approval by the representative of the Government.

Members are therefore somewhat restricted in the exercise of their authority and would not be subjected to so much adverse criticism if consumers, and the public generally, had a full appreciation of the law governing the operations of electricity boards. Members of boards exercise a close interest in the welfare of the public even though it is not possible to satisfy the requirements of all those who would like electricity. In doing this, the many problems encountered are not always apparent to the public. It is sufficient to say that, more particularly in the last five years, development of electricity has been so rapid that it has adversely affected the financial standing of some of the boards to an extent. In other words, boards could be accused of developing their regions too rapidly with the result that deficits have piled up. That is one reason why boards today have the problem of reviewing charges for electricity to cover the cost of supplying it and the cost of extending it to other parts of the State.

The Government enacted that electricity was to be made available to all who required it and were prepared to pay for it. No line was drawn between the city dweller or the person living on the land. There was a distinction a couple of years ago, and a surcharge was imposed on country dwellers. In the old days people in an area served by a transmission line had to pay a surcharge. This practice was absolutely unfair to the country dweller. He was paying this unfair rating. It was only recently, through representations from boards, and the sanction of the Minister in charge of electricity, that this unjust and unfair surcharge was removed. To assist boards to extend supply to the land, subsidies of up to one-third of capital expansion were introduced by the Government 10 years ago to offset costs of such extensions. However, there is a limit to just how far such a scheme can go. It is most unfortunate that the Government, with their ever-increasing burden of financial responsibility for many State functions and obligations, have now had to reduce their assistance to boards although they have acknowledged, and will continue to acknowledge, the admirable job that electricity boards in Queensland are doing.

Extensions of supply are undertaken in order of economical importance to boards

and consumers as a whole. Priority is determined on this basis. However, it will be some time before all those who desire electricity are satisfied. What is more, current events are not making it easier.

It will be apparent, then, that there are uneconomic extensions of supply throughout the State, which in effect means that losses so occasioned must be borne by the consumers of the region as a whole. I do not think it is unreasonable to expect assistance of this nature and I think all hon. members will agree. The point to be kept in mind, particularly by those who already have electricity is that, apart from other factors, the cost of supply must rise to cover the loss the boards will sustain to make this essential commodity available to as many as possible. Boards have very extensive areas to reticulate and quite formidable tasks to accomplish with a rapidly decreasing economy.

The aspect of cost of electricity to consumers is doubtless the one in which they are materially interested, and it is one which causes greatest concern to members of boards generally. It is quite a job for members of boards to keep an even balance between the cost of generating the product and the price the public have to pay. This often results in boards accumulating deficits simply because they maintain tariffs at the lowest possible figure, which provides no margin for any excess cost to supply the electricity demanded.

With rising costs attributable to the cost of fuel and the increasing cost of salaries and wages paid to those associated directly or indirectly with the industry, consumers of all the regions of the State must be prepared to measure up to the extra production expenses. Boards are very hesitant to vary tariffs, particularly when they are considered reasonable, but they have to be guided by the financial position of the time and by the needs of the succeeding 12 months. Members of boards have to be guided by their officers, who examine very carefully the financial position of the boards and who have to make a fairly accurate assessment of the requirements of the following 12 months.

Very often boards are caught with charges for which they have made no provision. For example, a couple of years ago the Townsville regional board had to meet a heavy increase in the salaries of professional officers, which was made retrospective for a considerable period. That cost the board over £20,000. Then we had the cyclone in Bowen and the cyclone in Home Hill, both of course not provided for, and the cost to the board was £43,000—a large sum to be caught with without provision for it.

Remembering that the payment of interest and redemption charges on loans for new generating plant, transmission lines and extensions of supply takes about 40 per cent. of the board's revenue—roughly 8s. in the £1—hon. members will have some

idea of the problems boards have to face to cover the costs of generation and expansion with the remaining 12s. in the £1.

The Townsville Regional Electricity Board has for several years had the benefit of electricity generation by water from the Tully River. This has had a very stabilising effect on the upward trend in tariffs. Had this not been so, the cost of coal would have forced the Townsville tariffs up still more.

The annual report, which I have here, shows that in 1958 the Townsville Regional Electricity Board consumed 66,000 tons of coal at a cost of £5 12s. a ton, using the availability of power from the Tully Falls hydro-electric scheme, while in 1960 31,000 tons of coal were consumed at the increased cost of £6 0s. 4d. a ton. It is therefore of paramount importance to that Board that the bulk of its generation should come from the Tully Falls hydro-electric installation if tariffs are to remain anywhere near their present level. Only recently the Board was forced to increase its tariffs by 7½ per cent. With the fall-off in water in the Tully River and the consequent lessening of generation at that centre, decline of bulk supply to the Townsville Regional Electricity Board is having a very serious effect. For the greater part of the year, we have been getting 75 per cent. of our reticulation requirements from the Tully Falls installation. But because of the incidence of the drought and the small quantity of water in the Koombooloomba Dam, the flow of water has dropped to a mere trickle. To make up the leeway, the coal-burning plant at South Townsville has been working at almost its full capacity, thereby increasing the cost of generation and, what is more, the cost to the consumer. The hope of the Townsville Regional Electricity Board is therefore obvious—that a plentiful rainfall in the Tully catchment area will give a greater supply of bulk electricity to Townsville. Not only will this result in immediate savings to the Board and its consumers, but the need to install further coal-burning plant would be obviated. Only a couple of years ago the Townsville Regional Electricity Board discussed the installation of a new 15-megawatt turbine. We shall be very happy if we can get increased supplies from the Tully Falls installation and avoid increasing charges to consumers, and we know what great savings the Board can make by using hydro-electricity. Fortunately for North Queensland, further investigations into the generation of electricity by water power are now being undertaken, and I believe that another hydro-power station, on the Herbert River, may be considered in the near future.

It is of interest to give some idea of what is meant by the grid system, because this means of transmission of power is now being widely used. In such a system, all equipment generating electricity channels that electricity into transmission lines running to different parts of the State where electricity is required. This network of lines gives the

impression of a grid. The distributing authorities draw the power that they require from this grid. If a generating unit should default, normally there should be sufficient plant generating at the time to make up for the unit that has ceased to function. This avoids interruptions to power supplies to a great extent, and the value of the grid system can therefore be appreciated. Its great effect on industry, in particular, is obvious. The aim of regional boards, and indeed major electrical authorities throughout Queensland, is to tie in with the grid all their generating plant to enable them to provide an uninterrupted and plentiful supply of electricity. It is for that reason that the Tully Falls and Cairns systems have been tied in with the Townsville system, and very shortly Townsville will be tying in with Mackay. In effect, there will be a complete tie-up between the Cairns Board, Kareeya, the Townsville Board and the Mackay Board. Should the generating plant of one of those systems fail, there will be a complete tie-in, thus assisting to prevent blackouts in the area.

The charge that the board has to make for electricity is always a contentious subject. It is often claimed that tariffs for electricity are too high and that they should not be so high, notwithstanding that tariffs of regional boards compare favourably with tariffs elsewhere. I speak of that from my own knowledge, too. For the most part, this is attributable to the fact that a study of what is involved in the charge for anything is not always made, with the result that the body responsible for the charge invariably finds itself in bad odour on this question, if on no other. The purpose of such tariffs is to fix a fair compromise between the cost to the supplier and the cost to the consumer. For the consumer tariffs should be reasonable for the service given him; for the supplier they should yield a sum to cover the cost of generating and making electricity available to the consumer. The costs of generating in thermal plant are made up broadly of two components, the first arising chiefly from the fuel consumed and varying with the quantity of electricity generated. The other is owing to interest on capital works and non-varying expenses, which normally remains constant, in respect of a certain installation of plant, whether electricity is drawn therefrom or not. The variable component happens in most cases to amount to only a small fraction of the fixed component. It means that financially a satisfactory turnover per unit of capital outlay is at least as important as technical efficiency. The plant and distribution system must be so planned that it will carry the greatest anticipated load. The most efficient way in which this can be done, of course, is where consumers take a full load for 24 hours a day for seven days a week. If, however, consumers restrict their demand to only certain periods of peak loading, which is normally what is done, it is obvious that certain plant and distribution lines must lie

idle during times of low consumption but all this has to be paid for. When peak periods are imposed on normal loading, the plant has to run at full capacity. Often to enable the load to be met the plant has to be enlarged prematurely at considerable cost. From this it can be seen that if it were possible to level out the demands of consumers, an electric authority such as the Board, could run its undertaking cheaper than where considerable demands are made for certain periods only. It is this occurrence that kills any savings boards might be able to make. It is something that very adversely affects the cost of electricity. Tariffs therefore have to be considered and based upon such factors. It is by no means easy for boards, even with the skill and knowledge available to them, to readily and properly assess what are correct tariffs. So much regard has to be given to what demand will possibly be in the immediate future in assessing such tariffs.

In the last 10 years the annual rate of expenditure on electrical development throughout Queensland increased from £6,500,000 in 1950-1951 to almost £12,000,000 in the last financial year. Over the same period the total capital invested in the electricity supply industry increased by £120,000,000 to a total investment of £150,000,000 at 30 June, 1961. By the end of the current financial year that figure will have reached the staggering proportion of £164,000,000. They are mere figures, but they reflect in no small measure the magnitude of Queensland's development, in particular, the startling revolution in the use of electricity to improve and expand industrial processes, to raise the standard of living in our homes, and allied with water, to increase the productivity of our soils. I say once again that the regional supply of electricity to Queensland has made a great contribution to the State.

Mr. Davies: Do you give credit to the Australian Labour Party?

Mr. ROW: I do. They started it and we are maintaining it.

Mr. Houston: Only because you cannot give it away.

Mr. ROW: What a stupid statement. Following on the commissioning of the Regional Boards' central generating stations in 1951 and 1952, and later the Tully Falls Hydro scheme, thousands of miles of transmission and distribution lines have been constructed and the growth in demand for electricity has been extremely rapid.

In South-east Queensland, supply of electricity has also been developed on a regional basis outside the Brisbane metropolitan area, and the transmission and distribution lines of the Southern Electric Authority now extend over a wide and populous area. The Southern Electric Authority, successor to the City Electric Light Company, was constituted a public authority by legislation in 1952.

Membership of the authority includes the Commissioner for Electricity Supply, Mr. Neal Smith, and an additional member appointed by the Governor in Council who, I understand, is Mr. Fullagar. The legislation also provided for the undertaking of the authority to be acquired in 1968 by substitution of Government-guaranteed stock for the Authority's variable interest stock on a pound for pound basis.

Mr. Bennett: Do you agree with that?

Mr. ROW: Of course I do. That was done without the need for cash payment or other compensation. Taking bulk electricity now from the Southern Electric Authority, the Dalby Town Council is providing electricity supply on a regional basis throughout several adjoining shires in addition to the town of Dalby.

Mr. Ewan: Do you think there will ever be a town of Condamine authority?

Mr. ROW: I think so. There is no way in the world that Condamine will not get it. In western Queensland, every township with 40 or more consumers now has its own electricity supply. These small local authority electricity undertakings were designed and constructed by the State Electricity Commission for the interested Local Authorities, and were made possible by a special Government subsidy, with satisfactory agreement with the unions concerned and close collaboration between the Government, the State Electricity Commission and the Local Authorities concerned. But for this there would not have been any prospect of the towns concerned obtaining electricity on an economic basis in the foreseeable future. The schemes have been eminently successful and in virtually all cases additional plant has had to be installed to cope with the increasing demand from consumers. In the larger western towns major improvements have been made, such as the construction of new power stations, installation of additional generating plant, change over from direct to alternating current and reticulation and voltage improvement.

The overall pattern of Queensland's electrical development is best illustrated by figures I shall quote, which are interesting in that they show the tremendous expansion over the past 10 to 12 years.

The units of electricity sold in 1938 were 192,000,000 and some odd thousands. That figure rose to 664,000,000 in 1950 and in 1960 to the colossal figure of 1,928,599,337. With the advance of electricity supply throughout country areas, the number of consumers naturally increased. The number of consumers rose from 149,000 in 1938 to 243,161 in 1950, and in 1960 to 399,466. The following revenue figures are interesting:—

Year	Amount £
1938	1,574,000
1950	4,906,000
1960	21,557,340

The average consumption per consumer jumped from 1,228 units in 1938 to 2,732 in 1950, and 4,828 in 1960.

The average revenue per consumer rose from £10 in 1938 to £20 3s. 7d. in 1950 and to £53 19s. 4d. in 1960.

A vigorous forward planning and detailed investigation of new sources of power for the future has been undertaken by the State Electricity Commission and its overseas consultants, Messrs. Merz and McLellan, in conjunction with the electric authorities.

The Government recently approved recommendations by the Commission of far-reaching importance to Queensland. Under the plan large-scale electrical development is estimated to cost some £159,000,000 up to 1970. The approved programme includes the construction by the Southern Electric Authority of Queensland of a 360 megawatts power station on the West Moreton coalfield at an estimated cost of £36,000,000 to serve the needs of South-eastern Queensland and the Wide Bay-Burnett and the Dalby Town Council areas of electricity supply. Also included is the construction by the Capricornia Regional Board and the S.E.C. of a 150 megawatts power-station on the Callide open-cut coalfield, at an estimated cost of £23.45 million if developed to its full capacity. Immediate development of the Callide power station, planned to 1970 only at this stage, is estimated to cost £9,210,000.

Transmission works under the approved programme include inter-connecting transmission lines between the networks of the Southern Electric Authority and the Wide Bay-Burnett Regional Electricity Board at an estimated cost of £1,800,000, and between the Townsville and Mackay regions of North Queensland at an estimated cost of £460,000. In addition, to cater adequately for supply to the southern districts of the Townsville Region and for inter-connection with Mackay, the 132,000 volt North Queensland system is being extended from Townsville to Clare at an estimated cost of £1,000,000.

Those figures indicate what I mean by the grid system, the connecting-up of all the distribution lines of power authorities throughout the State. When the grid system is in operation, if one power-station breaks down the power flows freely along the transmission lines from other power-stations. That is a splendid idea.

Something that is near and dear to my heart in North Queensland is the Barron Gorge Hydro-electric Scheme at present under construction at an estimated cost for the first stage of £5,850,000, to serve the North Queensland inter-connected system. This excludes the storage dam on Flagg Creek which is planned for construction when required at an estimated cost of £4,967,000.

Mr. Low: North Queensland has done well under this Government.

Mr. ROW: My word!

The completion of the Barron Gorge scheme is scheduled for early 1963, and will meet North Queensland's needs until 1967.

An A.L.P. Member interjected.

Mr. ROW: I could give figures from the annual report to show the tremendous extent of electricity development in North Queensland, and the increased consumption per consumer.

Investigations are now proceeding into additional sources of power to meet requirements beyond that date, including prospects for a thermal power station on the coalfields at Collinsville, and a hydro-electric scheme on the Herbert River. The Herbert River investigations by the Co-ordinator-General and other associated departments into the possibility of a hydro-electric power scheme for the Herbert River have been going on for several years. It is unfortunate that owing to the lack of rain in the Herbert River last year these investigations have been delayed. As hon. members will appreciate, the flow of water, and many other matters have to be considered in a hydro scheme. The initial cost of a hydro scheme is much greater than the cost of a thermal scheme but the resultant running costs of the hydro scheme are much cheaper. Many things have to be investigated before a hydro scheme can be put into effect and if I had the time I could read a long history to hon. members.

In the Herbert River district we have an estimated population of 13,700, and it is now estimated that only 400 are without electricity. In the Townsville area, comprising Hughenden, Charters Towers, Bowen, Ayr, Home Hill, Ingham and Townsville, the estimated population is 105,000, and of that number, it is estimated that 98,000 have electricity. Those facts will indicate to hon. members the vast development of electricity in North Queensland. The supply system of the northern part of the State is being progressively developed throughout the whole area, from Mossman to Mackay. The inter-connection between the Cairns and Townsville systems has been utilised to the fullest extent to the benefit of both regional boards and work has now commenced on the inter-connection of the Mackay and Townsville systems and extensions to the Townsville transmission system at a total estimated cost of almost £1,500,000. When this work is completed, it will be possible for some of the benefits of hydro generation at the Tully Falls station to be utilised as far south as Mackay and Sarina.

In the western areas of the State, the following projects have recently been completed:—

A 33 kV transmission line from Miles to Drillham and Dulacca, at a cost of approximately £45,000.

A 33 kV line connecting Thallon, Dirranbandi and St. George with the New South Wales system at Mungindi at an estimated cost of £190,000.

A 33 kV line from Barcaldine to Aramac, at an approximate cost of £50,000, thus permitting the closing of the small power station at Aramac and the unrestricted use of electricity there.

In addition, a 66 kV line from Mt. Isa to Cloncurry is being constructed, estimated to cost £130,000. This 72-mile line will enable the Cloncurry power station to be closed, and supply at Cloncurry will be obtained at more favourable rates from Mt. Isa Mines, which generates the power at Mt. Isa.

It is also important to note that natural gas is now being used for the production of electricity at Roma. If adequate gas reserves can be procured at that centre or elsewhere, this fuel could well become an important source of electric power in Queensland.

I have touched on a number of important aspects of the electricity supply industry. I am sure hon. members will agree that much more can be said and much detail given of an industry that is rapidly expanding throughout the length and breadth of Queensland. The demand is growing rapidly, at a rate never anticipated, and rural extensions over the past decade have increased considerably. I assure the Committee that nothing gives greater satisfaction than association with a regional board, and seeing the power being circulated by transmission lines to country areas to people who, for years, have been used to kerosene lamps and kerosene refrigerators. People who are not associated with regional boards cannot appreciate how much pleasure is derived from seeing these people enjoying the amenities of the city dwellers, which they have long been denied. I assure the people that as long as we are associated with the electricity supply industry as the Government, as we will be for many years, it will be our endeavour to expand electricity supply farther and farther into the regional and rural areas.

We know that a system of guarantees has to be set up. Guarantees are usually worked out at 10 per cent. of the capital cost of the extension and most boards impose a guarantee of 10 per cent. of the cost for a period of six to ten years. It still remains a remarkably good investment because, for example, if the guarantee is of £50 a year for six years or even £100 a year for six years, at the end of those six years either £500 or £1,000 has been paid and the person has got electricity for all time.

One of the most important points is that the rural consumer can get electricity much more cheaply from the board than by having his own generating plant. I have known men in my own area who have thrown

away almost new generating plants which have cost them over £1,000 preferring to get electricity from the regional board.

The achievement of expansion of electricity supply, and any praise for it, are due to all those who made it possible. Employees of all the boards and all others associated with this great industry, whether contractor or labourer, must surely be congratulated for a splendid co-operative effort. The part the public of Queensland can play to assist the boards is one of full co-operation. This would be the most effective way to obtain for all in the State the great benefits that electricity can bestow.

In such matters as organisation, administration, labour relations and public welfare, regional electricity boards are fully conscious of their responsibility not only to the State but also to the nation, and are ready at all times to do what can be reasonably expected of them.

Mr. DIPLOCK (Aubigny) (12.17 p.m.): The hon. member for Hinchinbrook followed the pattern set by other hon. members opposite and, I think rather jovially, congratulated the Treasurer on the Financial Statement. I think he did so with his tongue in his cheek and I feel sure that, if all hon. members were to give their considered opinion of the Financial Statement, and if that opinion were arrived at without taking into consideration party politics, there would be unanimous agreement that it was a very disappointing one, and that a general survey of its contents would truly reflect the financial quagmire in which the Government find themselves year after year.

Under Labour Governments the finances of the State were husbanded in a very efficient manner. Reserve balances were built up to cushion the effects of a recession should one occur, and to ensure that in such an event the number of unemployed was kept to a minimum. Now we have arrived at the stage where there is evidence of a recession but, unfortunately, the cupboard is bare and there are none of those cash reserves to enable this Government to provide work for the big and ever-increasing army of unemployed. It is my opinion that the reserves that were so patiently built up by Labour Treasurers to help guard against the misery of unemployment and stagnation in industry, which exist today, have to a large extent been flagrantly wasted by this Government with one thought in mind. That was to create the impression that it was a progressive, up-and-doing Government. Concessions were granted here and there and much face-lifting took place. At times this was unnecessary, and in some cases, particularly in areas represented by Government members, it amounted to a deliberate wastage of public funds. Now the Treasurer, instead of being able to do something about unemployment, is sheltering behind excuses such as the ravages of drought and the effects of the

credit squeeze. Surely it will not be denied that there have been droughts before and that the position has been dealt with much more efficiently by former Labour Governments than this Government are dealing with it. Credit has been particularly tight at times, but I do not think anyone can remember a time between the days of the depression and the present when conditions were harder than they are now.

Unfortunately, there is not one shred of evidence in the Budget of an attempt to collect extra revenue other than by taxes that can, and in some cases will, ultimately be passed on to the workers. There is evidence that certain taxes will be collected, but they will ultimately be paid by the workers, most of whom are on little better than the basic wage. We must be fair to the Treasurer, however, and admit that he has been open enough to mention the amount of revenue to be collected from liquor and racing reforms. Of course, if we take the wool from over our eyes, this is the main purpose behind the reforms, despite the Government's claim to be doing something to control things that are militating against the social and moral welfare of the people of Queensland. With the improved basis of tax reimbursement, were not the people of Queensland entitled to expect a balanced Budget that would reflect a determined effort on the part of the Government to grapple with the unemployment situation, which is far worse than hon. members opposite are prepared to admit?

Before the Government were elected to office, they criticised the Labour Government on every possible occasion for their unsympathetic attitude to private industry and accused them of doing absolutely nothing to encourage decentralisation. From time to time I have asked the Government to adopt a more sympathetic attitude towards those employed in industries in rural areas, and I have stressed particularly the case of the Oakey abattoir. But I am sorry to have to say that, despite the fact that we have a coalition government in which the Country Party has a majority of members, I have met with little or no success. At the moment the economic stability of Dalby is suffering because of unemployment, which is largely due to the unsympathetic attitude of the Government towards the biggest employer of labour in the area. I think, Mr. Taylor, you must agree that it is difficult to understand, particularly when one remembers the promise of the Government before they were elected to office to do all in their power to foster industries removed from the metropolitan area.

I intend to refer to tenders. For that employer of industry in Dalby, Napier, was one of the tenders. In doing so I hope to convince the Committee that the Government have not been sincere in their assertion that they would foster rural industry, and that they were not sincere when they promised to

foster the decentralisation of industry. When I talk about these tenders I am not speaking on behalf of the firm that progressed because of the sympathetic treatment meted out to it by previous Labour Governments. It has progressed and will progress despite the treatment meted out to it by the present Government. Indeed the firm is well able to look after itself. I am speaking in the interests of hundreds of people who now find themselves in a most difficult position because unemployment is rife. As the firm has had to curtail its activities there is very little, if any, chance of employment in the area. I stress again that many of those people have left the metropolitan area and established their homes in the country because they believed the Government would foster industries in rural areas. I stress again that most of them have established their homes in Dalby because their health required them to go to a western area. When I have given the Committee the details of the tenders I think it will be agreed that the Government have no respect for, and do not concern themselves at all, with the workers from the metropolitan area. I am pleased to be able to say that after going through a period in which it experienced many difficulties, the firm has now found the answer to its problems. That answer has not been supplied by anything that the Government have done. It has expanded its activities and is gradually taking on some of the workers it was forced to retrench. I feel sure that it will have the effect of Dalby's regaining its stability in a very short time.

Soon after the Government took control of the Treasury Benches, engineering firms in Maryborough, Bundaberg, Mackay and other places outside the metropolitan area were told that government contracts would come to an end. Despite the fact that they were told that no private firms would be given a government contract, one firm in Brisbane is receiving favourable treatment by way of government work. The tenders for the supply of VJM hopper wagon bodies that were finally approved a few months ago definitely prove that the Government have no regard for the fate of the worker outside of Brisbane. I shall quote the notice calling tenders for the hopper bodies to which I refer. It is headed, "Queensland Railways" and reads—

"Tenders, with deposit in sealed envelope, correctly endorsed, close with the Secretary to the Commissioner, Adelaide Street, Brisbane, at 2.30 p.m. on 9th March, 1961, for the manufacture and supply of 300 or, alternatively, 500 'V.J.M.' Hopper Wagon Bodies, using Australian steel, and alternatively using Imported Steel. Tendering documents available from the Secretary, upon payment of £2 per set. The lowest or any tender not necessarily accepted."

I should like the Committee to keep in mind that tenders were called for 300 or, alternatively, 500 bodies using, alternatively, Australian steel or imported steel.

Napier Bros. of Dalby quoted for 500 bodies from imported steel at £153,075. Commonwealth Engineering Company quoted £152,497. There was a difference of only £578.

I selected the quotes for 500 bodies and from imported steel because, at that time, manufacturers could not count on receiving the required amount of Australian steel. I prove that by quoting from a letter written by the Premier. In reading this quotation from the Premier's letter, I wish to stress that the engineering consultants, Messrs. Ford, Bacon & Davis, had advised that the construction of hopper bodies must be proceeded with as quickly as possible. The letter reads—

"At the time the tenders were considered the experience of the Railway Department was such that availability of sufficient steel for the contract through Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. was too indefinite to consider the order being placed on a forward delivery basis, since it was the advice of the Engineering Consultants, Messrs. Ford, Bacon & Davis, that the construction of hopper bodies must be proceeded with as quickly as possible."

I should like the Committee to take notice of those two facts: Firstly, on the Premier's admission only imported steel was available, and secondly, on the advice of the engineering consultants the construction of hopper bodies must be proceeded with as quickly as possible.

When the tenders were opened I arranged to be there and the Dalby firm's price was so close that I felt justified in approaching the Premier and pointing out to him that, as both firms had to use imported steel, the difference of £578 would be offset by the fact that Napier Bros. would have to plough back on that steel £3,000 in freight to the Government because it would have to send it to Dalby by rail. I was told by one Minister that that would not count at all because the railways were not paying. I put it to hon. members, that is a very weak argument—to say that if you had a train loaded with cargo it would not pay. The railways are not paying because they were not getting the freight. They were not enjoying the confidence of the people of getting their patronage.

Mr. Aikens: If the Government will not patronise their own railways, how can the people be expected to?

Mr. DIPLOCK: Quite right. I interviewed the Premier and I pointed out that there was a difference of only £587 in an amount of £153,000; also that that would be offset by the fact that £3,000 would have to be ploughed back to

the Government in rail freight, and the fact that this was the one big industrial concern employing labour in Dalby. The Premier assured me that consideration would be given to such matters, and I really believe consideration was given to them by the Premier. In his letter, the Premier pointed out that the advice of the engineering consultants, Messrs. Ford, Bacon & Davis, was that the construction of hopper bodies must be proceeded with as quickly as possible. I claimed further that the difference of £500 would be offset by the rate of delivery guaranteed by the Dalby firm. If we are not going to take notice of, or give any consideration to, the advice of the consulting engineers, why pay them the fee they are being paid by the Government? The Commonwealth Engineering Company could deliver their first wagon body in November, 1961, and thereafter at the rate of only four a week, because they had sufficient other work on hand to keep the men in employment. Napiers guaranteed delivery of the first wagon body in July, 1961, and delivery thereafter at the rate of 10 a week. I ask would not that alone be ground or justification for giving the contract for these bodies to Napiers? But that is not all. According to the Press advertisement the tenders were to be for 300, or alternatively 500. Of the tenders accepted, one was for 200, not 300, and the firm whose tender was accepted put in a special price because it had sufficient Australian steel on hand to build 200 wagons. The Commonwealth Engineering Company was given a contract for the other 300. If tenders are called for 300 and 500, and one firm puts in a tender for 200 because it has sufficient Australian steel for 200, the granting to it of a contract for 200, and to another firm for 300, may be legal but it is not morally right. Every interested firm should have had the right to tender for a similar number. Each and every one of the tenderers could have had steel for less than 300, but only one tender was received for less than that number. Tenders were not called for less than 300, and I think it was morally wrong for the Government to accept such a tender. During the election campaign big hoardings were displayed saying, "Put us back and we will foster decentralisation and encourage rural industries." We find that in practice they are not prepared to give the people engaged in industries in rural areas an even break, because if these people had received an even break they would have been the successful tenderers.

Mr. Walsh: They give preference to Brisbane against the country.

Mr. DIPLOCK: Of course they do.

I was very pleased to see that an additional amount is to be spent on Education. I wish it to be clearly understood that I should be happy if we were spending twice as much on education, although I believe that we are spending just a little too much

on secondary education compared with primary education. I give the Minister and the Government due credit for building new high schools, and, in every instance, they are very fine buildings. I should say that the Teachers' Training College in Brisbane is the finest training college in Australia.

Mr. Aikens: Have you looked at the University I had built in Townsville?

Mr. DIPLOCK: Not yet.

I am glad that the Minister is in the Chamber to hear my remarks about primary school buildings.

Mr. Pizzey: In the last three or four years more has been spent on primary schools than secondary schools.

Mr. DIPLOCK: On buildings?

Mr. Pizzey: Yes.

Mr. DIPLOCK: That would not even it out because of the small number of secondary schools compared with primary schools.

Mr. Pizzey: My remarks refer to the building of secondary schools.

Mr. DIPLOCK: The Minister would know as well as I that some of the country areas have received shocking treatment in connection with buildings.

Mr. Pizzey: There are some schools that Labour was prepared to put up with for 30 years that we have not got around to yet, and Dalby is one of them.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I am referring to the four rooms under one building that the Government put up that have no floor, no ceiling to stop the dust, and no ventilation, and did not have electricity until the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads, and Electricity had it installed. I was pleased that it was on the programme last year, but it was taken off. I do not know who took it off. However, I have been advised by the Minister for Education and Migration, and by the Minister for Public Works and Local Government that the work is to commence very shortly. I give the Government credit for that.

Mr. Pizzey: We are not happy about it. It is one of the worst. However, it has been impossible to overcome all the bad ones in three years.

Mr. DIPLOCK: In some instances, new schools have been erected and the old ones, put into the background, and not used, are better than those rooms at Dalby.

I sincerely hope that the Minister will not allow anything to interfere with his intention to commence this building in the near future. I do not say that the Minister gives preference to a place because it is represented by a Liberal, or a Country Party

member, but if he does, he is not really taking it out on a member representing another area——

Mr. Pizzey: You are attacking your own regime now.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I can give instances of where Labour neglected one of its own electorates to help an Opposition electorate. There were five applications for the last high school that was established under the Labour Government. He will agree that the high school was established in the Premier's area. If the present Government took a leaf from the book of Labour Governments we would have new high schools being built all the time.

The time has arrived for consideration to be given to a general increase in the fees paid to the drivers of school transport buses. I suppose the Minister has received 50 or 60 requests for increased fees. Is that right?

Mr. Pizzey: Yes.

Mr. DIPLOCK: The time has arrived to consider increasing the rate. Some of the people who get in touch with me say, "We have applied and applied and applied and the only answer we get is that the matter is under consideration." I point out to them that they cannot expect everything in a day, but the day grows to a year and the year to two years. I hope the Minister will have the matter investigated as soon as possible. The school transport system that operates on a bitumen road and over a lengthy route may be all right but the man who operates with only a small number of children, over metal roads and not good metal roads at that, and in hilly country, cannot possibly operate successfully.

Mr. Aikens: How many school transport services were operating in the country when you were Minister for Education?

Mr. Pizzey: None in the secondary sphere. They would not allow the secondary children to travel on the primary-school buses.

Mr. DIPLOCK: There were more primary buses granted by me than have been granted by the present Minister.

Mr. Pizzey: Rubbish!

Mr. DIPLOCK: And there would have been three times as many granted by Labour Governments as have been granted by the present Government.

Mr. Pizzey: How many years?

Mr. DIPLOCK: Transport systems were not being operated over all the time of the Labour Governments.

Mr. Walsh: Not so many years.

Mr. Pizzey: We can give you those figures.

Mr. DIPLOCK: We do not want figures. We want some more money for the operators of school transport.

We must voice some criticism of the Government's attitude towards replacing in country areas police who are on annual leave or extended leave. Go down Queen Street and you will find two or three police constables and a sergeant watching the red, amber and green traffic lights. In the country the policeman has a very big area to cover, including perhaps eight or 10 townships. In addition he may have to supervise behaviour at quite a few hotels and attend to applications for stock permits, and all the other permits that are required from time to time, yet when he goes on annual leave, or in the case of one policeman when he goes for his three months' leave, the area is left without the services of a policeman. That is a shocking state of affairs.

Mr. Low: Do you mean to say police stations close down?

Mr. DIPLOCK: They are unattended. I am referring to Peranga. A policeman is sent out from Toowoomba one day a week. He has to deal with 10 small towns. When the policeman goes on holiday, there is no supervision over five or six hotels. The policeman at Cooyar is going on three months' leave. During his absence the only police service for the whole of the area will be the visit of a constable from Toowoomba one day a week.

Mr. Aikens: They have taken the policeman away altogether from an important northern town named Ravenswood.

Mr. DIPLOCK: The people may be well behaved up there.

Mr. Melloy: They have closed stations in the metropolitan area, too.

Mr. DIPLOCK: Yes, but it takes two hours to travel to Cooyar from Toowoomba, and it will be left without protection.

The Railway Department is always looking for revenue. I am going to bring up a hardy annual and say that in my opinion it would be much better if sitting passengers from western towns were allowed to travel on the Westlander without paying a surcharge. People travelling from Dalby and other places along the western line will not pay it, and in five trips out of six one finds the sitting carriages absolutely empty. Quite a number of people hitch-hike, and if seats are vacant it would be better to allow people who want to travel on the railways to use them rather than to allow trains to run empty to Brisbane. Instead of waiting for the next train, many men and women take the bus, which connects with another bus for Brisbane at Toowoomba, and the railways are losing those passengers.

Mr. Low: What is the surcharge?

Mr. DIPLOCK: I am not sure. I think six shillings for the first class, 4s. for second. I also think that more sympathetic consideration should be given to the complaints made by consignors of stock. In some cases on which I have made representations, the department's attitude has been that it accepts no responsibility. In one case 40 prime bullocks were bought and trucked at Dulacca. Although they were bought and paid for as first-class export bullocks, when they arrived at Cannon Hill they were so bruised that 17½ of them were classed in a lower grade. I approached the Railway Department about it, but they said, "We accept no responsibility. How do we know that the cattle were not bruised before they were trucked?" To get the cattle from the sale yards to the trucking yards involved a walk of about 100 yards. Over the past 11 months that man has sent nearly 6,000 cattle either to the Brisbane abattoir or to Dinmore. He has paid the hauliers nearly £6,500. Prior to the incident where he received no consideration from the Railway Department, he always used the railways, never private transport.

Mr. Aikens: Anyone in the game will tell you that most bruising is caused in the loading of cattle into trains and in the unloading of cattle from the trains, not on the train journey.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I got bruised going from here to Cairns.

Mr. Aikens: Your skin is more sensitive than the skin of a beast.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I think there should be some sympathetic notice taken of and consideration given to complaints about the bruising of livestock.

Mr. DONALD (Ipswich East) (12.55 p.m.): I am very pleased to be given the opportunity to discuss the Collinsville State Coal Mine because I was reliably informed that after the present Item had been before the Committee we would not have the opportunity to discuss it again. I am going to discuss that matter now by combating untruths with truths, fabrications with facts, and misunderstandings with understanding and knowledge. Consequently, I have to reply to the hour-long speech of the hon. member for Bowen last Tuesday evening. He gave the Committee what he referred to as something of the history of Collinsville down the years. He went on to say that the production at Collinsville was built up by the transfer of miners during the war years. Just what happened then? He neglected to say that the Governments of the day sent out a plea to the mine workers of Queensland to go to Collinsville to produce coal to help the nation's war effort. True to their tradition the coal miners of Queensland rallied to the cause, went to Collinsville and produced record tonnages of coal. If anyone wants to condemn any body of men for doing what the

nation wants them to do in a time of crisis, they are entitled to try to do it. We should remember that the workers and residents of Collinsville were closer to the enemy line than the national capital. We know that bombs dropped in Townsville. The miners went to Collinsville in answer to the nation's call. They knew of the nation's needs. They left their homes to go to Collinsville where they were housed in huts. Their accommodation was reasonable at the time but it deteriorated into a disgraceful shambles.

The hon. member went on to talk about the miners' pension. He should have known that the miners' pension was achieved only by two nation-wide strikes by the mine workers of Australia. What was the attitude of the then Opposition, people of the same political philosophy as the hon. member for Bowen? The Leader of the then Opposition went on record as saying that the leaders of that strike should have been lined up against the wall and shot. I was one of them. Yet they try to claim credit for legislation that has come about only by ordinary evolutionary means. Let us examine just what happened in the particular case the hon. member mentioned. I refer to the pension payment to a widow whose husband is killed in an accident at work. When the legislation was first framed that unfortunate woman had to wait until her compensation was eaten out at miners' pension rates. Even then the miners' union wanted the tribunal to pay the widow compensation plus her miners' pension. We continued with our agitation, which resulted in her compensation payment being exhausted at compensation rates. It was a move in the right direction. Then, owing to the agitation by the Miner's Federation, and for no other reason, the Government of the day, of which the hon. member for Bowen was not even a member, were forced to amend the miners' pension scheme so that widows would be able to receive their miners' pension and also their compensation. I find it strange, that in times of national disaster, particularly a disaster at a colliery, the mine workers are proclaimed as national heroes but, should they happen to engage in an industrial struggle to improve their social and economic conditions they are regarded as recreant saboteurs. It was just because everybody, on two occasions, engaged in industrial struggles, when every miner in the Commonwealth of Australia ceased work, that the pensions scheme was won, and I state very definitely that any improvement to the pensions scheme, irrespective of what government were in office, was due only to the determination of the mine workers that that scheme should be improved.

So little does the hon. member for Bowen know of the industrial or political movement that he kept referring, in his speech on Tuesday evening, to Mr. Millar as president of the Q.C.E.

Dr. Delamothe: You did not hear very well.

Mr. DONALD: Anyone would know that Mr. Millar could never qualify for the Q.C.E. let alone be president of it. I did try to correct the hon. member by way of interjection but he refused to be corrected. He went on to make the improper statement that people who live in Collinsville, and were in the convoy, were paid £250 or £6 a day.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I rise to a point of order. If the hon. member proposes to distort matters he should at least have read my speech. He would have seen that the £250 mentioned by me referred to two specific members.

Mr. DONALD: I did not need to read his speech; I heard it. He deliberately said that certain people got £250 or £6 a day. I will deal with that in a few minutes.

The hon. member also criticised Alf Arnell because he had the audacity to meet the convoy when it arrived in Brisbane. He shows abysmal ignorance of the industrial movement. Mr. Arnell is president of a very powerful industrial union and it was his duty to meet that convoy.

Then the hon. member goes on to talk about people getting into a panic. On the night the convoy arrived in Brisbane I had to attend a special meeting of the Q.C.E. I parked my car in the grounds of Parliament House and on the way back from that meeting, at about half-past nine, I tried to enter the little gate at the side. These people talk about panic! That gate was locked with a huge chain and a great big padlock. I thought, "If the other gates are locked like this, what will I do?" I walked down to the gate in Alice Street and it was open but guarded by two very big policemen. Two huge specimens of manhood were there.

I walked along the passage and I met the nightwatchman and said to him, "What is all the trouble? Why is the place locked and why are the policemen here?" He said, "You know, the Collinsville miners are here tonight." These people talk about panic! Was I going to shoot the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity or the Premier? They should talk about panic when here there was such concrete evidence of panic that was not necessary. Like the residents of any other coal-mining community, the Collinsville people are law-abiding and decent people.

The hon. member went on to say that the general president of the Miners' Federation was the only man at the conference, when they met the company officials in Brisbane, who refused to agree to the suggestions of the owners of the mine. I will deal with that in a few minutes. He tried to tell hon. members that area committees were inspired and invented by the Communist Party—again showing his ignorance of the industrial movement, because area committees have been in existence for a long time. They are part of an efficient industrial, working-class organisation on which all the unions in a particular industry in a

district have representation. I went to the area committee meeting when I arrived in Collinsville and I am not ashamed of having done so.

Dr. Delamothé interjected.

Mr. DONALD: I do not know what he means when he talks about the Kremlin. That shows what little regard he has for a meeting of members of the working-class movement. I went to the meeting and told the members of the area committee that the Minister for Mines was the best friend they had in the Cabinet, and I still think he is.

Dr. Delamothé: You praised him.

Mr. DONALD: I told them I did not think the action of the Government would meet with the wishes of the Minister for Mines. They said, "It must be the Minister." I said, "He has been compelled to take the action he has taken, through pressure brought by the Liberal members of the Cabinet," and I still think that is so.

It is said that I praised the Minister for Mines. What is wrong with giving him credit when he deserves it? I do not play politics in things such as this. When justice is done, I am satisfied, and I am prepared to give credit to anyone who does a good job, particularly on behalf of the working class.

Let me get to the Collinsville meeting. What happened there was a credit to the people who attended and those who organised it. It was a tremendous meeting. The picture-show hall was full and a crowd was outside. The Chairman performed an excellent job and the audience behaved themselves much better than do Government members in this Chamber. The chairman called on Mr. Millar to give a report on the negotiations that had taken place since the last meeting. Out of courtesy he called on the Chairman of the Shire Council, Mr. Cunningham, to be the first speaker. He refused and the chairman then said, "Perhaps our member of Parliament will speak. He should be the second speaker." But what did their member of Parliament say? He said, "I won't bother to speak until the last. I will speak when everybody else has spoken." He turned his face on the decency and courtesy of the people of Collinsville. His action could be described only as the action of a coward.

The mine workers and the people of Collinsville have been very, very good to the hon. member for Bowen and in their time of need they looked to him for support, but in vain. He let them down and did not come to their assistance.

Apart from the high-temperature dispute of three weeks this year, there have been fewer stoppages at the mine than at any time in its history—so much for the Government accusations of unjust stoppages. Difficulties in working the mine at Collinsville have been experienced since mechanisation was introduced towards the end of 1953 and

losses have been incurred, but they have been due solely to the fact that the machinery proved to be unsatisfactory for the mine. The Miners' Union and other technical men warned the Government against spending approximately £500,000 on the machines introduced there. The correctness of their warning was demonstrated by the fact that for the period from July to October, 1953, before mechanisation, the mine showed a profit of £5,000, and after mechanisation, from November, 1953, to June, 1954, the mine lost £116,000. The mine workers cannot be blamed for that, because they and the engineer at Collinsville told the Government that the machinery they were introducing was totally unsuitable for the Collinsville mine. Prior to the mine's being closed three coal-cutting machines at £18,000 each, were in the mine, but had not been used since the disaster in 1954, and this is now 1961. A shuttle car valued at £17,000 was taken down the mine in 1953 and has never been used. A Jeffries Loader machine, valued at £30,000, was buried by a fall of stone almost 12 months ago, and it is still buried. Hon. members will agree that those items are an indictment of the mine management and not the workers at the mine. The physical conditions of the mechanised mine at the time of closure had improved considerably and it was recognised by the management and the men that it was in the best condition since mechanisation started. By coincidence that may be why the Government are getting rid of the mine. I will now quote from a letter I received from Dick James, the Vice-President of the Queensland Colliery Employees' Union, referring to the charges made by the hon. member for Bowen. It was written at Booval, on 18 October, and it reads—

"Dear Jim,

In relation to the members of the Collinsville convoy to Brisbane and their return to Collinsville, the only money that the convoy members were in receipt of was a gift by the Scottsville miners of £5 to each member of the convoy for the purpose of assisting them on the long trip to Brisbane.

Prior to their return to Collinsville, each member of the convoy was issued with the sum of £3."

That was from the Queensland Colliery Employees' Union.

"In other words the total amount of money that each member of the convoy had from the time they left Collinsville, until their return, was £8."

The hon. member for Bowen would not go from Bowen to Collinsville unless he got more than that. The members of the convoy drove thousands of miles, and do not let us forget that the total amount of money that each member got was £8. The letter continues—

"No member of the convoy was in receipt of any wages as far as the Union

was concerned. The members of the convoy left Collinsville on a voluntary basis. A Balance Sheet of the entire expenditure and the cost of the convoy was submitted to the Queensland Colliery Employees' Union, was audited and checked, and found to be correct, and accepted as a true and honest undertaking as far as the convoy was concerned."

Where is the £250 that the hon. member for Bowen referred to? The letter continues—

"In relation to the re-engagement of labour at the Collinsville mine referred to by Dr. Delamothe, it is obvious that Dr. Delamothe has been grossly misinformed or he is deliberately distorting the true facts in relation to same.

At a conference held in Sydney between the new owners of the Collinsville State Mine and the Miners' Federation, it was decided that because of the failure to reach satisfactory settlement in relation to the employment of labour, that the Union would present a complete list of the entire membership at the Collinsville Branch of the Union prior to the closure of the mine for a future conference to be held in Brisbane for further discussions. That conference was held on 11 October, and was attended by Mr. Thornton, Mr. Conway and the Manager representing the employers and Mr. Thomas, Secretary, Coal Owners' Association, Mr. Lawrie, Assistant Secretary, Coal Owners' Association, Mr. W. Parkinson, General President, Miners' Federation, T. M. Millar, District President, and C. Vickers, District Secretary, and J. Nisbet, Collinsville Branch Secretary.

The employers submitted the same four men that they had previously selected to further drive the shaft to the Garrick seam. The Union in submitting the complete list of the previous membership selected four men who were practical miners and were selected as a compromise and in accordance with the policy of the Miners' Federation to assist in having the shaft in question sunk as desired by the Management. The Company completely refused to accept the compromise submitted by the Union, however, the Union informed the Company that our offer was still open and was prepared to negotiate at any future date. Mr. Parkinson was not the only Union representative in attendance at the conference as has been previously set out, and the entire Executive, including Mr. Nisbet, was in complete agreement with the proposals submitted.

Further that Mr. Parkinson did not attend the conference as a professed Communist, but as the General President of the Miners' Federation, working in the interests of the members that he represents."

We must not forget that he was elected by the mine-workers throughout Australia under a democratic Federal-approved ballot.

"For your information, Jim, this individual, Dr. Delamothe, has from the very inception of the closure of the Collinsville mine completely distorted the facts surrounding the closure. The Union, on every occasion, has made every endeavour by negotiation to try and have the Collinsville mine reopened under normal conditions, and we shall continue to press for that principle.

"I might also add that the question was asked Mr. Thornton at the conference as to the future of the two underground tunnels at Collinsville and he made no comment whatsoever, and it is our opinion that the Company has no intention of commencing operations of the two underground mines as in accordance with the previous statements that we have made, that Davis Contractors are linked with Mt. Isa, and the fact that prior to the closure of the Collinsville State Mine by the Government, the Open Cut Mine which is worked by Davis Contractors was not in production, but a week after the closure of the State Mine, the underground mine at Scottville and the Open Cut filled the necessary trade markets to the Northern part of the State to the extent that today, the output at the Open Cut filled the necessary trade markets to the Northern part of the State to the extent that today, the output at the underground mine at Scottville is 650 tons per day, and the output at the Open Cut, operated by Davis Contractors, is 1,500 tons per day. This proves our contention that there is no intention of Davis Contractors to open the State Mine, and also proves the gift that was presented to Mt. Isa and Davis Contractors by the Hon. Mr. Evans, Minister for Mines, and his Government.

"The question of the offer by the Bowen Consolidated, which is merely another name for Mt. Isa, of a third shift on production to absorb some of the unemployed Collinsville miners was merely a political racket, and had no basic foundation whatsoever.

"The driving down to the Garrick Seam is just another fairytale. It is based by Mr. Thornton on the grounds that it could be used for export trade to Japan, to France, which is ridiculous.

"I think it would be a good idea if you checked on the recent statement made by Mr. Spooner, the Federal Minister, and Sir Edward Warren, the Chairman of the New South Wales Coal Owners' that America is toying around with the idea of undercutting the Australian market to Japan, and no doubt this will succeed, so I would say that it is only eyewash as an attempt to hurt the Collinsville people and to confuse the general public of this State, and I consider it to be political trickery."

This letter is signed by Richard James, the Vice-President of the Queensland Colliery Employees' Union. He is not a Communist. He is a rather decent gentleman. He is a very devout churchman and he would not tell a lie, let alone print one. That letter alone condemns the hon. member for Bowen and should silence him for ever.

Quite a lot has been made of the book-keeping losses of the State coal mine at Collinsville. Many people seem to derive great satisfaction from them and gleefully acclaim that they are proof that State and public enterprises are total failures. They deliberately refrain from taking into consideration such State and public enterprises as the State Government Insurance Office, the Public Curator Office, the Commonwealth Bank, the Australian National Shipping Line, T.A.A., C.O.R., A.W.A. and the whaling station.

A few weeks ago, the State Treasurer, in his speech when introducing the Appropriation Bill, paid a well-deserved tribute to the State Government Insurance Office and drew attention to its worth to the economy of Queensland.

It will, I am sure, surprise many Government hon. members to learn that the publicly-owned Labour-founded T.A.A. for the year 1959-1960 made a net profit of £352,938, that the Australian National Shipping Line made a net profit of £1,314,376 despite years of anti-Labour Commonwealth Government's restrictions on these public air and shipping undertakings, and despite the subtraction, before net profit, of provision for obsolescence, insurance depreciation, superannuation and income tax. Those hon. members who are so hurt and who are keeping up a running fire of interjections should know, if they know anything, that if it were not for the generous treatment given to A.N.A.—T.A.A.'s rival—by the Federal Government, they would not be able to keep their planes in the air.

It is not only these two public enterprises but also the history of C.O.R., A.W.A., and other public business undertakings that have been sold by the Commonwealth Government that shows what could be done by Governments in business. The Snowy Mountains Authority, another A.L.P.-founded project, which is a long-term investment, is bound to return rich dividends to a great number of beneficiaries.

The losses incurred in the operation of the State mine at Collinsville was one of the main reasons advanced by the Government for selling the colliery, another being the number of stoppages caused by industrial disputes. Let us examine these charges and see whether they justify the Government's action in closing the mine on 19 April.

Before dealing with the Tenth Annual Report of the Queensland Coal Board, let

me quote from the Treasurer's Financial Statement. The table relating to Trust and Special Funds shows the cash balances at 30 June, 1956, for the State Coal Mines Fund as £207,431 in debt. This year the table relating to Trust and Special Funds shows a credit of £234,324 for the State Coal Mines, or an improvement of approximately £442,000.

If we turn to the pages of the Tenth Annual Report of the Queensland Coal Board, which is up to its usual excellent standard and a copy of which has been delivered to each hon. member, we find among the carefully compiled tables, one dealing with the output of the collieries of Queensland and the output per man-shift of individual mines. There are also tables dealing with the man-shifts worked and lost in each district and in each mine. The number of days lost through industrial disputes, sickness, absenteeism and other causes is recorded for the information of all who may be interested. A perusal of the tables will convince any fair-minded person that the employees of the State mine at Collinsville have a production and industrial record that compares very favourably with that of other mine-workers throughout the State.

I am not putting this document forward only as I see it. I am proving my case, as I said I would prove it, by facts. These are the figures given by the Coal Board showing the output of coal per man-shift worked—

District	1949-1950 Tons	1960-1961 Tons
West Moreton—		
Face	6.00	9.16
Overall	2.65	3.79

Dr. Delamothe: Give us the overall figures.

Mr. DONALD: I have nothing to hide and nothing to fear. I will give the hon. member the overall, and it will be all over him. If the hon. member would listen, he would not be so easily hoodwinked. The table goes on—

District	1949-1950 Tons	1960-1961 Tons
Darling Downs—		
Face	5.21	7.00
Overall	2.89	3.12
Maryborough—		
Face	5.06	5.17
Overall	2.38	2.54
Rockhampton—		
Face	6.92	7.49
Overall	2.64	2.42
Bowen Underground—		
Face	7.65	11.79
Overall	2.04	2.28
Total Average—		
Face	5.99	8.67
Overall	2.51	3.41

Dr. Delamothe: Give us the Collinsville and Scottville ones separately.

Mr. DONALD: I will give the hon. member the figures if he will only remain quiet. I shall not go through all the mines in the West Moreton district but I shall quote the figures for Boxflat Extended because it has the highest individual production in Queensland. In 1958 it was 17.97 tons, which rose to 29.55 tons in 1961. At the coal face it has risen from 5.76 to 7.52 tons. At the Bonnie Dundee mine it has risen from 7.72 to 7.00 tons.

Let me move on to Collinsville and Scottville because that is what the hon. member for Bowen is very anxious to hear. Again I have nothing to fear from quoting the figures. In 1958 Collinsville was 9.98, Consolidated 9.30; in 1961 Collinsville was 25.12 and Consolidated 9.59 tons.

The hon. member wants to know the overall production. I will tell him because the working classes never lie in the presentation of a case. The figures in 1958 for Bowen are 2.06, Bowen Consolidated 2.63; in 1961 Bowen Consolidated 2.48 and Collinsville 1.93. I have nothing to hide.

Dr. Delamothe: Give us something new. You are wasting time.

Mr. DONALD: If the hon. member did not waste time the other night I do not know what he did!

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DONALD: The overall is a little bit in favour of Consolidated. I shall say why, but not just now. It is .42 in 1959 and .55 in 1961. Going to Bowen Consolidated open cut, we find that the open-cut production per man is not as high as the output of underground miners at Collinsville. The figures are 14.84 and 22.03.

I want to emphasise these figures because of the never-ceasing propaganda that tries to impress upon the people of Australia that the miners are always on strike. I am referring to a table that sets out the time lost at Queensland collieries through various causes. In 1960 .74 was the percentage lost through industrial disputes. The percentage for sickness was 6.65, with a percentage of 1.88 for absenteeism, and .06 for other causes. That is the position in Queensland. On the Bowen field, which shows the best figures in Queensland for the percentage of time lost in industrial disputes, the following are the figures—

195928
196024
1961	8.99

The figures are not necessarily due to Collinsville because there were just as many disputes at Bowen Consolidated, and more at the open-cut mine. The figures for sickness for the same three years are—

1959	6.37
1960	5.84
1961	5.7

The figures for absenteeism were 2.55, 2.45 and 2.55 respectively. They are official figures from the Queensland Coal Board and the accusation that Collinsville people indulged in strikes more than anybody else did is not substantiated by them. On the contrary, they have a better record than any of the others.

Now, I should like to deal with the open-cut. What is the record of Bowen Consolidated Open-Cut, a privately-operated mine? Hon. members should note that they did not sell their mine. Their figure last year was 8.32 for days that could have been worked but were lost through industrial disputes. One does not hear anything about that. Why should we continue to harp on losses through industrial disputes at Collinsville mine?

Dr. Delamothe: You are the only one who has mentioned those.

Mr. DONALD: I am the only one who is telling the truth. Any hon. member could get those figures.

Should any hon. member still feel unconvinced, allow me to draw his attention to the report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into certain matters relating to the State Coal Mine, Collinsville. The Commissioners were the Honourable J. A. Sheehy, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Queensland, Chairman, Septimus Flowers, Esq., District Mining Engineer, Newcastle, of the Joint Coal Board of New South Wales, Walter Scott, Esq., Governing Director, W. D. Scott & Co. Pty. Ltd., Management Consultants throughout Australia and New Zealand.

The terms of reference of this inquiry were, as hon. members know, extraordinarily wide involving inquiry not only into all aspects of the disaster but also the history of mechanisation of the mine, the success or otherwise of the mine under mechanisation, and as to whether mechanisation should be discontinued or not. Further, the members of the Commission were required to investigate the future of the mine from the angle of safety, health and protection of the miners and also from the economic angle, as to whether the mine should be discontinued in the public interest.

The Commission heard evidence on 79 sitting days, 13 in Bowen and 66 in Brisbane. Eight days were occupied in hearing addresses. Thirty-two witnesses were examined before the Commission and 191 exhibits were tendered. Some idea of the cost of the Commission may be derived from the legal expenses provided by the Government to the then Superintendent of State Coal Mines and another official of the mine. They were close to £10,000. That is what it cost the Government to provide these gentlemen with the services of leading legal men.

Just what the total cost of the Commission was, I do not know, but I do know

that it cost the Queensland District of the Miners' Federation a pretty sum of money in legal expenses.

As the personnel of the Commission was both talented and experienced in law, production and management, some notice must be taken of their findings. If this is done, it will be found that the position at Collinsville, prior to the closing of the mine, was not nearly as bad as it was painted.

The Annual Reports of the Queensland Coal Board have shown that the production and industrial record of the Collinsville mine workers compared more than favourably with that of mine workers throughout the State of Queensland. The report of the Royal Commission also reveals this satisfactory state of affairs.

In dealing with the price factors, the Commission expressed the obvious view that the success of any mine is equally dependent upon the price it receives for its product as it is on production and the cost to produce.

On page 106 of the Commission's Report there are two tables and some very interesting information that I intend to quote in a minute or two.

Mr. McCarthy, Secretary, Queensland Coal Board, was asked whether interest was an allowable item in calculating the cost of production. He replied that it was not allowed. Had it been allowed, and had the State mine received the same price for its coal as the neighbouring Bowen Consolidated company did, it is doubtful if any losses would have occurred.

Many hon. members will be astonished to learn that the price received by the management of the Collinsville mine was lower than that received by the Bowen Consolidated mine and, at one period, it was as much as 5s. 8d. per ton lower than that paid to Bowen Consolidated. The critics of the State mine at Collinsville no doubt will be flabbergasted and disappointed to hear this. This is what the Commission said on page 104 of its report—

"Prices received by the Collinsville State Coal Mine have always been controlled and an understanding of the method of that control is inseparable from any examination of the financial results and position."

On page 105 the Commission said—

"The Board has obtained from various sources details of the selling prices of coal operating at the State Mine, Collinsville, and at the privately-owned mine on the Bowen Field from 1943 to date, and these details, together with brief reasons for fluctuations, are set out in the schedule attached hereto. I think it is summed up in the schedule. It will be noted from this schedule that whereas until October, 1948, the State Mine prices were similar to those of the Consolidated Mine, from

that date until January, 1951, the State Mine prices lagged behind those of the private mine, the difference at one period being as high as 5s. 8d. per ton."

The Railway Department received a discount of 5 per cent. on all the coal it bought from the Collinsville State Mine. The following passage from the report is of interest—

Period	State Mine Price compared with Bowen Consolidated Price	Approximate Tonnage Produced by State Mine
	<i>s. d.</i>	
1-11-48 to 7-11-48 ..	-1 7	23,242
8-11-48 to 30-11-48 ..	-2 5	15,438
1-12-48 to 31-5-49 ..	-0 1	82,594
22-7-49 to 13-11-49 ..	-1 2	41,767
14-11-49 to 31-12-49 ..	-5 8	15,448
1-1-50 to 30-6-50 ..	-2 11	69,651
1-7-50 to 7-1-51 ..	-2 5	61,238

The Commission went on to say—

"In approaching the problem of the effect upon the financial results of the State Mine played by prices and pricing procedures, it is suggested that the first step is to ascertain what additional amounts would have been necessary each year in order to allow the mine to break even. These results are best obtained by a listing of the cost of production on the one hand and the average selling price on the other."

On three or four occasions, between 1941 and 1953, if the Collinsville mine had been able to charge what the Coal Board allows every other mine to charge, that is, 2s. in excess of production cost, it would have shown a profit in all those years.

The report continues—

"The losses sustained by the mine over a period of years are thus, it is believed, seen in better perspective. It must be remembered that the State Mine prices substantially lagged behind those of Bowen Consolidated in the years 1949, 1950 and 1951. If the State Mine had received even the same prices as those given to Bowen Consolidated during those years, the loss in 1949 would have been almost eliminated and those of 1950 and 1951 greatly reduced."

Dr. Delamothe: That is a shocking indictment of your own Government.

Mr. DONALD: I am putting up a case for the miners who were slandered by the hon. member.

Dr. Delamothe: It is a shocking indictment of your own Government.

Mr. DONALD: I do not think the hon. member is in his right seat.

Dr. Delamothe interjected.

Mr. DONALD: Are you going to deal with him, Mr. Taylor?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will please proceed with his speech.

Mr. DONALD: The report continues—

"We were informed that, as from 10th January, 1955, a special price adjustment was made 'in the interests of Bowen Consolidated Mines, 3s. 3d. per ton being added for this purpose.'"

Mr. Evans: That was done by your Government.

Mr. DONALD: I am not speaking about the Government. I am putting up a case for the miners.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have been very patient in listening to the cross-firing between hon. members while the hon. member has been endeavouring to make his speech. The hon. member for Bowen has already had an opportunity of making his speech and now the hon. member for Ipswich East is replying to him. I should be very grateful if all hon. members would allow him to proceed without interruption. Even though they may disagree with what he says, they should allow him to proceed in a reasonable way.

Mr. DONALD: I wish to let hon. members know that this is not my opinion, but the opinion of three very eminent gentlemen who inquired into this business. So that no-one may say that what I am saying is biased I am taking very great care to quote from the official report of the Commission. The report continues—

"We were informed that, as and from 10th January, 1955, a special price adjustment was made 'in the interests of Bowen Consolidated Mines, 3s. 3d. per ton being added for this purpose.'"

If that 3s. 3d. had been added to the State Coal Mine price the mine would not have made a loss. The report continues—

"As far as the State Mine is concerned, it appears to obtain an increase only if, as and when, Bowen Consolidated gets one. It is at least questionable as to whether this is a desirable procedure.

"The problem, however, goes much deeper than that. The policy of the Queensland Coal Board in arriving at a price was to take the results for the previous year and, in the light of the cost of production for that year, adjust the selling price for the then current year accordingly. This had the effect of the mine almost always running at a loss in a period of rising costs. The reverse would be true if costs were continually falling, but no such happening was at all likely, nor did it at any time occur.

"The importance of this is best seen by an analysis of the results which would

have transpired if the price of the following year had been operating in the previous year. These projected results are given since 1948 as under:—

Before I give the figures let me say that private enterprise does not wait for the following year before it puts up its prices. As soon as there is a rise in the cost of production, the price of the article is increased, but the Collinsville Mine had to wait for a year for an increase in the price of coal. The following table shows the results—

"Year	Result for	Projected
	Year.	Result.
	Loss	Profit
	£	£
1948 ..	7,262	19,264
1949 ..	5,157	25,944
1950 ..	36,224	9,235
1951 ..	25,908	41,502
1952 ..	4,635	30,251"

That table is followed with this statement in the report—

"Indeed, no clear financial figure is possible without it. In the five years shown—1948 to 1952 inclusive—the results showed a total loss of £79,186, as against, after the price adjustment indicated, a profit of £126,196—truly a remarkable margin within which to allow for price rises given at the time higher costs were involved."

That is just another indication of the burden that the State coal miners at Collinsville had to carry. The report continues—

"Nor is this the only factor involved. Mr. McCarthy was asked whether interest was an allowable item in calculating the cost of production. He replied that it was not allowed.

"According to the accounts of the two mines, it would appear that Bowen Consolidated made a profit on eleven occasions and a loss on two, whilst the State Mine figures were a profit on four and a loss on nine occasions.

"The Bowen Consolidated accounts, however, include some items which require adjustment as, for example, the fact that a Government subsidy was received on four occasions."

The Government subsidised the private mine at Scottville but never at any time did they subsidise their own mine, yet members of the Government have the hide to trot out the balance sheet of the Bowen Consolidated Mine to show how it has done ever so much better than the Collinsville mine. The report continues—

"Before a true picture can be obtained, therefore, certain items should be adjusted. In the case of the State Mine, Interest (which may or may not appear in the Bowen Consolidated accounts but which is not separately shown and is unlikely to be treated in the same way as in the State Mine accounts) and in the case of Bowen

Consolidated, provision for Income Tax, Government Subsidy, and Surplus on Sale of Investments, all require adjustment. (Directors' Fees and Dividends and Sundries are left in as they are small and any apportionment may be difficult)."

"After adjusting the two sets of accounts (including interest for the State Mine), the position would be—

Bowen State Mine ..	Profit £17,612
Bowen Consolidated	Profit £1,196"

The report goes on—

"Before proceeding to other matters, one further analysis is necessary. Reference was made by Mr. E. McCarthy to the discount of five per cent., given by the State Mine on all coal used by the Railways. Figures showing these deliveries are not available for the whole period but it is quite evident that, if the discount was given over the years from 1941, the discount of five per cent. allowed to the Railways by the Mine has amounted to a considerable sum and should really be taken into account in any endeavour to arrive at the true Profit and Loss position of the State Mine. It may perhaps be argued that it was not unreasonable for a customer as big and as consistent as the Railways to be entitled to some special discount. It should be remembered, however, that the Railways were in any case buying the coal at considerably cheaper prices than would have operated if they had had to buy Callide or Blair Athol coal and transport same to North Queensland. We are not indicating that the discount should not be given but we do suggest that, in any assessment of the financial results of the mine the discount should be taken into account.

It must be remembered that the aim of the Queensland Coal Board was to adopt a pricing policy sufficient to give a profit of 2s. a ton.

At the outset, it should be remembered that a discount of five per cent. to the Railways, at least from 1951 onwards, would have represented 2s. per ton which would wipe out on coal supplied to the Railways the 2s. profit to which reference was made by the Secretary of the Queensland Coal Board."

It goes on—

"It is safe to say that the State Mine would, on these prices have shown a most handsome financial result."

The hon. member for Bowen was very anxious to prove that the overall production of the Collinsville State Coal Mine was lower than that of Scottville. The report has this to say—

"It is admitted that the surface workers at the State Mine could be expected to be greater than at Consolidated. In the first place, the State Mine looks after the town's electricity; secondly, it carries on a certain

amount of outside work. In the years 1947-1948 to 1951-1952, for example, the work performed at the workshops at the State Coal Mine for other State undertakings, or for private organisations or individuals, is shown hereunder—

	1947-48	1948-49	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52
	£	£	£	£	£
Total Wages paid workshop staff	9,380	11,345	11,369	12,543	13,211
Wages charges for "outside" work	682	967	1,265	520	1,924
Percentage	7.2%	8.5%	11.1%	4.1%	14.5%

As is well known, the Collinsville State mine had men working on the surface who would not have been employed by private enterprise. When a man was injured below to such an extent that he could not hew coal or be employed underground a job was found for him on the surface. Every man thus appointed added to the reduction of overall output per man shift of the colliery.

Again, the Collinsville State mine carried an army of officials and clerks that the Bowen Consolidated was not required to carry.

That is the position and I think it explodes any objections to being a little over half-a-ton under sometimes.

On the economic position this is the finding of the Commission—

"Irrespective of the domestic results secured year by year by the State mine, and apart altogether from what adjustments could be well made to the published figures in order to arrive at a realistic appraisal of the results achieved, there can be little doubt that, on the evidence submitted, the State mine has endeavoured to fulfil a very real and important need in North Queensland, and upon a basis of economics has, in our view, completely justified its existence."

This series of questions was put to Mr. McCarthy—

"So that we can get it quite clearly in evidence, you have already indicated that the landed price at Townsville in the case of this average Townsville consumer which you nominated—the landed price at Townsville of Callide coal would be £7 16s. 10d. and Blair Athol £9 4s. 0d., while the Bowen Underground price would be £5 7s. 8d. Now, I take it that, leaving other factors out of account, if there are other factors, and we will come to that in a minute, it would be feasible to say that if the State mine had produced 150,000 tons in a year, which had gone to this Townsville consumer, the economic advantage to North Queensland could be arrived at by taking the number of tons—150,000 tons—and multiplying by, shall we say £2 9s. 2d., in the case of Callide—if this arithmetic is correct—and £3 16s. 4d. in the case of Blair Athol? If they were the differentials and the tonnage supplied to Townsville, say, 150,000 tons—assuming that the arithmetic was right—if that sum came to £360,000 in the case of Callide

And remember always, when making these comparisons, that at no time did the increase at Bowen Consolidated to any great extent exceed half a ton more than the Collinsville State Mine. But what do we find? These are the figures—

coal and £560,000 in the case of Blair Athol, would you say that we would be justified in assuming that this mine had made an economic contribution to North Queensland in that year to the extent of this, say, £360,000 and £560,000, according to whether Callide or Blair Athol coal had been used? Now, is that a fair statement, leaving out the actual arithmetic of the statement? Is that a fair statement that we might make?"

Mr. McCarthy replied—

"In my opinion, it is a reasonable assumption that the consumers of North Queensland have been saved that amount of money. There are certain factors that are associated with it and a large proportion of that extra cost is entailed in railway freight. It is not all money that is being paid for the coal, and in turn that has always created a matter of difficulty on the part of the Railway Department—that hauling coal from the Central Division. But putting those factors aside, I think it would be reasonable to say that the economic position of North Queensland would be improved to the extent of the sum that you arrive at."

What is their finding in regard to public interest? They say—

"There is no doubt that the Collinsville State Coal Mine has contributed greatly to the development of North Queensland. For example it has—

(a) Developed the coal resources of the State.

(b) Helped to develop North Queensland industries by making coal available at reasonable price.

(c) Obviated extra strain on the Railways by minimising haulage of coal.

(d) Saved the State and/or North Queensland consumers large sums of money by the development of coal resources close to points of usage.

(e) Given employment to anywhere between 200 and 400 men over a long period of years."

What is the condition of the sale of the mine? The report says—

"To determine the effect of closure of the State Mine upon employees, it is necessary to consider what consequential changes there would be in the lives and

conditions of those employees. If, for example, it was decided to lease the State Mine and the employees were required as at present, the only difference being that their employer would be the lessee instead of the Government, presumably no difficulty would ensue. There would, of course, be some hardship accrue to some if the lessee required less employees than are engaged at the present time. There would, however, seemingly be two safeguards here. The first would be that the mine employment being already fairly low, it is unlikely that there would be anything much in the way of dismissals. Secondly, it is conceivable that the State Government may be prepared to make it a condition of any lease that dismissals be not allowed for any other than stipulated reasons, at least for a stated period.

"These conditions could also apply in the event of a sale of the mine to private interests."

That has not been done. The Royal Commission said that if the mine were sold, the Government should see that the interests of the employees were safeguarded. As I said in moving the motion for the disallowance of the Order in Council, they have thrown the employees at Collinsville to the wolves instead of safeguarding them.

What do we find? Davis Contractors Ltd. have not brought the mine into production, and it looks as if they do not want to produce. What do they want? They want to get back to the days when the employer could employ whom he liked and victimise a man who had the courage to stand up for his rights. I can visualise, without any imagination, the attitude of the Minister for Mines. I do not think that he wants to see anyone at Collinsville victimised. Because the Government have refused to take an interest in the welfare of their former employees, I am sorry to say that the miners at Collinsville and their families are being victimised today, perhaps out of sheer spleen.

Time does not permit me to refer to many other factors to prove our contention that there is no justification for the sale of the State coal mine at Collinsville on the excuses advanced by the Government of financial losses and industrial unrest.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HOUGHTON (Redcliffe) (3.10 p.m.): At this stage I should like to express my appreciation of the difficulty with which the Treasurer has been confronted in the framing of his Budget, because of the prolonged drought experienced in Queensland. Added to that has been the industrial dispute at Mt. Isa Mines. I hope that wise counsel will prevail so that a satisfactory conclusion may be reached to the benefit of all parties, one that will allow the development of the State to proceed as I am sure hon. members on both sides would desire.

I do not intend to attempt to deal with anything with which I am not conversant but I shall take the opportunity to express a few thoughts about the departments that I know something about. My remarks will be confined mainly to the Valuer-General's Department and to the Minister responsible. I make my comments without any personal animosity, or personal reflection on either the officers of the department or the Minister.

The Valuation of Land Act of 1944 was introduced as, "An Act to make better provision for determining the valuation of land for rating and taxing purposes, and for matters incidental thereto or consequent thereon." Today there would not be a more contentious subject than the work of the Valuer-General's Department. The hon. member for Townsville South pointed out how vitally people are affected.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. HOUGHTON: The hon. member for South Brisbane is like a jackass.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. HOUGHTON: If you put your hat on——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will not make personal references.

Mr. HOUGHTON: As a result of the work of the Valuer-General a great deal of embarrassment has been caused both to the Government and property owners. The valuation of rural or urban land has no real relationship, nor is there any distinct relationship between land used for commercial or industrial purposes and land used for domestic purposes. In his approach to revaluations of land the Valuer-General must remember always that his valuations create a hand that reaches into the pockets of everyone. High land valuations now constitute a great hazard to the home buyer. Unimproved value, of course, is the basic factor—in other words the site value of any portion of land. In the early days of primitive life land ownership by individuals was unknown. Man lived by direct appropriation, taking what was already provided by nature. Private property consisted of weapons, ornaments and other items of a similar kind, usually made by the man himself. Barter undoubtedly existed but in those days it was hardly necessary. As the evolution of society progressed man exerted more and more control over nature. Land, for all practical purposes was there and no necessity existed for man to appropriate any particular unit of it to call his own—in other words, to exert property rights over land.

Gradually, man became less nomadic and commenced to till the soil thus entering on the first stages of agricultural pursuits in his evolution. As men attached themselves to definite areas these areas became more

and more valuable, thus bringing about conditions conducive to development and "property" in land.

In the days of King John and the Magna Carta all land belonged to the king, or, in other words, to the public domain. It was public or Royal property. When we refer to real estate, most of us do not know what it means. It is not because other property was not real, or was unreal or imaginary, but because it was Royal estate, "royal" being the early spelling for "real".

So, we approach the early use of the word "title" that we know today as "title of land". It is usually thought of in terms of a grazing homestead, a grazing lease, a perpetual lease or some other form of lease. In effect, the main object is to have security of title so far as the laws of society or of the country will permit, and there does not appear to be a clear or inalienable right to land whilst there is a law that allows compulsory acquisition or resumption. That applies today specifically in regard to the acquisition of land by resumption.

Nevertheless, in the great majority of Crown lands, title in fee simple cannot be enjoyed by many. The proportion in this category is very small, there being only 6 per cent. to 8 per cent. of freehold as against all other titles, such as mining leases and others.

It will thus be seen that the Crown is the greatest holder of land in this State.

Reverting to the original use of the word "title", it relates very closely to nobility and a title bestowed by the King. He granted the noble title hand in hand with the title to land. Today we have progressed to the point where, under the transfer system certain owners are granted a certificate of title which proclaims to all and sundry that they are the owners in fee simple of the land described in the deed or title. In tracing the evolution of property we trace the evolution of society. History does not reveal when valuers or land agents became prominent in the field of real estate. We do know, however, that auctioneers, for example, were in existence in the days of Babylon. The customs of those days when competition and bidding were very keen would make it safe to assume that there must have been valuers.

We are very interested in all aspects of valuation, and must approach the problem with a clear mind. Valuers, both private practitioners and Government valuers, must accept a heavy burden of responsibility, as their work is very important in our society and affects our everyday life. There is no room for platitudes or loose thinking in any consideration of the subject.

In the domestic field the land-owner has no opportunity of passing on additional costs. We find at present that rates are struck invariably by local authorities on the value of the land, the rate in the £1 being assessed to meet

the budget for progressive development and maintenance of services. It is often claimed that the value of land has no relationship to rates, that any increase in valuation is followed by a corresponding reduction in the rate percentage. But what happens is that all local authorities take advantage of the opportunity provided by increased valuations to increase their revenue.

Mr. Sherrington: That is what you do at Redcliffe.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I referred to all local authorities. My remark was applicable to local authorities generally, even in the hon. member's local area. Even if ratepayers have not felt the sting this year, they will next year. The opportunity is available to local authorities, and I suppose Redcliffe and other local authorities will take advantage of the opportunity. If the rate is 1s. in the £1 and the capital value of the land is increased by such an extent that the same revenue could be obtained by fixing a rate of 6d. in the £1, the local authority invariably sets the rate at 7d. or 8d.

That is the problem confronting the home-owner today. He has no opportunity of passing on his added costs. Industrialists or owners of land used for commercial purposes can pass onto the consumer the increase in costs, by way of an increase in the price of the goods or commodity. Consequently the impact of an increase in rates is not felt by the industrialist to the extent that it is felt by the property-owner who may be on a fixed income. He may be a pensioner. There are many such places in Queensland such as Redcliffe. There we had the first white settlement and consequently wide development has followed. People on fixed incomes, pensioners, and even the battler or poor old labourer find great difficulty in meeting extra costs. Steep increases in rates can ruin such a person, and the Government must watch that aspect very closely. That is one which is of grave concern to everybody.

Mr. Walsh: What is the alternative?

Mr. HOUGHTON: If the hon. member will sit and wait I will give him my opinions. Whether they are right, or acceptable to him, I do not know. I am submitting these matters for the consideration of the Committee and we will just have to wait and see if they are of any benefit.

The Valuer-General's valuation must undoubtedly be based on the existing amenities. That is the point. We know that there are areas that have more amenities than others. The Valuer-General from time to time will say that his valuers do not determine values specifically on the amenities within an area. There is another point that must be remembered. One owner can reside comfortably on 16 perches, yet the owner next door needs 32 perches and is caught in the undertow. The first valuation could be £500, and a comparable valuation for the

property next door, with an area of 32 perches, could be £1,000 or thereabouts. A slight reduction might be made for the two parcels taken together. If the rates are determined on the overall value of £1,000, a person who is already contributing to the development of the area is paying for double services. The person on 16 perches gets all the amenities provided in the city of Brisbane, and if he lives at Spring Hill he may have extra amenities provided by the local authority. I wish to bring these matters to the attention of the Committee now and so tie them in with a formula to overcome the problem.

Undoubtedly, many people will say, "Who makes the valuations?" That is an easy question to answer. It is the person who wants or needs the land and is prepared to pay a price for it. It is ridiculous to apply the sentence quoted by a member of the Government committee investigating the Act, "Land valuations have been based in this and other States on what a willing seller is prepared to accept and what a prudent buyer is prepared to offer." After all, what is a prudent buyer? If such a person exists today, he would be landless. He would not be able to obtain a parcel of land. A man wanting land must pay the price demanded for it, or go without. In all areas of closer settlement, with amenities, the price is fixed by the seller and, if the seller wishes to change his equity by buying in another area, he must obtain the price for his land to enable him to do so. Can we then accept the principle outlined as a basis for valuation, as it concerns the populated areas? If we do, how would the prudent person fare on a market of supply and demand?

Mr. Gaven: They are the Valuer-General's words.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I am not worried about what he says. I am saying what I believe, and it is up to him whether he agrees or not.

Speculative buying must affect the price as a middle-man is now in the picture, so we must discount such sales as a basis for valuation. It therefore all boils down to the basis used by the valuer who has his feet on the ground. He can estimate the cost of converting the unimproved land into a condition suitable for home building or, if certain improvements have added value to the land, there must then be an estimated cost of such to be deducted, if we are to have a true unimproved value, or site value.

We return to the point—what basis did the valuer use?

Mr. Walsh: The basis under the Act.

Mr. HOUGHTON: That is so. He works specifically within the Act. If he follows the intentions of the authors and blindly revalues land every three or five years, irrespective of where he is going, the Valuer-General cannot be blamed. If the Act

is outmoded and completely unrealistic, let us have it amended. If the Valuer-General determines the valuation of a block of land as £1,000 unimproved value in 1961, it is hard to predict what it will be in 1971 if the same basis of valuation is to be continued in the future.

The cost of homes today is conservatively based on an increase of 400 per cent. on the 1942 valuations and with the basic wage increase at 350 per cent. and all other costs merging into 300 per cent. to 400 per cent., is it not time that a halt was called to the upgrading in values and prices of dirt or a block of land for a home?

The Government attempt to lift the exemption from land tax so as to take home-owners outside the field. Last year when the matter was brought before the Assembly I strongly protested about the Valuer-General's formula of valuation at the time. That in itself was conclusive proof that the Valuer-General's valuation was not acceptable to the Government. So a formula was adopted to try to pacify some of the people grossly affected by those valuations. Some received consideration; others did not. That is proof that the valuation as determined was not correct or that the Government of the day did not consider it to be correct, and I concur in that. Had the Government been sincere, all valuations for the last five years, including those of the city of Redcliffe, would have been included in the formula adopted, not just those that were specifically incorporated in the valuation arrived at, say, 12 months before.

If the value of land has no relationship to rates, as was claimed by local authorities, as rates are paid on the gross value of rateable land at a figure in the pound struck to meet budget requirements, why all the heartburning and fuss about the costs to the people in creating values on a false basis of reasoning? That is the crux of the matter.

Let us have equitable valuations so that everyone pays his just share of rates and taxes. Today and for the past few years rapid changes have taken place by extensive development, which has again brought about a position which urgently calls for a review of methods of valuation and truly calls for the science of valuation and not valuation by regulation.

The Department of the Valuer-General comes specifically under the Minister for Public Works and Local Government. I do not doubt the honesty and integrity of the Minister or of the Valuer-General but, in the interests of the welfare of the State, the department should be taken away from the Minister and put under the guidance of another in a department that has no direct relation to matters of vital importance to the development of the State. After all,

the Minister is responsible not only for valuations but also for local authorities, to whom valuations are of vital importance.

Mr. Richter: Which department would you tie it to?

Mr. HOUGHTON: I shall come to that in a moment. I should say that under no consideration should it be tied to the Department of Public Lands. That department has its own valuers operating throughout the State and they frequently are in conflict with the Valuer-General's valuers. In my opinion, the Valuer-General should be supreme. He should not be under the control of the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation or the Minister for Public Works and Local Government. The Premier should be the only Minister having jurisdiction over him, and there should be no ministerial interference with his decisions. They should be final. Any valuation determined by the Valuer-General's department should be binding on the Government for probate and succession duties or for any other purpose. If the Government adopted my suggestion, the public would be treated fairly and the Valuer-General would not be under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Public Works and Local Government. I believe that the Valuer-General should submit a report to Parliament like the heads of other Government departments do.

Mr. Aikens: In what way does the Minister control him now?

Mr. HOUGHTON: I do not know, but he has the right to control him. If there is a dispute about a valuation, the Minister has the right to appoint another officer to determine matters coming under the jurisdiction of the Valuer-General that may be of importance to local authorities.

The Valuer-General usually revalues land every three to five years, and he is not called upon at any time to present an authority for doing that.

Mr. Walsh: Obviously he gets his authority under the Act.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I take it that what the hon. member for Bundaberg says is correct, and that he gets his authority under the Act. However, I think that land-owners should have the same rights as the Valuer-General. A land-owner is given 42 days in which to lodge an objection or an appeal. If justice is to prevail and we are to have uniformity, the conditions should be equal for all parties. The Valuer-General should be bound by the period of 42 days also. The land-owner should have the right of appeal to a relevant appeal court. The Valuer-General does not have to face up to any limitation. Unless a land-owner is successful in getting his valuation reduced by a certain percentage he has to bear the costs. In order to get justice he has to have a very deep pocket. The Act should be amended to give the appeal court full discretion in the awarding of costs.

I should like to state a specific case in which the right of appeal is denied, and this is of vital concern to the ratepayers of the Redcliffe area. Some time ago a parcel of land in that area was subdivided. A plan was presented to the Redcliffe City Council for approval. On the advice of the engineering department and the works committee it was rejected because we were of the opinion that certain drainage works were necessary. However, the person concerned was not prepared to provide the necessary drainage estimated to cost £600, even though the land had been purchased by him at the nominal price of £1,800, and his total outlay had been recouped already by the sale of a couple of blocks of land. He appealed to the Minister who in turn appointed an officer to determine the issue. I cast no reflection on the person appointed, but he was in the employ of the Government. That officer gave a ruling binding on the Council, that there was no necessity to put in the drainage works. With the first heavy fall of rain the run-off from that parcel of land was responsible for great damage to adjoining properties. Although the person appointed by the Minister said there was no necessity for the owner of the land to put in the drainage the Council face the liability of £600 or £700 to complete it. Had we had an opportunity to appeal, undoubtedly we should have done so. Time has proved us to be right. We have written to the person concerned, and to the department asking where we go from here. We are still awaiting a reply to that letter. It is a situation that is confronting many local authorities today.

Another case concerns two adjoining parcels of land of equal size, with the same type of soil, one facing the waterfront and the other facing the street to the rear. The person who appealed to the court for a determination has been advised that the ratio of the value of the front parcel to the value of the rear parcel is two to one, therefore, the front parcel of land is valued at £1,000 and the rear parcel at £500. When a court makes a decision it is binding on everybody, but the Valuer-General has the authority to say, "There will be a further valuation in five years' time and that will overcome any adverse decision so far as I am concerned." The property-owner is consequently faced with the same costs again in five years' time in going to court and obtaining a true valuation of the same property.

I have touched on several matters about which I feel strongly but the most important, of course, is that of rating. Virtually all local authorities in the State today, if not bankrupt, are next-door to it and the imposition of rates on property-owners has reached such staggering proportions that they are, in many cases, unable to carry the load. I have a solution that I think might overcome the problem and I should like to submit it to hon. members. I assume, for argument sake, that the capital value of the land in a local authority is £2,000,000 and that the rate for the area is

1s. in the £1, the revenue from which is £100,000. The Council in its wisdom, or otherwise, might draw up a works programme costing another £20,000, thereby increasing their budgetary responsibility to £120,000. I assume again that properties in the ratable area, enjoying the privileges, rights and amenities provided, number 10,000.

If the rate is established at a flat £10 for each property each owner would be faced with an initial basic cost of £10. The Valuer-General may have valued one piece of land at £500 and another at £1,000. The Council have 10,000 properties rated basically at £10 each, giving them their basic revenue of £100,000. To find the additional £20,000 for Budget purposes it could be portioned out in proportion to the capital values determined by the Valuer-General. Taking again the two properties valued by the Valuer-General at £500 and £1,000 respectively, each property owner is faced with the basic rate of £10, to which could be added 3d. in the £1 on the Valuer-General's valuation in order to meet the extra £20,000. That is to say, the property valued at £500 would attract an extra 500 threepences over and above the basic rate of £10, while that valued at £1,000 would attract an extra 1,000 threepences over and above the basic £10. I feel that that would be an equitable way of attaching rates to properties and would not prove to be a hardship for pensioners.

With commercial and industrial sites the additional impost could be easily absorbed and, if the local authority so desired, such areas could be zoned or classified to overcome any problem that might arise.

The time has arrived when, unless some action is taken to face this problem, many property-owners, particularly pensioners, will be driven off their properties. I do not know where they will go after they reach far-western parts of the State. I have no doubt that public servants could work out a scheme along the lines I suggest. It would be very beneficial and effective. Such a formula would be equitable and I ask the Government to consider it seriously. I think there should be a basic rate and that for the extra revenue to meet the Budget the rate should be according to the Valuer-General's determination.

Another suggestion I make is that we get away from the present method of determining the unimproved value. A site value should be taken. I could give many instances in Queensland to illustrate my point. One is the Rankin Estate at Southport, near the Jubilee Bridge. Years ago it was a mangrove swamp. It was filled and the area has been brought up to a very high standard. The Valuer-General's valuation of each block might be, say, £300, compared with £400 for a block where no filling has been done. I suggest a time limit should be set so that those unseen improvements are not taken into account in perpetuity.

Mr. Walsh: Invisible improvements.

Mr. HOUGHTON: That is so, invisible improvements. For residential areas I suggest a limit of 15 years. If the owner sells his land, I suggest that it should then be automatically placed on a normal rating basis. That would eliminate the effect of invisible improvements in the valuation of the particular parcel of land.

In many places, including Redcliffe, concessions for invisible improvements have been enjoyed by three or four different owners. If somebody has capitalised on the improvements, the land should be placed on the same basis as other land for valuation purposes.

Mr. Hughes: That does not overcome the anomaly of a variation in values as between the land of a permanent homeowner and the block next door owned by a speculator.

Mr. HOUGHTON: If my suggestion was adopted, it would, because the speculator would benefit only once, and if the buyer remained on his land for 15 years the invisible improvements would be absorbed and the land could then be treated normally for valuation purposes.

Mr. Walsh: Your argument is that the expenditure is recouped over that period?

Mr. HOUGHTON: Yes. The problem is a little more difficult when we are dealing with rural land. I think a greater period should be set for rural land. A man improves his property, by ringbarking, draining or other invisible improvements. The Valuer-General does not pay any heed to it. The more he improves his land the greater is the hardship for the owner.

Time should be allowed for the basic principles of rural-development valuation to be absorbed. Many factors affect valuation in rural areas such as underground drains. If there is any doubt about invisible improvements the land holder can be called upon to submit an accurate record to be used by the Valuer-General in making his valuation.

I come now to another important matter, the qualifications of valuers. It has been commented upon in the Press from time to time. It is most important that people engaged in this profession should be fully conversant with all conditions, that they should be fully qualified to undertake this important work. There should be a register of all valuers who are competent and capable of determining values. I am an approved valuer but I am not permitted to make valuations in Brisbane. If a prudent valuer makes a valuation outside his area he determines it on the basic information supplied to him by a person fully aware of the values in the area. I could not accurately determine valuations say in the Cooktown area because I would not be fully conversant with the valuations there. I may have a

rough idea about them, but the people in the area would know more about them than say a person from the Valuer-General's Department. Let us be realistic. If the Valuer-General sends a valuer from Brisbane to Cooktown and he is a prudent valuer, he should be sure that he is fully informed of all relevant details before he determines the value of any parcel of land there.

Mr. Walsh: He must do that, because his value stands the test in the Land Appeal Court.

Mr. HOUGHTON: The hon. member may say that, but we all know how they stood up to the last tests. I will leave that to the Committee to judge.

Mr. Walsh: That was only one of thousands.

Mr. HOUGHTON: When I say that, I am not saying anything derogatory of the person who carried out the valuation.

If the Valuer-General is charged with the responsibility of valuing a whole area, it might be a different matter, but valuers are sent all over the place. Valuers are sent from Brisbane to other parts of the State, and they can value only on the information given to them on arrival.

Mr. Walsh: You would do the same thing if you went to Bundaberg.

Mr. HOUGHTON: The same principle applies.

He formulates his value on the basic factors and determines the value of a parcel of land without considering all the relevant factors.

Mr. Hilton: Are not average sales a big factor in determining valuations?

Mr. HOUGHTON: Up to a point.

I trust that the Minister will give serious consideration to what I have suggested because the matter is of paramount importance to everybody and the introduction of such a system as I have outlined would overcome the problem of home-owners being forced to leave a locality because of the impact of increased local authority rates on land valued at a high figure, say £1,000, by the Valuer-General. The valuation of land for business or commercial use is a horse of a different colour.

I feel keenly about the present situation and I hope the Minister will study my suggestions or have his departmental officers go through them. Certainly it is vital to have the Valuer-General removed from Ministerial instruction on valuation.

Mr. Richter: He is not instructed now.

Mr. HOUGHTON: Well, as regards any remark, it is uppermost in the minds of many people that the Minister instructs him what to do. I say without fear of contradiction that I think the officers of the Department of the Valuer-General are very

sincere and very approachable and prepared to carry out their role honestly. I intend no reflection on the Valuer-General or on the Minister in charge of the department.

Let me give an illustration from my own area of the sort of thing I want to draw the Committee's attention to. The year before last the Valuer-General determined the valuation of one parcel of land for rating purposes at £100. We sought to acquire the land for drainage purposes and, in fairness to the owner, we asked the Valuer-General to value it for resumption purposes and his figure was £1,100. So he valued it at £100 for rating purposes and £1,100 for resumption purposes. I should say that the true value of the site is £1,100. That is the difficulty that confronts us. It should be possible to adopt a formula to iron out all these problems, and, instead of having one property owner enjoying the advantage of such a low valuation for rating purposes as against a high one for resumption, his block would attract such a valuation that he would pay his full and fair share for any other development of the area over and above the requirements of the local authority's budget.

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) (4.4 p.m.): The financial and other statements by the Treasurer are among the most apologetic and dreary ever to come from the Government benches. The issue that brought about the tragic state of affairs that led to this Government's taking office had no relation to any talents of this Government or the parties comprising it. As a matter of fact, the Government could very easily and very properly be described as an accidental government, and it was a bad accident for Queensland when they were elected. They have no talent and no merit; nor have they developed any ability. It could be truthfully said that in their few years of office they have deteriorated with experience. They obtained office only by intrigue and by negotiating with people who were prepared to desert the Australian Labour Party and assist them.

They also made a great many promises, and perhaps this induced a few people to vote for them. The only promise they kept faithfully was the promise that they would look after anybody who helped them to defeat the Australian Labour Party by deserting it. To the credit—or discredit—of the Premier and his colleagues, they have honoured that promise to the hilt, even though they may have done so at the expense of the taxpayers. As I said, they have honoured no other promise, and they have treated with contempt their most faithful adherents over many years.

The section of the Government that describes itself as the Liberal Party has a very strong prejudice against country people. If it were not for country electorates, the Government would not be in power. As one moves round the country it is evident that people who have been life-long supporters of the so-called Country Party are heartily sick

of hearing promises that are never fulfilled and seeing the introduction of sectional legislation. The Liberal Party is diametrically opposed to most of the beliefs of the Country Party, but the parties have in common a hatred of the Labour Party and a contempt for those who might be described as the working classes, the useful people in the community. Those people include white-collar workers, farmers, waterside workers, miners—all those who really toil and do a useful job—and no Government have shown more contempt for them than the present regime. They should be roundly condemned for their attitude. Numerically the Country Party is stronger than the Liberal Party, but they are hopelessly outclassed in political tactics and intrigue and are really under the domination of the minority group.

The Budget that we are now debating is typical of what could be expected from such a hotch-potch crew, who have only succeeded in bringing the State into disrepute. In his four years as Treasurer, the hon. member for Chatsworth has been deficient in the accounts of the State, and he deserves the sobriquet of "Tom the Deficit Man."

His vocation in private life has been that of accountant and auditor, a guardian of business or commercial rectitude, to whom even minor irregularities would have been distasteful. Older hon. members will remember his oration on the evils of betting. I am sure the Premier will remember what he said when he was sitting beside him. He told us of all the misery and broken homes that have been brought about by betting on horse racing. Let me read from "Hansard" what he said—

"In the years I have been practising my profession as an accountant I have come across a limited number of cases of financial crashes. In some instances the man has made a complete and utter mess of his own financial affairs and in other cases there has been a bad breach of trust by an employee, in the course of which he has embezzled money, and has had to be dealt with. It is my experience that, of all the factors that can unsettle a man's life and can lead to those things, horse-racing and betting on horse-racing is by far the major one."

Dr. Noble: They tell me the worst form of gambling is the one-armed bandits in New South Wales.

Mr. BURROWS: Yes. I will come to that. The hon. gentleman will remember when that oration was delivered by the Treasurer. We were on the other side of the Chamber and he was over here. We listened to him in shame and silence. I can still recall how one hon. member stuck his hand into his pocket and pulled out a Casket ticket which he tore into ribbons as if it were a how-to-vote card of one of his opponents. The hon. member for Windsor interjected about bringing people to tears. There is

no future tense about it; it is past tense because at that time the hon. gentleman did bring us to tears. We believed in his sincerity and honesty of purpose. We had to concede that perhaps we had not done our full duty in the consideration of this great social evil that he condemned so eloquently. Little did we dream that within the course of five or six years the very man who was preaching against and condemning this evil would embrace it and use part of the proceeds from it to pay for some of the tragic mistakes his Government had made. In his Financial Statement he predicts that the State will benefit to the extent of £1,000,000 in a full year and £500,000 for the balance of this financial year. Let us see where the morality is. This is the man who was professing such a high standard of morality. I should forgive him if he were some of the other Government members who, at least, have the decency not to place themselves on a pedestal much higher than they could ever attain. As Treasurer he is prepared to take a percentage of the money that is wagered in bets. Taking the case of a bank clerk or some other trusted employee who might embezzle say, £100, we have not been told what percentage the Government intend to extract from it, but, assuming it is 5 per cent., the Treasurer will not come in for 5 per cent. of the winnings or losings over a period but for a percentage of the turnover, which anyone who has had anything to do with commerce or business affairs will know, is a much higher percentage, in the final analysis, than if only a percentage of the profits were taken.

Boiled down it simply means that 95 per cent of the £100 embezzled will go to the bookmaker and £5 to the Government and the unfortunate weakling who took it will go to gaol. If the Premier and his colleagues get any satisfaction out of that I am sure nobody on this side of the Chamber will begrudge it to them.

Mr. Walsh: For all the Trust Funds they have embezzled they should be in gaol long ago.

Mr. BURROWS: The hon. member for Bundaberg mentions Trust Funds that they have embezzled. They started off in the same way as the first 6d. embezzled under criminal law is taken. The hon. member for Windsor would know that if it was an ordinary civilian who shared in the spoils of the embezzlement he would be in the dock with the other unfortunate man who had taken the money.

Mr. Smith: I would not go as far as to say that.

Mr. BURROWS: If he was not in the dock with the embezzler he would be up as a receiver of stolen goods.

Mr. Smith: Who is he?

Mr. BURROWS: The man who took a share of the booty—the man that the hon. member's colleagues so eloquently described. But that is not enough! Another pillar of rectitude is the Minister for Justice. What a travesty—Minister for Justice!

Mr. Walsh: Minister for no justice.

Mr. BURROWS: That would be more correct. To get further funds to replace those dissipated by the Government, by their extravagant waste in many respects, we have another Minister, the Minister for Justice, to whom we looked up in private life and for whom we had the greatest respect, intending to help his colleague by introducing another Bill imposing a 50 per cent. increase in tax on the unfortunate drunk.

Dr. Noble: You voted for it.

Mr. BURROWS: I did not vote for it.

Dr. Noble: You were sitting on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. BURROWS: Let the hon. gent. not worry about that. Let us analyse the morality in it. The Minister for Health and Home Affairs is a medical man—or we hope he is—and he knows that it has been confirmed by medical opinion generally that drunkenness or alcoholism is a disease. When a man reaches that particular stage we are told that he is sick, that he has to be pitied; he is suffering from a disease. He is the man who will be paying this tax, a tax that has been more than doubled since the Government took office. I ask the Premier whether that gives him any satisfaction, even if it will allow the Treasurer to balance his Budget? Can the Government not find means of achieving that result more honourably than slugging the drunk or sharing the spoils of the embezzler? Nothing can be gained by beating about the bush or wearing the silly grin that I see on the face of one Minister. I am being factual. Government members are fortunate in not having a conscience. Anyone with scruples or morals would not be happy at the action they are taking. A great American President once said, "I would rather be honest than be President." I would rather be honest and sleeping in the Domain than be dishonest on the Government benches if that was the only way in which I could be sure of remaining there.

I have referred to the worst examples of improper and immoral taxes. Other sectional taxes imposed by them are not as immoral, nevertheless they are bad. The history of the Government reveals that of the increase in taxation since they assumed office 85 per cent. has been at the expense of primary producers and the irony of it is that they are primarily responsible for the Government's being in office. Since they came to power four years ago revenue has increased from £85,158,100 for the year prior to their election, to £108,816,921 in the last year, yet they are forced to admit that they have no likelihood of ever balancing the Budget.

The Treasurer in his apologetic and plausible manner tried to excuse the deficit, one of the main reasons, according to him, being the effects of credit control. He said—

"The effect of credit controls had its greatest impact on revenues derived from Stamp, Succession and Probate Duties."

He blamed credit control for the reduction in collections under that heading, and listed it as one of the causes of the deficit. In the year prior to the Government's taking office revenue from probate and succession duties was £2,913,723. This year it was £4,003,611. A comparison of receipts this year with receipts last year reveals an increase in virtually every item. All the principal items have shown an increase. The Premier will remember how boldly and loudly he claimed that if his Government got into power they would abolish Land tax. We find that there has been an increase of 20 per cent. in the amount collected in land tax this year compared with the year before the present Government came to office. The amount collected is more than has been collected by any previous government. All hon. members will remember the great plans that were made, or how they were going to improve things for the land owner, how Sir William Payne was to be appointed to bring down a formula to eliminate the anomalies of the man on the land. There would be no more extravagant rents, no more inconsistencies. Today, there is more discontent among landholders than ever before, under a Labour Government. What has been the relief from excessive and extortionate rents by the Premier and his colleagues? Land revenue has increased under this Government by 55 per cent.; stamp duties have jumped 60 per cent.; probate fees by 37 per cent. All those items were to be reduced by this Government. Collections from stock-owners and other primary producers have risen by 32 per cent. Those are important items of revenue in the Consolidated Revenue account, but they are only a few of the increases that industry has had to bear for the privilege of keeping an incompetent Government in office, a Government that have brazenly and impudently done this State irreparable damage over the past four years by—

Dissipating its public funds;

Aggravating industrial relations by meddlesome legislation;

Alienating its public lands;

Destroying efficiency and curtailing the activities of the Railway Department;

Attacking primary producers with savage sectional taxes;

Discouraging decentralisation and closer settlement;

Creating unemployment; and

By legislation forecast in the Financial Statement will encourage crime and vice as a means of increasing revenue.

This year the Treasurer is attacking the betting public and the unfortunate alcoholics. Someone mentioned that the Treasurer was wearing

a red carnation. To his credit, he did not have the audacity to wear a white one. By interjection, the Minister for Health and Home Affairs said that we have not introduced the poker machines, or the one-armed bandits, as they are called. If they continue in office, it will only be a matter of time before they resort to that, unless the electors realise the tragedy and incapability of the Government. If they are to continue in office they will be resorting to that and I shudder to think what other sources of revenue they will then devise.

I am sorry the hon. member for Rockhampton South is not in the Chamber. I do not want to indulge in personalities as he did in his speech when he insinuated that anyone who had not looked down the muzzle of a gun was not a hero. The parliamentarians I regard as having courage are those who will say in the Chamber what they say to their electors. I am sorry that the hon. member for Rockhampton South does not come within that category. He has attacked the proposal to establish an abattoir in Rockhampton. He took the opportunity in his oration to show that he is a real good servant of vested interests in the form of Vestey Bros., the firm that has a stranglehold on the meat industry in Central Queensland and that is holding Central Queensland back.

Mr. Ewan: You sell your fat cattle to Vesteyes.

Mr. BURROWS: If the hon. member will only be patient I will quote to him some remarks by a really genuine dyed-in-the-wool grazier.

The hon. member for Rockhampton South contradicted himself. He began by extolling the potentialities of Central Queensland for the production of beef cattle. Only last year, we remember, he was so enthusiastic about a subject that he did not know anything about that the hon. member for Fassifern, who could not stand it any longer, told him in disgust that he did not know what he was talking about. The hon. member for Rockhampton South was going to run 10 beasts to the acre under some East Street, Rockhampton, scheme of his. He made wild statements giving figures. As a matter of fact he also said—

"We are already producing 2,250,000 beef cattle annually in Central Queensland."

Of course, those figures are beyond the dreams or the imaginings of the most ambitious commonsense man in Central Queensland or in any other part of Australia. However, we will not dispute the fact that Central Queensland carries a great number of beef cattle. From calculations I have made it supplies about 250,000 head to the markets annually.

Of that 250,000, 136,189 were treated at meatworks in Central Queensland—89,685

at Rockhampton, and 46,504 at Gladstone—and many others are railed to southern markets.

If the Rockhampton people do not want an abattoir there, I should like the hon. member for Rockhampton South to know that we should be very happy to see one established in Gladstone. The closer it is to a large number of people, the better, and the ideal place for an abattoir would be at Bajool, which is 20 miles south of Rockhampton, or about half way between Rockhampton and Port Alma, a port through which they could export to the interstate market. In my opinion, the shipping of meat from Central Queensland to Sydney and Melbourne has great possibilities, and I think that will be done in the near future. If Rockhampton does not want an abattoir, I respectfully suggest that the Abattoir Board should come to Gladstone. We will welcome them with open arms. I do not want to ram my opinions and beliefs down the throats of hon. members, but these are my opinions. The hon. member for Roma said something about graziers, and he is an ex-grazier. The arguments in favour of an abattoir from the graziers' point of view have been outlined by Mr. R. S. Wilson, one of the biggest cattlemen in Central Queensland and a man who, it must be conceded, has made a great success of his calling. I shall not read all he had to say in this newspaper article, but referring to abattoirs he said—

"A district abattoir will benefit the producers of the district by making available facilities for killing on owners' account. It will create competition for available cattle by encouraging more buyers—the meat operators—into the saleyards and paddocks. More money directly to the producers means more money circulating in the district and increased prosperity and work for all.

"A service works at Rockhampton will create direct employment in the abattoir and extra employment in the establishments of additional meat exporting organisations. A step-up in the development of crop fattening will make more work available both on the land and in the town industries supplying the landholders' needs.

"Will a district abattoir increase costs to the consumer? The only authoritative answer to this is to be found in the experience of other cities—that answer is 'No'. It decreases costs, if suitably constructed and allowed to operate competitively, such as the only comparative district abattoir, which is Toowoomba."

He goes on to say—

"A public abattoir is a service works not concerned with satisfying the demands of its shareholders."

I should mention that Mr. Wilson is a very prominent member of the Country

Party. As I said, he is a man who has a very thorough knowledge of the industry in which he has been engaged over the years and in which he has been so successful. He went on to say—

"It will treat stock for all meat operators and will assure that all cuts, and not only the cuts which are not suitable for export, will be made available to the people of Rockhampton."

Those statements are not made by an A.L.P. man, although they are statements with which every A.L.P. man is in accord. As I said previously they are made by a practical man. When the hon. member for Rockhampton South gets up and contradicts him on such a subject I respectfully submit that he is giving an exhibition of ignorance.

There is not the slightest doubt that he was speaking for Vesteys. Vesteys' meatworks are virtually obsolete. They are built on the wrong side of the river. When the meatworks were built we had shallow-draft vessels that could come up the river to Rockhampton. No-one knows better than the hon. member for Rockhampton South that the river has silted up. The hon. member knows the river policy that was agreed upon. He is a member of the harbour board that decided to close the river. Vesteys' meatworks are on the wrong side of the river, the saleyards are on the western side at Gracemere. They have to take cattle from Gracemere down and across the river to treat them, then bring them back from Lakes Creek across the river again. They have to take them 42 miles altogether to get to a point of shipment. Abattoirs at Gracemere or Bajool would be much more economic because the cattle could be taken in a straight line. Vesteys realise that an abattoirs built there would have a big advantage from the buying point of view. They are determined to use every means at their disposal to prevent the building of the abattoirs.

Abattoirs are just as necessary in Rockhampton as in Brisbane. There is no doubt that abattoirs could be run more efficiently than the Vesteys' works are run now. They are regarded as being the worst employer in Central Queensland. I am not going to enter into personalities, but if ever there was an evil influence in Central Queensland, one that is retarding development, it is Vesteys' influence. In my opinion that influence has done more to keep Central Queensland back than any politician of any political colour who has ever sat in the Queensland Parliament. They are bending all their efforts to prevent the putting into effect of this progressive, hygienic, common-sense proposal that would be to the benefit of the people of Central Queensland. In addition, as Mr. Wilson put it, it would serve the industry by catering for interstate and overseas markets as well.

Whilst he is in Rockhampton the hon. member for Rockhampton South condemns

his own colleagues as being anti-progressive. Only a short while ago the Premier had to rebuke him publicly for something he said about the Government, which, to his surprise, was published. When he comes down here he tells the Government, "We do not want new industries in Central Queensland." I tell the Treasurer and the Premier through you, Mr. Taylor, that we want many more industries in Central Queensland than we have and, if any government, irrespective of their political colour, introduce one extra industry there, I will not be behind the door in complimenting them for doing so. I will not go behind their backs to condemn them if they do not.

I challenge the hon. member for Rockhampton South to reply later on to these arguments put forward, not by me, whom he would perhaps accuse of being prejudiced by party affiliations, but by Mr. Wilson, at the graziers' association meeting in Rockhampton a short while ago, and by Mr. Pearce, the grazier chairman of the abattoir board, all men who have a superior and better knowledge of the cattle industry, with all due respect, than any hon. member in this Chamber.

Mr. GILMORE (Tablelands) (4.48 p.m.): Our weak and slandering Opposition have once again exhibited the qualities for which they are now quite renowned. We have just listened to one of their most able orators.

When we look at the substance of this amendment it appears that it is bound up with disagreement with one of the items in the Budget, but I have not yet heard anyone on the other side suggest that any vote should be reduced. We have heard from them much talk about unemployment and about the expenditure that has taken place but, when unemployment is at a high level, that is the logical time for the Government to spend, and that is exactly what is being done in this Budget.

We cannot have it both ways. When private industry is incapable of balancing employment with production, the Government can, with advantage, utilise the services of the unemployed on productive and national projects. That is exactly what the Government is doing; it is revealed in the Budget.

Unemployment has been at a high level, and the expenditure of all departments had to be increased to relieve it. Owing to drought and other factors the Government are not able to balance their Budget, and that is to be regretted. We have no control over droughts. They have occurred before and they will happen again.

The people of the State must get great satisfaction from the mighty effort of the Department of Education. We remember the difficulties experienced in the fields of education and housing when a Labour government were in office. Great improvements have been made since then. We

confidently look forward to the recommendations of the select committee that inquired into education. I am told by experts in the field that we can expect the greatest revolutionary measures in education ever known in Queensland.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. Aikens (to Mr. Davies): The greatest blow to education in this State was your election to Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member for Townsville South and the hon. member for Maryborough cease speaking to one another across the Chamber?

Mr. GILMORE: I apologise to the hon. member for Townsville South for interrupting him.

The Health Vote is something of which any government would be proud. Despite all the weaving and waving of the Opposition, the Health Vote is a record, a fact that must be very disappointing to hon. members opposite.

There is also an increase in the Vote for the Department of Agriculture and Stock. Personally, I should like to see the Vote even bigger because our primary industries, more than ever, need the benefits to be derived from scientific development. I do not suggest that any Vote should be reduced in order to increase the Vote for Agriculture and Stock. Would any hon. member suggest that the Vote for Housing should be reduced?

I am very proud of the development of electricity in Queensland and the extension of such benefits to country areas, where it is most needed. We are pushing ahead with the Barron Falls Hydro-Electric Scheme at the fastest possible rate.

The main roads of Queensland have been transformed. The standards in North Queensland are far higher than those set by Labour Governments.

Mr. Sullivan: Members of the Opposition say that there has been no development in the North. Is that right?

Mr. GILMORE: They do not know what is going on in the North. They have not been there.

The Commonwealth Government are helping to develop the Gulf Country because they are very conscious of the necessity for it. They are making £5,000,000 available to provide beef roads to help expand this Territory. The graziers who produce beef in that area have never been able to get their cattle to market in prime condition. They can get them out only as stores after walking the condition off them.

Mr. Sullivan: The hon. member for Townsville North condemns the road from Normanton to Julia Creek.

Mr. GILMORE: I am not surprised at that.

Mr. TUCKER: I rise to a point of order. I did not condemn the project. I ask the hon. member to withdraw his remark.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please mention the remark that he wishes to be withdrawn?

Mr. TUCKER: That I condemned that beef road.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member for Condamine to accept the assurance of the hon. member for Townsville North that he did not condemn that beef road.

Mr. Sullivan: I accept his assurance.

Mr. GILMORE: The graziers in the Gulf Country are unable to get their beef to market in prime condition simply because they cannot get them there quickly. Our Federal Government have done a great deal to bring stability to Australia and while the Labour Party join with the Commos., the present Federal Government will always be there.

Mr. DAVIES: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Tablelands has stated that the Labour Party has joined forces with the Communists. His statement is objectionable to me and my colleagues and I ask for its withdrawal.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member knows the subject matter on which he can rise to a point of order. If an hon. member makes an accusation against another hon. member and it is distasteful to him, he may ask for it to be withdrawn, but he is not obliged to withdraw a statement made about a body of people.

Mr. GILMORE: I did not intend to drag this issue into the debate, but it is just as well to let hon. members opposite know where they stand in the eyes of the public. It is just as well to let them know that they think that the A.L.P. is dominated by the Communist Party.

These roads will serve the beef-producing areas that are now being developed. The graziers are now able to take advantage of the increased prices and are therefore able to develop their holdings, fence them, provide water, as well as amenities for their employees and themselves. They are now in a sound financial position and they will be further advantaged when the roads are completed. However, if the roads are not sealed that will defeat the purpose for which they are intended. The sealing of the roads must be given the highest priority. If we do not seal them, we might as well leave them as they are.

Mr. Davies: You know they are not going to seal them. You know the Federal Government will not give you the money to seal them.

Mr. GILMORE: The Federal Government have indicated that they will build the roads and when further representations are made

I am confident that sealing will take place. Sealing is imperative, because long-distance cartage cannot be undertaken on corrugated roads.

It is my experience and the experience of many others that in the development of a country such as ours we cannot pay too much attention to irrigation and water conservation. When we think of Queensland and the size of it and are told that more rain falls on a country as small as Germany than on the whole of this State, it makes us realise that we must conserve water. We must have irrigation.

Mr. Davies: Which way does the rain fall on West Germany?

Mr. GILMORE: The hon. member would be more interested in the red rain that falls on East Germany.

In the Mareeba-Dimbulah area at the moment we have a golden opportunity to bring a vast area of land into production.

Mr. Houston: Who built that dam?

Mr. GILMORE: It may be recalled that, over the years that I have been a member of this Assembly, I have given full credit to those who were responsible for the planning and initial construction of the Tinaroo Falls Dam scheme. I still do. The Labour Party started it and the credit for that is theirs. Leave it at that. The credit for continuing it and the job of finishing it is ours.

Now let us have a look at this Tinaroo scheme and see what can be done. Let us look first at the sales of tobacco from the area. There is no other product that can compare with tobacco on today's market because Australia produces barely 40 per cent. of her requirements, so we have an assured home market. Indications are that the area is the most favourable in Australia for the production of tobacco. The water is eminently suitable, combined with the land, to produce the crop. The value of the tobacco crop in the Mareeba-Dimbulah area last year, under the depressed conditions prevailing, was £4.8 million, which was equal to 51 per cent. of the value of the wheat crop of Queensland, 270 per cent. of Australia's peanut crop, 120 per cent. of Australia's maize crop, 108 per cent. of Australia's rice crop, and 54 per cent. of the total value of production from the Murrumbidgee irrigation area. And the Mareeba-Dimbulah scheme has not yet been fully exploited. There is much to be done and a great deal more money is required. It is for us to do the job. We must not turn our backs on it. It is developing Australia. The crop can be readily sold, it commands a fair price and its production brings about closer settlement. As a matter of fact it is as close settlement as it is possible to achieve. In that area the sales of tobacco were 98 per cent. of the production and the price was 140d. per lb.

Mr. Sullivan: The average price?

Mr. GILMORE: Yes, the average price. That is due entirely to the quality of the product. I urge the Government to treat this as a matter of urgency, because it is imperative that they do so.

Dealing with the Forestry Vote, the time is long overdue for declaring more State forests. Far too many of our valuable timbers have been sacrificed in the hope that the land could be used for maize growing, dairying, or some other form of agricultural production. Quite often land that was suitable for producing fine timber was not sufficiently fertile for agriculture. Officers of the Forestry Department are capable of regulating the supply of timber to the sawmills, and if we declare State forests we can, by natural regeneration and silvicultural practices, assure timber supplies of the highest quality for generations to come. If we delay, we shall have great gaps in our forests. Because former Labour Governments opened land for settlement that should never have been opened, farmers have gone broke and walked off their land and it has now gone back to lantana, wild tobacco, and useless trees. It will never again become a natural forest of indigenous trees.

The timber industry north of Townsville employs 3,600 people. The value of production of the sawmills in that area is about £6,000,000, and the wages paid are about £2,000,000. Royalties amount to approximately £700,000 in some years.

Mr. Houston: Under Labour.

Mr. GILMORE: Under Labour Governments more timber than enough was destroyed. There were logs in the Mallan area that should never have been cut. I ask the Government to declare more State forests before further damage is done.

Labour has a very deplorable record in the tobacco industry. They were always anxious to keep growers in poverty.

Mr. Walsh: You would not like to malign the Scullin Government, would you?

Mr. GILMORE: I should not like to go back to the Scullin Government. In 1936 the percentage scheme was set up, with 2½ per cent. for cigarettes and 13 per cent. for tobacco. In 1938 the cigarette percentage went to 3 per cent. and tobacco to 15 per cent. It is significant that under Labour in 1946 the cigarette percentage remained at 3 per cent. but we suffered a reduction to 5 per cent. in tobacco. They were the Labour Government who were trying to help the growers by reducing the statutory amount that had to be put in! In 1953 when the present Liberal-Country Party Government got into its stride in Canberra the percentage was increased to 4½ per cent. for cigarettes and 7½ per cent. for tobacco. In 1953 it was further increased to 6 per cent. and 10 per cent., in 1954 to 6 per cent. and 12½ per cent. After the shocking devastation that the growers had to suffer by Labour's reduction

it took them years to become geared up to production again, but notice how under the Menzies Government momentum was gained and maintained. I repeat that the figures in 1954 were 6 per cent. for cigarettes and 12½ per cent. for tobacco, but here are the figures for the following years—

	Cigarettes Per cent.	Tobacco Per cent.
1955 ..	7½ ..	17½
1956 ..	7½ ..	17½
1957 ..	12½ ..	21
1958 ..	15½ ..	16½
1959 ..	22 ..	23½
1960 ..	28½ ..	24½
1961 ..	35 ..	32
1 July, 1962	43 ..	40

That shows how the industry has grown because of its fostering by the Menzies Government, in contrast with the reduction it suffered under Labour. The Labour Party introduced the Australian Tobacco Board during the war. Whom did they put in charge of it? The head buyer of B.A.T. was the No. 1 appraiser, the second buyer was the second appraiser and the third buyer and appraiser was the third man. The growers had one representative.

The Australian Tobacco Board was maintained for some years after the war. It was not until 1948 that it was abandoned by the Commonwealth Government. Let me give the Committee the story. I was representing the growers as a substitute on the A.T.B. I went to Canberra—incidentally at my own expense. I met the Minister for Agriculture and Stock there, the Hon. Reg. Pollard, a Labour man. He is still in the House of Representatives. He said he would not relinquish the marketing of tobacco in Queensland or Australia. He still wanted to keep it under National Security Regulations. My argument was, "How would a few struggling tobacco farmers endanger the nation's security?" He said he would not do it.

Hon. members may recall that the Butter Board put the Commonwealth Government through the High Court and proved that they could escape from the same position. Our Minister for Agriculture and Stock will confirm that. The Commonwealth Government, under Labour, had to be challenged to release the dairy farmers.

On this occasion I said to Mr. Pollard, "If you don't do it, the tobacco industry will apply to the High Court." Incidentally, we did not have two bob with which to go to the High Court. Nevertheless, we came back and would not open the selling floor. He had to abandon it. We went to auction, and the price went from 34d. to 64d. That is what happened under the auction system and what Labour did to the tobacco growers.

Today, the tobacco growers have encountered another problem—that of enlarged production under the sympathetic treatment

of the Government and the impetus of the percentage scheme. Many people have been induced to engage in tobacco production. No-one can blame them for that, but no guidance was available to them and in many cases unsuitable soils were selected. Many of them did not have the knowhow to produce it.

Another factor came into the picture. In the continued dry weather, the chlorine content of the soil to which tobacco is very partial, rose, and the tobacco from some good areas was carrying more than the normal quantity of chlorine. Many of them were also using a soil fumigant, Ethel Di Bromide known as E.D.B. about which little is known of its chemical reaction in the soil. It has now been found that it combines with chlorine and creates a condition in the leaf very similar to that created by chlorine. It renders the leaf an immature type and it will not mature under the mechanised dryer treatment. In fact, the longer the leaf is kept the sourer it becomes.

We were assured by the Commonwealth Government, when they realised this position, that they would not allow the percentage system to be used to encourage production in unfavourable areas. We had no argument against that because, as we said, we want an industry on a quality basis. If there is an argument against that, I do not know what it is. I think that quality in any industry should be the dominating factor. I have the utmost sympathy for people who put their money in thinking that they had the protection of this percentage scheme and that anything they produced, good, bad or indifferent, would be sold. The Commonwealth Government are not prepared to do it and therefore we have to take other steps to render assistance.

Mr. Houston: Who determines whether it is fit for sale or not?

Mr. GILMORE: A committee set up by the Commonwealth Government, composed of manufacturers, State experts and marketing organisation appraisers. These appraisers have gone throughout Australia and in last Saturday's newspaper I read that the Right Hon. John McEwen had said that their report on the tobacco was that it was mainly unusable, that it was of doubtful quality at best and that he was not prepared to support an application from the Victorian tobacco-growers to re-dry it. The expert committee has investigated the unsold tobacco and has condemned it. Manufacturers have not the power to condemn it, nor have growers the power to applaud it. The committee does the job. I am not here to criticise the members of it. I have never attended even one of its meetings.

Mr. Houston: Do you agree with their decision, knowing the leaf?

Mr. GILMORE: In regard to some. There is some that I should say is doubtful.

Mr. Houston: What about the leaf presented in the House the other day?

Mr. GILMORE: I did not see it.

Mr. Wallace interjected.

Mr. GILMORE: The hon. member for Cairns who could be referred to as the wandering member for Cairns—

Mr. Davies: Why do you call him that?

Mr. GILMORE: He wanders everywhere but in his own electorate. The other day he wandered up to the electorate of the hon. member for Cook. I do not interject during his speech if he criticises me, but he, with others, when the ball is thrown back, becomes anxious and nervous and chews his nails in case I say something cruel. I am not that sort of person. The growers on the Aerodrome are just as much entitled to water from the Tinaroo scheme as any other growers. I made representations on their behalf, in an effort to get water for them. I am fully aware of the difficulties confronting them. I presented their case to the best of my ability, but owing to certain factors I have not been able to help them to date. A certain amount of money is allocated for channels in the Tinaroo scheme. It is only fair and just that people who have waited for years for water to be channelled to their farms, and have no other access to water now, should be the first to receive it. Those who have some water and can carry on are generous enough to concede that that is so. It is not a matter of "Blow you, Joe." It is a matter of "Let us help all we can as quickly as we possibly can." That is what I stand for and that has always been my attitude. As soon as money is available I will be the first to see that the water goes to these Aerodrome farms. It is a particularly good area and by and large the farmers there produce good tobacco. Some do not, but on the whole those farmers are skilled men and they are entitled to water. On the other hand there are skilled farmers who have no water. I believe that the Aerodrome farmers would take the view that everybody should get a little water rather than that they should get the lot. I have been chided, and I suppose there is some political ambition behind it. We have heard from the hon. member for Cairns that as I hold office in the Queensland Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board I should resign because I am also their representative in this Assembly. I think that is the substance of his remark.

Mr. Wallace: I have said that is the opinion of the majority of the growers. Because of your dual capacity they believe that the tobacco industry has become a political football.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member for Cairns to cease interrupting. I should like to hear the hon. member for Tablelands present his case.

Mr. GILMORE: On my interpretation of football there must be a field and there must be players. Political football is very hard to define. The hon. member for Cairns is not even in the game. He is not playing. He is a member of a weak and feeble Opposition that know nothing, and are Communist dominated—every bit of them. They are not even in the game. Who would play football with people like that? I know these people up north—people toiling in the sun. I have worked for 30 years for the growers to take the women and kiddies out of the paddocks. Does the hon. member think I would put them back now?

Mr. Wallace interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Cairns must contain himself otherwise I shall be obliged to describe his conduct as disorderly and I will have to deal with him.

Mr. Davies: He provokes us by calling us Communists.

The CHAIRMAN: I will deal with the hon. member for Maryborough if he persists in his conduct.

Mr. GILMORE: The hon. member for Cairns may correct me if I am wrong, but I understood him to say that I was the chief beneficiary.

Mr. WALLACE: I rise to a point of order to make an explanation. I said that the tobacco growers said that because the hon. member holds a dual position the tobacco industry had become a political football and they believed the hon. member was the chief beneficiary. I did not say it at all; the tobacco farmers did.

Mr. GILMORE: The hon. member would not like to say it!

Mr. Wallace: I will say anything to you, any time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member please be seated. I ask the hon. member for Tablelands to accept the explanation of the hon. member for Cairns.

Mr. GILMORE: As Chairman of a responsible industry and being in a responsible position, I take strong exception—

Mr. WALLACE: I rise to a point of order. He has not accepted my explanation.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. I will be forced to deal with the hon. member.

Mr. GILMORE: I take strong exception to any reflection being cast on a Queensland Marketing Board. I resent any reflection on the members of that Board, and I resent the reflection cast on every grower by the remark that they would elect a man who would use his position for his own advantage. If the hon. member for Cairns feels as he

says others do—and I believe that only a man who has something to hide would say, "I heard somebody say it"—

Mr. WALLACE: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is trying to indict me. When I have an opinion to give, I will give it. The other day when I was speaking I said that was the opinion of the tobacco growers. When I have something to say to the hon. member I will say it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Tablelands to accept the explanation of the hon. member for Cairns. I ask the hon. member for Tablelands to deal with the matter, as stated by the hon. member for Cairns, that that was an explanation given by the tobacco growers.

Mr. GILMORE: I will accept his apology.

Mr. WALLACE: I rise to a point of order. I want the hon. member to accept my explanation. I did not apologise to anyone.

Mr. GILMORE: This snide way of attacking an industry—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member for Cairns please keep quiet and will the hon. member for Tablelands please say he accepts the explanation of the hon. member for Cairns!

Mr. GILMORE: In deference to you, Mr. Taylor, I must accept that. I believe—and I feel very strongly on this—that a great disservice has been done to an industry. No doubt in politics we become subject to criticism. I accept that as a man in public life but I abhor snide practices and shots in the dark.

Mr. Wallace: There are no shots in the dark about me. I bring it right out in the open.

Mr. GILMORE: If the hon. member feels that way let him come out in the street and say it and see what sort of reception he will get.

I was criticised in this Chamber. It was said that I deserted my growers when they were in trouble. Let us look at the facts. I went overseas on a trip. It took nearly two years to organise it. I did not keep it a secret. I told everybody. It was on the air and in the Press. I left on the Monday and on the preceding Saturday I chaired a meeting of some 600 growers in Mareeba and told them then. I said, "This is the position. I am going overseas." Originally I was booked to leave on 15 March but, when the Federal Government told us they would not let the percentage system be used to bolster up unfavourable tobacco, I delayed my departure for seven weeks. I saw those growers through the worst of their troubles. I attended the Mareeba sales and I attended the Brandon sales. I even went to Canberra twice and talked with the Rt.

Hon. John McEwen and the Hon. Charles Adermann and all their officers. I begged them to hold a meeting but it was held in Adelaide after my departure. All the Ministers for Agriculture were present at it. I did everything humanly possible, and I am sure the growers know it because of the welcome home I got the other day. But let it not be forgotten I am chairman of this marketing board. I went overseas on a holiday and, in the course of that holiday, I inspected tobacco-growing in Germany and other parts of Europe. I deliberately went to Canada and studied their industry. I went to America—to Virginia, North Carolina and Kentucky. I went into every aspect of their industry. And I discovered that we in Queensland have the world's best tobacco-growers. They stand out above everything else.

Mr. Evans: And you paid your own way, too.

Mr. GILMORE: That is true. I thank the Minister for the interjection. Let anybody show me a leader of any industry who has ever gone overseas on a fact-finding mission at his own cost. Before going I asked for leave of absence. It was granted by the Minister and I did not receive a penny of the chairman's allowances while I was away. Could a man do more for his industry? Then to come here and be criticised by this rabble!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will not refer to any members of Parliament as a rabble. I ask him to withdraw that remark.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GILMORE: The rambling hon. member for Cairns has been in the electorates of other hon. members. Let us see what is going on in his electorate. The Commo.-dominated wharf-lumpers' union and the Commo.-dominated meatworkers' union have lately tied up the products for export of one of the biggest industries in his electorate.

Mr. Wallace: Are you insinuating that all meatworkers and waterside workers are Communists?

Mr. GILMORE: I am not insinuating anything. I am saying that they are dominated by Communists. The Communists have done a great disservice to Australia and are in the employ of Moscow. They have wiped every ship off the coast. They have bludged themselves out of work and then begged farmers to give them a job. At Queerah, meatworkers dominated by the Communist Party held up the works many times. What has the hon. member for Cairns done about that? He has egged them on and kept them on strike. Now the wharf-lumpers will not load products going to a good market, a market that we need badly. We are trying

to develop the North by putting in roads and improving the facilities for water conservation. As soon as we get increased production, the masters of these people say, "No, you shall not shift it."

The rambling hon. member for Cairns goes into an area that is well represented. I do not hold any brief for the hon. member for Cook, but I do respect him for the job he is doing for his own constituents. I deplore, and the people of North Queensland deplore, the action of the hon. member for Cairns in supporting the Communist-dominated Waterside Workers' Federation and the meatworkers' union. As I said, there is not a ship on the coast today. Why do we tolerate such things? We should not tolerate them. We should see that the products are exported and that the conditions of employment of the men at Queerah are observed. We can do this only by taking a strong stand. The hon. member for Cairns condones the action of these men.

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) (5.38 p.m.): I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition that the item "Aide-de-Camp, £1,594" be reduced by £1 and I do so for a number of reasons.

We have just witnessed a preliminary bout. The main bout is about to take place. This coalition Government are a decadent Government. During their term of office they have been torn by internal strife and divided into many camps. There are groups within their own parties. There is a rebel transport group headed by the hon. member for Toowoomba East, who has been very outspoken. The hon. member for Condamine, well known as Slasher Sullivan, who believes in sacking one man in three in the railways, is very outspoken in his own electorate about what should be done about transport but then comes into the Chamber and has two bob each way. Then we have Tom Hiley's Booze and Betting Boys. They are the real force to be reckoned with.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will address hon. members by their proper titles and not by name.

Mr. THACKERAY: I shall refer to them as the hon. the Treasurer's Booze and Betting Boys. Then we have the Land Valuation Boys headed by the hon. member for Southport, Mr. Gaven. Last but not least is the Deputy Premier of Queensland, Mr. Morris, who heads the "Morris manglers". They supported Mr. Houghton to have him elevated—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member does not obey my request and speak of hon. members by their appropriate titles I will ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. THACKERAY: I should have said, "the hon. member for Redcliffe". On top of all this we have the Premier who is well known outside as "Frightened Frank" because we see him today running around into each

and every camp trying to pacify all the rebels. Even his Christian and temperance admirers are now doubting his sincerity. I say that without fear of contradiction. The most outspoken man in Cabinet would be the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity. He gets up and attacks the Commonwealth Government. The next thing he says, "We must secede from the Commonwealth." In the "Telegraph" he talks about having our own Navy and our own little aeroplanes flying about. But can we trust this man?

It is quite obvious to me that the Treasurer leads the strong gang in Parliament today? "the booze and betting boys," and they are showing their force in the Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Do I interpret the hon. member's remarks about "booze and betting boys" to refer to members of Parliament?

Mr. THACKERAY: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to withdraw it because it is not Parliamentary language to refer to hon. members in that fashion.

Mr. THACKERAY: I withdraw in deference to your ruling. According to "The Sunday-Mail"—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I asked the hon. member to withdraw those words.

Mr. THACKERAY: I just withdrew them. Anyhow, I do not want to upset you too much.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member is getting to the stage where I must ask him to resume his seat. I will allow him to proceed but if there is any more levity of that nature or apparent cleverness he will be immediately asked to resume his seat.

Mr. THACKERAY: Yes, Mr. Taylor. Anyhow, Mr. Taylor, according to "The Sunday-Mail" the Deputy Premier of Queensland is about to leave Queensland on account of ill health. It is remarkable what a great thing illness is when the sands of time are running out! When you realise that the hardest working man in the Cabinet outside the Treasurer would be the Minister for Transport who, we understand, works until 1 and 2 o'clock in the morning, and his health has not been affected, it gives you food for thought. You would think that the Minister for Health and Home Affairs would have taken a much greater interest in the health of the Deputy Premier. According to Press speculation things are not going too well at all between those two hon. gentlemen. While all this sort of thing is going on in Parliament we have members of the Liberal Party outside the Chamber openly slating Country Party members, and vice versa. They are not just rumours, it is true. It is going on all the time. If we believe the rumours, the Deputy Premier is openly criticising the Premier about bonus payments at Mt. Isa.

Coming down on the Sunlander recently the hon. member for Whitsunday was talking to a railway employee. He said, "What a wonderful Government it is! What a fair Government it is!" The railway employee said, "I don't agree with you there. I don't agree with you at all. What about all the unemployment in Queensland today?" The hon. member for Whitsunday said, "That is Federal!" The railway employee said, "What about the Deputy Premier? He is not very popular." The hon. member for Whitsunday said, "Oh, he is a Lib!" Those are passing remarks. Let me move to the Federal sphere and what the hon. member for Capricornia said to a deputation from the B.W.I.U. about unemployment. He said—

"It is not our responsibility; it is the State's."

That is the merry-go-round one gets with a coalition Government in Queensland.

Various hon. members opposite are fighting for Cabinet rank and whilst much double-crossing is taking place they are promising to support one another for Cabinet rank. If the Deputy Premier is knighted and made Sir Kenneth Morris—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I should be pleased if the hon. member addressed himself to the Budget. Admittedly the Budget debate allows wide scope of subjects but, as far as I can gather, most of the hon. member's remarks up to the present have been purely hearsay. I should be pleased if he will now apply himself to the business of Parliament.

Mr. THACKERAY: I agree with your ruling, Mr. Taylor, and I shall scrap the note I have here about budding ministers. Anyhow, whilst this has been going on the State has not prospered. The two parties in Government today are diametrically opposed to one another and, as a result of their faction fights, the State has not prospered. The solution of the problem in Queensland today is to return an Australian Labour Party government in the Federal sphere on 9 December and in this State in 1963. We are not a sectional party and we do not believe in introducing legislation for sectional interests. We believe in Australia as a whole and we are, undoubtedly, the Government to lead this nation. In times of strain and stress, in times of war, when the Liberal boys in the Federal sphere ducked the issue, we were called on to take charge of the affairs of the country.

One of the most serious failures of this Government has been their failure to arrest unemployment and to attract new industries to the State. In spite of their many published statements, the Government do not believe in decentralisation. I shall prove that. The latest unemployment figures for September show that the number of unemployed registered recipients for social services in this State is 16,752. At the same time last year it

was 6,454. The percentage of our work force unemployed this year is 2.9 per cent. against 1.1 per cent. last year.

Unemployment has not been tackled; the Government have not done anything about it. I shall deal specifically with Rockhampton later on.

In conjunction with the figures I have just mentioned the number of job vacancies in Queensland has fallen by over 100 for September. An interesting article appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of Tuesday, 17 October, headed "Nicklin sees less work for some." What a classical statement from a Premier! What future is there for the 16,000 unemployed in this State, with Christmas approaching? He goes on to say, "The State would hope for special assistance from the Commonwealth." That is also a classical statement. Where are the great fighters of the Country Party and the Liberal Party, the businessmen? What are they doing to arrest unemployment in Queensland?

At the same time the Secretary of the Queensland Employers' Federation, Mr. J. R. James, made a statement with which I agree. He said that the unemployment position underlined the basic weakness in the State's economy and the urgent need for more secondary industries. That is what is required in Queensland.

Let me now deal with subjects closer to home, and at the outset analyse the speech of the hon. member for Rockhampton South. Of all the statements ever made in the Queensland Parliament, this one takes top marks. It was the classic statement of a clown.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member a direct question. Did he refer to the hon. member for Rockhampton South as a clown?

Mr. THACKERAY: I said it was the classic statement of a clown. I did not refer to him at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Did the hon. member refer to the hon. member for Rockhampton South?

Mr. THACKERAY: I did not refer to him at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well.

Mr. PILBEAM: I rise to a point of order. I will not allow the hon. member to get away with a lie. I object to the remark, which could refer only to me, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member for Rockhampton South to withdraw the word "lie." It is not a parliamentary expression.

Mr. PILBEAM: I withdraw it.

Mr. THACKERAY: In view of your ruling, Mr. Taylor, I withdraw my remark. "The Morning Bulletin" of last Tuesday contained an article under the heading, "Pilbeam presses claims for C.Q. Area". It takes up three 5-inch columns in the newspaper. His remarks about the need for road allocations were quite good. Then the article deals with interjections between the hon. member and me. Although the newspaper said, "Pilbeam presses claims for Central Queensland," let us see what he did say as recorded in "Hansard." His speech was a classic. He said, "The main cause of the deficit this year and in previous years has been the state of the weather." What a statement from a person who is Mayor of Rockhampton and who has not been in Parliament long enough to wet his feet! He went on to say, "I do not think the Treasurer can gauge what the weather is likely to be." I never thought in all sincerity that the hon. member could be so absurd in his remarks. Does he realise the position in Rockhampton? According to him, if the Treasurer could rectify the weather or get a prophet to assist him, we would have no worry about deficits, no worry about railway finances, there would be no need for increases in stamp and probate duties, no need for land tax and no need for the Liquor Bill or the betting tax. According to the hon. member for Rockhampton South our fate hinges on the weather rather than the Government's failure to accept their responsibility. Even if the Government could control the weather, they could not overcome the seasonal and permanent unemployment we now have in Queensland.

Central Queensland needs new industries, but there is no likelihood of any being established unless the Government do something about, say, a cement works there. The hon. member for Rockhampton South did not press Central Queensland's claims for a cement works or a fertiliser works. We recall a further industry that the Deputy Premier said three years ago would be in operation in Rockhampton very soon, the fathom fishing industry. I believe the principal of the fathom fishing industry was none other than Somerville Smith who was sentenced to 12 months in gaol for contempt of Parliament.

The hon. member for Rockhampton South did not think of the boys and girls who would be leaving school this year. I should have thought a man who set out to present a case for Central Queensland would have raised all matters of interest to his area. The building of a road to the West is essential. I agree with his remarks about the barrage scheme and the Callide powerhouse. I am not criticising him for raising those matters. One would think that the hon. member for Rockhampton South, who is so flamboyant in his makeup, would have attacked this problem with a little more heart. I do not think he made a plea for the boys and girls leaving school this year. The figures I have from the Labour and National Service Planning and Research

Department indicate that in 1959-1960, for the Rockhampton Statistical Division, 900 boys and 900 girls left school. This year it is anticipated that 1,000 boys and 1,000 girls will leave school in that division. The Rockhampton statistical division includes south of Mackay, out past Emerald, and takes in Gladstone, the Dawson Valley and Biloela. What future is there for these children in Rockhampton, the majority of whom will have a secondary education, and many of the others a scholarship? Recently an examination was conducted to fill two vacancies for girls in a bank, and 100 girls sat for the examination. What chance is there for all these children to get employment this year? Most of them are in the under-16 age group and are not eligible for unemployment benefits under the Social Service Act. They must fall back on their mothers and fathers for support.

The apprenticeship position is not good. Indeed, it is far from satisfactory in Rockhampton and throughout Queensland. At 30 June, 1959, the number of apprentices in Rockhampton was 593, and the number of fifth-year apprentices 129. In 1960 there were 590 apprentices, and 151 fifth-year apprentices. As at 30 June, 1961, there were 572 apprentices, with 131 fifth-year apprentices, and 123 first-year apprentices. During three years there has been a decline of 21 in the number of apprentices in Rockhampton. Those figures do not present a bright outlook for the children of Rockhampton, but I did not hear the hon. member for Rockhampton South speak on their behalf. He is more interested in speaking on behalf of his boss, Mr. Hinchliff, of the C.Q.M.E. One would have thought that the hon. member would have spoken about the people of Rockhampton who are facing grave times. In seven years we have slipped from second place in the State to fifth place. We find that the Gold Coast has had the greatest increase in population of all cities, with an increase of 14,000, followed by Townsville and Ipswich with increases of 10,000, and then Too-woomba with an increase of 7,000. But Rockhampton has had an increase of only 3,800. The hon. member for Rockhampton South, who has been the Mayor of Rockhampton for 10 years was to set Rockhampton afire with a glorious new era, but under his regime, the population of Rockhampton, based on the 1954 boundaries, has risen from 40,670 in 1954 to 44,102 in 1961. Those figures prove conclusively that there has been maladministration by the hon. member for Rockhampton South, as the Mayor of Rockhampton.

It is very pleasing to see that the Minister intends to build a 150-megawatt capacity first stage powerhouse at Callide estimated to cost approximately £9,210,000 and to be completed by 1966. I believe that powerhouse is essential to Central Queensland because cheap power is vital for the industrial development of the region. The important consideration is whether they will be

able to supply industrial users in the area with cheap power. Recently the tariff rate of the Capricornia Regional Electricity Board was increased by 10 per cent.

Last year there was a deputation to the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity about the powerhouse. The hon. member for Port Curtis and the hon. member for Mackenzie were present but the hon. member for Rockhampton South was not. No doubt he did not think at that stage it was important to be there. Also present was Mr. Malcolm Newman. I believe he is managing director of Mt. Morgan Ltd. He told the Minister and the rest of us assembled that a cheap rate of electricity was the first essential to industry in Central Queensland. If my memory serves me right, he said it was necessary to have power there at the rate of .6d. per kilowatt-hour. He said that if we are unable to get power at that rate we will not, because of our geographical position in relation to markets in Brisbane and the southern States, be able to compete with southern operators. He said, too, that Mt. Morgan Ltd. was interested in various fields of development up there, including plastics, fertiliser, industrial gases and carbide. I think everyone is aware that carbide is tied up very closely with the plastics industry. He made it very clear that unless industry can get power at the rate he suggested he does not think we will have the industrial development in Central Queensland that everyone is talking about, so I sincerely hope that, when the powerhouse is built, we will be able to offer cheap power to industrialists.

It is rumoured that with the increase in tariff of the Capricornia Regional Electricity Board in Rockhampton, Mt. Morgan Ltd. will most likely go back to generating their own electricity. I do not know whether that is correct but, with the 10 per cent. increase, it certainly seems that it could happen.

In his speech the hon. member for Rockhampton South was very quick off the mark in supporting the increase of 50 per cent. in liquor fees. While I do not intend to transgress by anticipating legislation, I do not know how a man could honestly get up and support a 50 per cent. increase in liquor fees when the workers in my area—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is aware that that matter is the subject of pending legislation. He will not be in order in anticipating pending legislation.

Mr. THACKERAY: I know that, but he started it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member can make those remarks when the Bill comes before the Assembly.

Mr. THACKERAY: It affects the workers, and I would not be a party to

anything of that sort. It is characteristic of the hon. member for Rockhampton South, who sometimes reminds me of Murphy's dog—he can give it but he cannot take it. He advocated in Rockhampton recently that to solve the unemployment problem the rates should be increased by a halfpenny in the £1. It is beyond me. With his boss, Mr. Hinchliff, he openly advocated that increase in the rates, and he said that the only people who would not be affected by it would be those whose earnings were under £500. He said it at a meeting on unemployed that I attended. Since then, to be more fashionable and keep up with the times, the name has been changed to the Employment Committee. No matter what it is called, it will never achieve anything. The hon. member for Rockhampton South made that big brave statement, and the Editor of "The Morning Bulletin" said in his Saturday survey, "It is a little bit 'iffy'"—in other words, it is on the nose. The hon. member says, "We will support this scheme and solve our unemployment problem in Rockhampton, whether it is seasonal or permanent." I say that it is permanent. He should have got down to the crux of the matter and said, "This is a State or a Federal matter. We cannot solve it by increasing the rates of the people of Rockhampton." I notice that Mr. Hinchliff did not say, "Well, boys, although our profits are not disclosed—they go to London, as you know—we have had a pretty good year. Instead of the people of Rockhampton putting in £25,000, the State Government putting in £25,000, and the Commonwealth Government £50,000, here is a cheque for £50,000. We will give you a helping hand."

The latest idea is to get the service clubs, such as the Apex Club and the Lions Club, to help in solving the problem. How absurd! It is becoming fashionable to turn unemployment into employment meetings. That is what is going on in Rockhampton. The scheme is mushrooming, and it has already spread to the North. People are writing down expressing their views about how we can solve the problem of unemployment in Rockhampton. We cannot do it by increasing the rates. If the State Government and the Federal Government do not do anything about it, the rate-payers of Rockhampton should not be asked to pay this additional levy. The Federal basic wage is frozen and quarterly adjustments of the State basic wage have been abolished. Wages are not high enough to give people the standard of living to which they are entitled. The hon. member for Rockhampton South is so eager to hit the headlines that on one occasion he asked for an autopsy on a crocodile. On this occasion he has sidetracked the issue. What about unemployment in Rockhampton during November and December when the

meatworks are closed? Is he worrying about that? Not one iota. Yet he claims he is the saviour of the city.

I shall refer now to something that I believe should be exposed in the interests of the people of Rockhampton. The Treasurer is very astute. He can pour out the honey whenever he requires it, and he gets a few of the boys in, too. But whenever he says he is going to give something away, one has to be a bit wary of him. I have prepared what I believe to be a very damaging statement on the Rockhampton Harbour Board. The statement of receipts and payments for the five years 1961-1962 to 1965-1966 prepared by the Rockhampton Harbour Board for submission to the Rockhampton City Council is a classic example of how figures can be made to tell the tale its authors require it to do. It would take too long to dissect all the figures at this stage but I will make a few comparisons of the actual expenditure in 1960-1961 with the anticipated expenditure for the next five years, particularly 1965-1966. For administration the actual disbursements in 1960-1961 were £9,110 when the total revenue was £65,797, but the anticipated expenditure in 1965-1966 in this fantastic budget is only £8,905 with an estimated revenue of £71,090, and it remains constant at that figure for four years. Surely there must be some expectation of increases in the basic wage and improvements in the living standards of the workers over a period of five years. As the Town Clerk of the Rockhampton City Council said in his report to the City Council on the subject, there "has been an increase of 25 per cent. in the basic wage over the last five years, and I am one who thinks that it will be even greater in the next five years."

By the same token there has been no increase in harbour board dues since 1952, in other words up to the last anticipated year in 1965-1966 there will have been no increase for 13 years. It means that the harbour dues are to remain stationary for approximately 13 years, yet in the last five years the basic wage has risen in the vicinity of 25 per cent. Not one penny provision has been made for that.

There is one particular item, "Engineer Secretary." Everyone knows the special circumstances of the appointment of the present holder of the office, Mr. Morrison. I have the highest regard for Mr. Morrison. He gave wonderful service to the harbour board for a number of years as acting engineer. When the former secretary died he was appointed to the dual position of engineer-secretary for which he received the princely salary of £1,865 in 1960-1961, and it is expected that he will receive £2,000 in 1965-1966. Mr. Morrison must be approaching his retiring age. I venture to say that in 1965-1966 the board will not get the services of a junior engineer for £2,000 let alone the services of an engineer

and an acting secretary for that amount of money. None of that has been taken into consideration.

For the maintenance of harbour works, including dredging, in 1960-1961 the actual expenditure under this heading was £10,765. Naturally there will be some reduction in maintenance costs at Port Alma with the completion of the new concrete breast wharf, but there will be still heavy expenditure on the remaining old timber section with its railway approach. I was staggered when I learned that whilst in 1959-1960 it cost £3,589 to maintain the river wharves, maintenance on these fast decaying wharves is estimated to cost only £500 in 1965-1966.

I have here a copy of the "Morning Bulletin" of Monday, 25 September. It says on the front page—

"Meat Loading at City Wharves"

The first overseas meat vessel to sail up-river, the German freighter *Caroline Horn*, berthed at the City Wharves yesterday.

"Rockhampton's Harbour-master (Captain D. Whitehouse) joined the *Caroline Horn* at Sea Hill. He said that the 246 ft. vessel handled beautifully and made excellent time in a half-speed run up the river."

He said that there would be more types of this vessel travelling to the various ports throughout the Commonwealth. I believe it is one of 18 vessels. It can negotiate the river and is an ideal boat for the small packaged export meat, particularly for the American market. Yet, the anticipated expenditure for 1965-1966 is only £500 for maintenance of the Rockhampton wharf. For plant working and maintenance, excluding dredging, the actual cost in 1960-1961 was £10,827. For the same work in 1965-1966 the estimated cost is only £3,510. That is a great difference. The general actual disbursements for 1960-1961 were £9,850. Estimated disbursements for 1965-1966 are £7,480. Whilst provisions for holidays and sick pay—and this is an important one—increased from £1,330-odd to £1,400, the necessity for making any provision for long service leave appears to have disappeared by 1965-1966.

Actual loan and interest payments for 1960-1961 were £25,427, but for the 1964-1965 year and for 1965-1966 it is anticipated there will be an amount of £62,041 required, an increase of £36,614.

At this point I should like to sound a note of warning. In my opinion, the whole Budget has been prepared to delude the rate-payers of Rockhampton. Fancy telling the people of Rockhampton that, with an additional revenue of £2,793 in 1964-1965 and £5,293 in 1965-1966 as compared with actual revenue for 1960-1961, with interest payments increasing from £25,427 to £62,041, they are only going to be asked to subsidise the Rockhampton Harbour Board to the tune of £18,386 in 1964-1965 and £14,964 in

1965-1966. I do not consider that those figures will be borne out by the facts, and the Treasurer should take note of them.

In 1965-1966 harbour dues, despite the amount that will be received on oil, are expected to be £50,000-odd, yet in 1956—10 years earlier—the actual receipts were £54,377. I am sure that will concern the people of Rockhampton and should be of some concern to the Treasurer whose department controls harbours.

In the same report the Town Clerk quotes figures showing the total tonnage handled inward and outward over the river and Port Alma wharves in 1960-1961 at 46,803 tons of which 30,279 tons or 65 per cent. went over the river wharves and 16,524 tons or 35 per cent. over the Port Alma wharf.

As the policy of the present Board is to close down the river wharves and concentrate the whole of the shipping through Port Alma, I should like to ask the framers and supporters of this budget to explain how they hope to sustain their estimated receipts from harbour dues in 1965-1966 at £50,000 when the imports harbour dues on general cargo over the river wharves is 20s. per ton compared with only 13s. 4d. over the Port Alma wharf. Do they propose to increase the Port Alma charge to 20s. per ton? If so, I ask the merchants of Rockhampton who now, per medium of the river and its wharves, have their cargoes delivered virtually into their backyards, how they will feel about paying the extra road haulage or rail freight from Port Alma and also any possible increase in shipping freights to Port Alma.

In my opinion, once the river wharves are closed the battle between shipping and road transport will be lost. Increasing tonnages of goods will come forward by road, which means less work and wages for our waterside workers and all other persons connected with the industry, and which must have a retarding influence on the commercial life of Rockhampton. I am concerned and worried about the budget prepared by the Rockhampton Harbour Board and approved by the Rockhampton City Council. In my opinion it does not show to the full extent the liability of the people of Rockhampton for the development of Port Alma.

I thank you, Mr. Taylor, for being gracious enough to let me quote that statement.

The scheme has been arrived at by the Mayor of Rockhampton who is also—

Mr. Duggan: The architect?

Mr. THACKERAY: No, he is not the architect. The architect is Mr. Mark Hinchliff of Lakes Creek. The significant point is that Mr. Mark Hinchliff, manager of C.Q.M.E., is chairman of the Rockhampton Harbour Board, and the hon. member for Rockhampton South is a member of that board.

It is fantastic to suggest that there will be no increase in harbour dues, particularly

when we remember that the basic wage in the last five years has increased by 25 per cent. I have here the 1959-1960 report. The figures for exports over the two wharves indicate that C.Q.M.E. is the biggest exporter. The ratepayers of Rockhampton are the suckers for the C.Q.M.E. Company. We are being milked by the C.Q.M.E. Company, so that there will be low harbour dues. The hon. member for Rockhampton South is the junior partner in this concern and he and the C.Q.M.E. Company must take equal blame for the present state of affairs. The Treasurer is a very smart person. In volume 226 of "Hansard" at page 2163 he said, "The Rockhampton Harbour Board has been in a mess for 40 years." He went on to say he was not going to advance any money for development of the wharves in the city of Rockhampton. He said, in effect, "I have had my fingers burnt. Labour Governments have written off so much money that you will have to see if you can get the assistance of any other sucker." Then in comes the boy wonder and his boss and we, the ratepayers of Rockhampton, are called upon to pay the bill. Instead of having additional kerbing and channelling and other amenities to which we are entitled, we have to be the suckers for the C.Q.M.E. Company which is milking the city right and left.

The 1959-1960 report of the Rockhampton Harbour Board shows in regard to the trade of the port that the river wharves in 1958-1959 handled 34.1 per cent. of imports and this figure increased in 1959-1960 to 39.87 per cent. Exports over the river wharves in 1958-1959 amounted to 18.7 per cent., the figure increasing to 21.88 per cent. in 1959-1960. In the same years Port Alma imports represented 3.44 per cent., and the figure was reduced in 1959-1960 to 2.67 per cent. Looking at the overall picture we find that the river wharves of Rockhampton handled a considerably bigger amount of trade in those two years. I turn now to the 1955-1956 budget of the Rockhampton Harbour Board and compare the tonnage in that year with the tonnage in 1959-1960. The figures are for the city wharves and Port Alma. In 1955-1956 imports amounted to 36,645 tons. The figure dropped by 9,000 tons in 1959-1960, imports in that year being only 27,106 tons. Exports over the city and Port Alma wharves in 1955-1956 amounted to 65,179 tons, whereas in 1959-1960 they dropped to 36,630 tons. In other words, over 28,500 tons in four years. I am not opposed to the development of Port Alma but I am opposed to this scheme whereby the ratepayers of Rockhampton are the suckers for these big operators, combines, or monopolies, such as the C.Q.M.E. Why should the ratepayers of Rockhampton have to pay for this? The Treasurer would not be in it. He said, "No, I will not give you money. You get whatever terms you can get from the city council and we will be in that." That is exactly what happened. Unless the Treasurer examines very closely the statement I made about

harbour dues the ratepayers of Rockhampton will have to pay an astronomical amount to subsidise Mark Hinchliff's monopolistic concern, and we will be denied the essential services we so badly require.

I should now like to comment on whether the manager of the C.Q.M.E. utilises the port facilities at Rockhampton to the maximum extent or whether he uses road transport. How many tons of goods does he send away every year by road transport? I have been past the meatworks on several occasions and I have seen loaded 15-ton trailers for dispatch to the south. How sincere is he as chairman of the Rockhampton Harbour Board when he uses road transport for the meatworks? How sincere is he about the welfare of the people of Rockhampton? In all these things, he is supported by his yes-man, the hon. member for Rockhampton South.

The hon. member for Rockhampton South commented on the abattoir, and I say, here and now, that I have very grave doubts whether Rockhampton will ever get an abattoir. I believe that we have been sold down the river. The amount of money that has been allocated by the Treasurer to the Callide-Dawson Valley Co-operative Association Abattoirs—and that is just the thin edge of the wedge to pacify the hon. members for Callide and Mackenzie—is sufficient to stop Rockhampton from getting an abattoir. I know the proposed abattoir is in the Callide electorate but this money has been advanced to meet the strong political pressure that has been applied in those areas. As the hon. member for Rockhampton South said, there is no money for the Rockhampton abattoir this year. If there is a shortage of cattle in Central Queensland, why did not the hon. member for Rockhampton South in his speech oppose this abattoir in the Dawson Valley? He was told not to do it. He knows in his heart it will not affect the Central Queensland Meat Export Company in Rockhampton. He knows that with the geographic position of Biloela, and the saleyards at Rockhampton it would be uneconomic for outside operators to buy cattle at the saleyards in Rockhampton and then bring them through by train or road transport to Biloela for treatment there, and then ship the meat by road or rail to the southern portion of the State. He knows what will happen about the cattle abattoir in Rockhampton and there is no room for argument about that. If the C.Q.M.E. has nothing to worry about, why is there all the squealing about it? Why is it such an evil thing to have an abattoir in Central Queensland, the home of the cattle industry? I now present the slaughtering figures for Lakes Creek from 1958 to August, 1961—

Year	Cattle	Calves	Total
1958	146,302	6,481	152,783
1959	121,853	4,385	126,238
1960	108,275	4,182	112,457
1961 (to August) ..	86,360	3,325	89,685

Those figures include all export killings as well as killings for Rockhampton's domestic consumption undertaken by Lakes Creek. It is not possible to get the figures dissected into export and local killings.

Following are the slaughterings by the local slaughter yards for the financial years indicated and they include cattle and calves:—

1958-1959	19,579 head
1959-1960	15,538 head
1960-1961	12,572 head

Mr. Evans: What happened to those cattle? Did they go through Rockhampton?

Mr. THACKERAY: Yes. The only figures I have available of railings past Rockhampton are for 1960 and they are as follows:—

	Fats		Stores
	Gladstone	Cannon Hill and Southern Works	
Ex Central Division January-December, 1960	17,246	119,062	14,104
Ex Northern Division January-December, 1960	5,543	47,197	14,796

Those figures are accurate and I challenge anyone to show otherwise.

We hear all this talk about abattoirs. There is one at Oakey employing about 130 men and killing 1,600 head.

I strongly suggest to the members of the A.M.I.E.U. that, even if the franchise is given to the C.Q.M.E. company, the possibility of permanent employment in Rockhampton is very remote except for the top preference men at Lakes Creek. No-one can deny that. They talk about 200 to 400 men but those include general maintenance employees, clerks and I suppose all the men they have on all the stations about the place. Added together it seems to make a rosy picture but, if a franchise is given only to a local abattoir in Rockhampton, it will employ only a three-butcher gang. I say quite openly that in the near future the C.Q.M.E. company, like other big operators in Australia, will introduce more modern killing facilities. The killing facilities at Lakes Creek now do not compare with other meatworks such as Cannon Hill and the one Swifts intend to put in this year. There are two types of machinery that can be introduced into these meatworks, namely, the vo-mation system and the can-pack system. Installed at Lakes Creek they will have a considerable influence on the number of men required to work during the killing season. I am led to believe that the number of men will be greatly reduced—anything up to 25 per cent. I do not know the C.Q.M.E. company's business because Mr. Hinchliff and I are not on very good terms, but he

is a very astute business man and no doubt he believes in automation and mechanisation. Wherever he can dispense with the services of men he will do so. Through this system men can be dispensed with and a three-butcher gang is all that will be required to kill for the local consumption of Rockhampton, which is 300 head a week.

It is no good anybody's saying that the abattoir is not required in Rockhampton. The figures I have given prove that it is required and I only wish that some Country Party member outside the hon. member for Mackenzie would have come into the debate and openly stated the case for it.

Mr. Ewan: What percentage of these cattle that are bypassing Rockhampton would be killed there if a district abattoir were established?

Mr. THACKERAY: I think the southern operators would be prepared to kill cattle there. They have already told the officials of the Abattoir Board in Rockhampton that they are prepared to kill them there.

I caught the hon. member for Rockhampton South calling me a liar out of the corner of his mouth. I think he is a dingo.

Mr. PILBEAM: I rise to a point of order. I object to that remark.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member for Rockhampton South state what he objects to?

Mr. PILBEAM: He called me a dingo. I have proved that I am not a dingo.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Rockhampton North to address his remarks to the Chair. I did not hear the remark he made. If he used that term in reference to the hon. member for Rockhampton South, I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. THACKERAY: In deference to your ruling, I do so. I hate any man who refuses to open his mouth to say what he wants to say.

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

Mr. THACKERAY: I refuse to withdraw it because the hon. member for Rockhampton South called me a liar. I will not withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am asking the hon. member to withdraw the remark. I should like to point out to him that, under Rule 123A, I have not the power to order a member to leave the Chamber if he disregards the authority of the Chair. That must be done under Rule 124. If the hon. member refuses to withdraw the remark, he is disregarding the authority of the Chair and I must report him to the House. I appeal to the hon. member to withdraw the remark without comment.

Mr. THACKERAY: I will withdraw it. On a point of order, I now ask the hon. member for Rockhampton South to withdraw the statement that he made. He called me a liar out of the corner of his mouth. It is poetic justice.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Rockhampton South, did he call the hon. member for Rockhampton North a liar?

Mr. Pilbeam: I did not call him a liar. I said to the gentleman here, "That could be a lie."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The words "lie" and "liar" are unparliamentary expressions. I ask the hon. member to withdraw his remark.

Mr. Pilbeam: I withdraw it.

Mr. THACKERAY: Having made those remarks, I shall resume my seat, because the only other matter that I want to deal with is very controversial and I am sure you would rule me out of order, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Aspley) (7.53 p.m.): I rise to oppose the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, if only for the reason that hon. members opposite, apart from indulging in familiar political catch-cries, have advanced no valid reasons in support of their case. Furthermore, in expressing their views they have often been at variance with each other. For example, we heard the hon. member for Cairns berating the Federal Government for neglecting the North. On the other hand, the hon. member for Brisbane attempted to heap ridicule on the Federal Government for its plans to spend £5,000,000 on beef roads.

The Opposition has voiced its criticism of the Treasurer for his references in the Financial Statement to the drought and the current economic conditions and claimed that he has made excuses because of these factors. Let me say that the Treasurer has nothing to apologise for in his Budget. We are indeed fortunate in having a person of his calibre in charge of such an important portfolio.

Mr. Newton: Tell us how the drought has affected the poultry-farmers.

Mr. CAMPBELL: What does the hon. member think?

Mr. Newton: I am asking you.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The Treasurer presents his accounts in a far more creditable manner than his predecessors did.

In referring to the drought the Treasurer simply reported a statement of fact, and it ill becomes hon. members opposite to make such sneering references to drought conditions that have existed in many areas of the State for a great length of time. In so

doing such hon. members do a great disservice to those stout-hearted souls who continue to battle on in face of adversity in the hope of a better share of nature's bounty.

I was very pleased to hear the hon. member for Brisbane retract his exaggerated references in this regard. Naturally it is a great source of disappointment to hon. members opposite that the Government have so ably handled the administration of the State, for, in so doing, they have given the lie to the Labour Party's pre-election propaganda. The electors were told along with other matters that the Country Party-Liberal Government would eliminate the free hospital system. But under this Government hospital facilities have been greatly expanded, with the promise of many more benefits to come and at the same time a record expenditure has been budgeted for.

It was claimed that with the elimination of price control prices of commodities would soar, yet the last consumer price index revealed that a state of balance has been achieved in this field. The electors were threatened that the Government would slash wages. That this claim is fallacious is borne out by the fact that the Government have come to be regarded as a model employer, whilst their industrial legislation is designed to protect the decent employee, who desires to render honest service for his wages, from the ravages of industrial agitators.

Of course, the Opposition are most envious of the Government's commendable record of educational services, for no effort has been spared in this direction to cope with the staggering demands upon this service in the past few years. The reorganisation foreshadowed in the recently issued report of the committee appointed to inquire into secondary education in Queensland will prove to be a landmark in the progress made in education.

Because of the foregoing achievements, and others too numerous to mention, hon. members opposite are redoubling their efforts to knock the Government, but they will know that they knock in vain.

The present position in which the Labour Party finds itself, both in Queensland and elsewhere in Australia, could well be likened to the nursery rhyme that deals with the misfortunes of a character known as Humpty Dumpty. This situation is borne out by the recent gallup poll in which 80 per cent. of people interviewed rejected the Socialist philosophy.

A great deal of prominence has been given in the debate to the bonus payment issue at Mt. Isa. As usual, hon. members opposite have endeavoured to cloud the issue by misrepresenting the true position of bonus payments. Indeed, all they have achieved in this direction is to demonstrate their lack of knowledge of the facts of the case for bonus payments. What are the facts about bonus payments? The bonus payment is an

allocation of the company's profits. It is quite properly a matter for determination by the company in the same way as it determines its dividends to shareholders, the amount to be placed to reserves, and its allocation for depreciation and in consequence, should not come within the jurisdiction of the industrial tribunal. On the other hand, as hon. members know, the function of the tribunal is to determine the conditions of employment and wages, which, of course, includes overtime, margins and the like. That is precisely the basis of the recent amendment of the industrial law.

If the claim of hon. members opposite that the removal from the jurisdiction of the Industrial Court of bonus payments is a renunciation of a vital industrial principle, why is it in all these years, that so few employees have availed themselves of the facilities of the Industrial Court in this matter?

It is quite obvious that the Opposition speak with their tongues in their cheeks and are not sincere in this regard and, indeed, are not sincere when they declare their violent opposition to the principle of payment of bonuses to employees. The hon. member for Belmont who speaks for the Trades Hall, vehemently denounced the Government recently for removing the bonus clause from the previous legislation. During the passage of the amending Bill, he defined his attitude towards the question in no uncertain terms. I shall quote from "Hansard," volume 229 at page 2451 where he said—

"The Minister also spoke this morning about a bonus system. I am amazed that any Minister, particularly the Minister for Labour and Industry, who is concerned about safety in industry, would even consider a bonus payment in any particular industry. What does it mean? Let us be honest. It means the speeding up of the industry, placing young men in competition with old men; it means more accidents."

The Minister for Labour and Industry interjected—

"Do you mean to say you do not believe in the bonus scheme?"

The hon. member for Belmont replied—

"I do not believe in a bonus system. My reason for not believing in it is that anything given by way of bonus is not sincere."

Mr. Newton: I was referring to an incentive bonus system, and you quite well know it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I leave it to hon. members to determine the sincerity of hon. members opposite in this matter. One very disturbing feature that has emerged from the discussion on this matter is the extent to which hon. members opposite will go in casting aspersions on the principals and management of Mt. Isa Mines Ltd. It is a fact that this company's reputation as an employer of labour is such that it is regarded

as being one of the best in Australia and has provided, on its own initiative, amenities and conditions far in excess of its legal requirements and has done all in its power to ensure the contentment of its employees. It is unworthy of hon. members to make these charges knowing in their hearts that they are false.

We cannot expect companies to come to this State and establish themselves here when they know they will be subject to such attacks as we have heard from some hon. members opposite. The hon. member for South Brisbane made the unworthy allegation that the amending legislation was the pay-off for a monetary consideration by the company. All I have to say is that this unworthy innuendo should rightly be treated with the contempt it deserves.

Opposition members have made a great to-do about the profits the Mt. Isa company is currently earning. It is quite obvious that they hate to see a successful and profitable enterprise, and prefer to back a bankrupt show like Collinsville. They are content to conveniently forget that this mine operated for 16 years before it could pay a dividend to its share-holders.

Mr. Bromley: And the Labour Government gave it its kick-off in the first place.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I do not deny that. Since its inception 72 per cent. of its total earnings have been ploughed back into the company to finance expansion and thus build up an asset of tremendous economic importance to Queensland.

Mr. Hanlon: Don't you think the employees are entitled to some of the rake-off being ploughed back?

Mr. CAMPBELL: They are getting part of the rake-off.

Mr. Hanlon: Not a fair share of it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: That would be a matter of opinion. This company has made a significant contribution to the economy of Australia, as it is currently earning approximately £25,000,000 a year of export income, and in so doing has become the largest individual earner of export income for Australia.

Summing up, I submit that the Opposition has put up a sham fight for the following reasons: Quite obviously they are hostile to the principle of bonus payments; they are well aware of the company's record as a good employer and that the company has spared no effort in providing facilities and amenities for its employees to offset the climatic disabilities; and they know that the majority of employees are grateful to the company for its consideration of their welfare.

Mr. O'DONNELL (Barcoo) (8.8 p.m.): People in regular employment, more or less sheltered from economic difficulties, have virtually no conception of what being on

strike means to those who are involved. Every striker has had the experience of living without pay and, if the strike is prolonged, in many instances, of having his credit cut off by the local tradespeople. During the progress of the strike bitter feelings and personal hatreds are often stirred, and during that period of stress, and perhaps for some considerable time later, his environment is not very congenial. Further, he is looked upon often as a law-breaker for participating in a strike, and the best that is said of him, I suppose, by the people who are not involved in the strike is that he is a mischief maker, yet many who condemn, owe to those who took direct action in the past a debt of gratitude for their own improvements in working conditions, rates of pay and living standards. Highly-paid employees who have done nothing towards improving their own conditions have had their salaries increased because employees lower in the wage scale have won better conditions. We have not to look beyond the Chamber for proof of that statement. The Premier is paid a higher salary than a Cabinet Minister, and likewise the Cabinet Minister is paid more than a back bencher. The same position applies right down the salary scale. On what have their conditions been based? They are based on what has been gained by some employee far lower down in the economic bracket. Those people who condemn should take some time to think over the position more clearly because the men on strike are not enjoying their workless days. They are not enjoying seeing their families suffer, and they are not enjoying forfeiting their pleasures. They prefer to work and get their pay. Those who are observing the Mt. Isa dispute from afar have a different conception from those who are intimately concerned, but they should realise that the workers who are out believe they have a just cause, and have had to adopt this way of expressing themselves because of the Government's removal of bonus payment from the jurisdiction of the court.

The recent seasons have not been satisfactory for the grain growers of the Central Highlands, particularly for the production of wheat.

Mr. Hughes: You will agree that seasonal conditions have a great bearing on unemployment.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I will deal with that point later.

Last year the wheat crop was poor, and this year, with the exception of an area between Emerald and Springsure, production has been practically nil. In the more fortunate areas, sufficient rain has fallen to produce light crops. Luckily the sorghum season earlier gave yields which classed the production as an all-time record. The sorghum growers had a little good luck, thanks to the misfortune of their fellow country workers in other parts of the State.

The sorghum crop would not have had a satisfactory market if there had not been a drought. The unfortunate graziers had to turn to the local supply of sorghum which, because of its wonderful harvest, would not have obtained a satisfactory market overseas.

We are undergoing a change in the way of living on the Central highlands that is particularly interesting. We find that the pattern of change from grazing to agriculture, set in train by the Queensland British Food Corporation, and later followed by the subdivision of the district into living areas for closer settlement, though slow in its initial stages, has now reached a surprising momentum. Practically every property conveniently situated to rail transport, has land under the plough and the influx of share farmers has been astonishing. A fortnight ago, in the middle of 6,000 acres of wheat, I stood amazed. In whatever direction I looked, wheat extended to the horizon. It was a light crop certainly, but what satisfaction must it have been to the owner who, by producing this crop, has shown the potential of the district. This property has an interesting history. The man who owns it is progressive. He moved with the change from pastoral to agricultural activities, and moved well. The extent of the property is 11,500 acres, of which 6,000 acres are now under cultivation. Five share-farmers work it. The owner expects to put another 2,500 acres under the plough and employ at least another share-farmer.

That gives the Committee an idea of the potential of the Central Highlands. What can be done there can be done on almost any property in the immediate vicinity of the Gindie district, and of course it will extend farther with the change of ideas that has come about in the area, which, until 1950, was a purely pastoral district.

By the way, there are hundreds of thousands of these areas occupied by brigalow and softwood scrubs, and besides that there are the vast areas of open downs. When they are converted to agricultural pursuits the grain produced and the increased carrying capacity of the country will contribute greatly to the State's economy.

Our problem will not be to get production but to find markets to absorb the products. In view of England's proposed entry into the European Common Market our industries must move now, and quickly to discover potential markets in the Pacific or else we shall not be sharing in the future wealth. Much research work must be done to study the requirements of these people for we shall have to adapt our manufacturing techniques to suit their needs.

Mr. Hughes: Would you trade with Red China?

Mr. O'DONNELL: If they pay for the products, yes. Would the hon. member turn a Communist out of his shop if he wanted to buy something from him?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. O'DONNELL: Every aspect of marketing must be revised, for these prospective customers range from the primitive to the cultured. Their religions, their ideologies and their customs will have to be understood. Hit-and-miss methods by our exporters must go by the board. The State and Federal Governments have a moral obligation to help and finance research for markets.

Perhaps hon. members have not noticed the small article that appeared in this morning's "The Courier-Mail." It is a criticism of what Australia, generally speaking, is doing about markets. With your permission, Mr. Taylor, I will read it. It is headed—

"No drive in our selling"
and it has this to say—

"Australian firms really had not been selling their goods overseas, but just 'permitting people to buy', a Federal Government trade expert said last night.

"The expert is Mr. Nevil Stuart, Director, Export Policy, Department of Trade in Canberra.

"Mr. Stuart, a former Australian Government trade commissioner in Japan, was addressing the Brisbane division of the Australian Institute of Management.

"Singapore imports £1,250,000 worth of canned meat a year," Mr. Stuart said. "But Australia supplies only £60,000 worth. Australia is at the bottom of the list behind the United Kingdom, United States, Denmark, the Netherlands, and other countries.

"The United States sends \$1 million worth of frozen poultry a year to Hong-kong, but we don't sell one chook there."

Despite decreased subsidies by this Government the shire councils of the Central Highlands have done their utmost to accommodate the grain-grower. They have endeavoured wherever possible to build feeder roads to railways from the production areas. Thus more grain-growers are encouraged to come into the district. And, of course, we find their numbers increasing not so much by people who are purchasing properties but through the advent of share-farmers. The result is that more grain is produced.

However, all shire councils are feeling the pinch financially, for they are not able to cope adequately with the rapid development that has come about. I consider that the State Government should make strong representations to the Commonwealth Government so that more funds can be allocated to councils that have to endeavour to keep up with such unprecedented development as is seen in the Central Highlands. These areas should have preferential treatment because it has been said—I am quoting the words of a local resident—that in the Central Highlands development has been so rapid that it is beyond the means or the capacity of the ratepayer to afford it.

That is a rather strong indictment of the Government when funds should be flowing into such an area. The great development in the area should be appreciated, and a district that is going ahead so fast should be marked down as worthy of the greatest support from State and Federal Governments.

There is very little work offering in the Barcoo electorate at present. Local residents, as well as persons from other districts and other States, are searching for any class of job. Unfortunately, no jobs are available from the local authorities and the Main Roads Department, because, through lack of finance, they are marking time and only keeping the old hands employed.

Mr. Duggan: And the withdrawal by the Government of the subsidies previously paid to local authorities.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that comment. Although some local shearers in the Barcoo have gone to other districts for work, there has been some activity in the shearing industry. Isolated sheds will be the pattern for a month or so. Dry weather throughout this area has some bearing on the unemployment position, but the credit restrictions caused property owners to reduce their improvements and repair work for the time being.

The Premier is fully aware of the seriousness of the unemployment situation. He and his colleague have repeatedly blamed the drought for the present position. However, he stated in "The Courier-Mail" of 17 October that recent rains could make more jobs available in some areas of the State, but would not materially improve the overall picture. He also said that a good wet season would improve the position within the next 12 months—a long time to exist on social service payments, as I think hon. members will agree.

The State was hoping for special Commonwealth assistance to find jobs, because Queensland could not provide additional funds for unemployment. However, current history is against the possibility of this. We remember the long fight to get finance for the reconstruction of the Mt. Isa railway compared with the action of the Menzies Government in going out of their way to provide finance for railway standardisation in Western Australia, tied up, of course, with the establishment of a steel industry at Kwinana. Secondary industry has declined, and the Federal Government have failed to stimulate it. Modernisation processes on the waterfront have thrown at least 1,000 watersiders out of work from Bundaberg to Cairns, and no other work has been found for them. Increasing unemployment will loom as a greater problem in coming years. Modern mechanisation has cut into the amount of seasonal work available in the meat industry and this will be the fate of the sugar industry too. Other

industries are not being established in the coastal towns, and reduced employment in the shipyards at Maryborough has added to the problem. I believe that fewer than 100 men are working there now. Queensland has the greatest seasonal unemployment rate of all the States as well as the greatest short-time working rate. Who is to blame, the State or the Federal Government? We remember the £200,000,000 allotted to the Snowy River project and the £2,000,000 allotted to the Canberra lake. There is also the likelihood that the Menzies Government will contribute £3,500,000 to the Murray River dam. We cannot blame Mr. Menzies alone; his Government is composed of both Country and Liberal Party members, who make the decision. It looks very dim for Queensland's prospects when we hear of the decision that they will contribute £3,500,000 to the Murray River dam at Chowilla near the South Australian border. That amount of money represents 25 per cent. of the cost of the dam, which it is expected will be the largest in Australia. We do not begrudge the people in the other States these things, but owing to the State Government's lack of initiative not one thought is given to Queensland. Our only salvation is in getting people back into employment. To do so we must produce and find markets.

Coastal employment is of particular interest to the electors of Barcoo and other western electorates, for those unfortunate people thrown out of work on the coast move west with the forlorn hope of obtaining some form of employment. They become competitors with the local unemployed for whatever jobs are offering. We want prosperity along the coast; we do not want to knock the coast. We want conditions along the coast to be good because good conditions on the coast reflect a prosperous hinterland. However, the position at the moment is a very dismal one with the unemployed from the coast moving inland.

I must comment on decentralisation—an unfulfilled promise of the Nicklin-Morris Government. We must stop the concentration of people in a few areas scattered along the eastern coastline, and aid development. Our empty spaces must be filled. I should like to quote Mr. Arthur Calwell. I realise that will not be very pleasant to hon. members opposite, but the following is a sentence of wisdom:—

"The promotion of our sprawling cities indicates a national degeneration which could lead to the point of national extinction."

Attractive conditions and amenities must become an essential part of life in the West and the North. Industries must be established to hold the people. The so-called unfavourable parts of the State attract the various types of public servants as a means to an end, namely promotion. Many of

our school-leavers we have to export to obtain positions. The Government should help. Give Central Queensland a university, a teachers' college, an agricultural high school, and a research station in the West. Expand secondary education wherever possible; explore every avenue for closer settlement; keep freight charges on essential goods at the lowest practicable level, and it will be found that the people will be contented with their lot.

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) (8.30 p.m.): I preface my remarks by asking the Treasurer a question through you, Mr. Taylor, because on his reply will depend my contribution to the debate and perhaps the fate of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the hon. member that whilst he may ask his question, the Treasurer is not obliged to reply. In fact, he cannot reply until he closes the debate.

Mr. BROMLEY: I did not think that he would reply. When he was presenting his Financial Statement his initial remarks led me to think that he was reading from last year's Financial Statement in which he said that the economy of the State and the Government's finances were affected by a combination of adverse factors. The Treasurer used the same phrase in his opening remarks this year.

Mr. Ewan: There has been a drought for five years.

Mr. BROMLEY: He truthfully mentioned the unfortunate fact that Queensland had had another dry year.

Mr. Ewan: Five dry years.

Mr. BROMLEY: Had had another dry year. He continued—

"While the national counter inflationary measures caused a decline in activity in industry generally which has continued into the current year."

The Treasurer used the words, "combination of adverse factors." He has a responsible job, to my way of thinking, the most important in the Government. He is responsible to the people of Queensland and to the Parliament and he should mention the other adverse factors that are ruining the economy of the State. There are many and they should be stressed amongst the most important being: four years of mismanagement by an inefficient coalition party, torn by internal strife; the lesser part of the coalition striving to become the so-called strength; the desire by each to enact legislation for their own sectional interest, neither party having a snowball's chance in Hades of being strong enough to rule in their own right, and each having as its theme song, "I'll Walk Alone."

The lifting of import restrictions is another adverse factor affecting the economy. I know that the blame for this does not lie

squarely on the shoulders of the State Government but surely they could have pointed out to the Federal Government, who have never been interested in the progress of Queensland and apparently do not wish to see us progress, that in Queensland we are trying to expand our export market yet the State is being flooded with products similar to those that are the mainstay of our export balances.

While speaking on the economy I quote from the 1961 annual report of the Queensland Chamber of Manufactures. I do not think anyone will argue that that body is not a supporter of the Tory coalition government. The article is headed "Economy" and reads—

"On November 15th, 1960, the Commonwealth Government announced drastic action intended to curb excessive spending.

"It has long been obvious that the dominant flaws in our post-war economy—constantly rising costs and a fluctuating overseas balance, both resulting from our inability to reconcile growth with stability—could not be easily rectified.

"By the end of 1960 it was apparent that the Government had made the mistake of trying to cure two problems by adopting a single remedy—deflation."

"Thereby the Government

(a) Dampened down domestic activity to the point of causing widespread unemployment; and

(b) Failed to stop unnecessary imports because of its stubborn refusal to reimpose selective import licensing.

"Your Council recommended that as a first step to rectify the overseas position the Government should take immediate action and reimpose selective import licensing. The credit squeeze could then have been relaxed sufficiently to correct the unemployment.

"Insofar as imports are concerned, the main fear of Australian manufacturers was that, unless licensing was restored, the Government could not strengthen the tariff barriers sufficiently to protect the local economy—during the period of import licensing the inadequacy of our tariff had not been recognised.

"Your Council believes that the lesson of the past few months is that governments and their advisers must at all times keep in close touch with the market place. The psychological impact of government measures on businessmen's expectations and on the public may be far more important than the actual measures themselves. And, in periods of difficulty and uncertainty, as current events are demonstrating, the retention of public and business confidence is critically important.

"The State Government also has a serious responsibility for the condition of the economy in that it must work in close co-operation with the Commonwealth and

must keep the Commonwealth Government fully informed of all its plans for development. These plans must be sufficiently developed to permit the proper appraisal of their value by those who control the purse strings."

That article bears out my earlier contention that the important portfolio of the Treasurer is not being administered wisely enough to bring about a stable economy in Queensland. The failure of the Government to provide sufficient money to expand water conservation, and so combat the effects of drought to which the Treasurer referred, is conducive to an unsound state of non-productivity of primary products, particularly export products. It is well known that the run-off from the great coastal rivers of Queensland exceeds the flow of water from the Southern Alps. Something should be done to trap this waste water. We of the Australian Labour Party have been urging the Government to increase water conservation, and so combat droughts of which country members speak so glibly. The Treasurer's apology for the Budget is based on drought conditions.

The Premier and other responsible Ministers issue statements to the country Press about the projects the Government have in mind for developing Queensland country areas, and projects that will encourage population. I predict that we are unlikely to have greater population in Queensland while the present Government have control of the Treasury benches. People are leaving the State continually because of the maladministration of a government that are bereft of stimulating ideas. Stimulating ideas have been put forward from this side of the Chamber. If adopted they would mean progress for Queensland.

Earlier I sought to ask the Treasurer a question. Perhaps he will answer it in his reply. I ask him to indicate also in his reply whether he believes in full employment and a full, progressive, stable economy.

I will give the reason why the Federal anti-Queensland government will not allocate money to the State with the greatest potential, to use their favourite phrase. They do not want Queensland to become industrialised, as they know they would lose the great majority of the seats they now hold in Queensland. I do not think anybody could deny that. The Government know, we know and the Menzies Government know that if Queensland was industrialised, as we want it to be, there would be so many industrial workers in Queensland that the Menzies government would be annihilated in this State.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BROMLEY: That is what hon. members on the Government benches will say on 9 December, 1961, when they find that the electors of Queensland have awakened to this Government and the coalition anti-workers' Government in

Canberra. The Canberra Federal coalition Government are living on borrowed time and on that date the people, knowing that we must have a stable economy, will return a Labour Government. The electors can hardly wait for the day to come when Labour will rehabilitate the country. They know that the A.L.P. comes to the forefront in times of crises. We have only to look through history to find that in the last war the coalition Government could not carry on in 1940. What did they do? They turned to the Curtin Government, the country went to the people, and the people supported the A.L.P. as they will do in December next. Let the Government members make no mistake about that. I tell Government members through you, Mr. Taylor, that they should make no forecast of what will happen on 9 December. They are only trying to bolster their confidence. The people of Queensland and Australia have had enough of the Federal Government and know that the Australian Labour Party is the only party that will govern Australia economically.

For the time being, I will ignore the interjectors on my left and will silence them by saying that the people will return an A.L.P. Federal Government that will provide security and full employment. That will be our first objective. One of the first things we will have to do is to provide security and stability.

Hon. members opposite are asking for objective ideas. I will give them four objective ideas to help the economy of the State. The Tory Government have done worse than take value out of the pound; they have taken the pound out of circulation. We have only to look around us to see what has happened. Government members must not fool themselves into thinking that the pound is still in circulation. It may be in the pockets of hon. members on the Government benches with big grazing properties, but what about the poor unemployed in Queensland and Australia? They have no pounds in circulation. Government members should not delude themselves. The Federal Government have achieved their objective of creating a pool of unemployment, but the Labour Party will create full employment.

The Minister for "Imagination," Mr. Morris, kidded the people into believing that when the coalition Government took charge it would not be a case of finding jobs for the workers, but finding workers for the jobs. That slogan bears repeating because it was one of the central policies of the Government parties during the last election—it would be a case of finding people for the jobs, not jobs for the people. It is the reverse now. We in the Opposition are trying to find jobs for the people, but the Government are doing nothing about it. The Minister is still trying to find workers for the jobs, but he is doing it by driving people out of Queensland to the southern States. Eventually, when they get sick of the maladministration of the

coalition Government they will all go down south and we will not have sufficient people in Queensland to fill all the jobs.

The best job for the Minister for "Imagination" would be in the weather bureau because, as has been pointed out, the Government have been basing their stop-and-go policy on the weather. This matter is relevant to the debate. When one considers the type of legislation that has been introduced in the last four years and the lifting of price control of recent months even with unemployment figures so high—and how they have soared—one wonders whether the Government wish to continue in office.

It is strange when we see members of the coalition fighting and arguing amongst themselves over such matters as the Transport Act but never castigating the responsible members of the Government, both Federal and State, who were the cause of the tremendous figure of 125,000 registered unemployed. That is the figure in recent weeks. Probably it is higher in fact but I am quoting the registered unemployed. It certainly smacks of selfishness personified. If this Government had been seriously concerned about unemployment the subsidies to local authorities would never have been reduced. The Treasurer has reduced them and saved the Government money. In replying to a question I asked about August last he said the State Government will save £1,000,000. They have been reducing subsidies continually since 1957 until now they are non-existent, but they are doing nothing about creating employment with the £1,000,000 that they saved. If they had kept up those subsidies to local authorities there would be more employment today.

We read in the newspapers, not only the Brisbane papers but also in the country Press, of workers being displaced. The brickworks at Pomona have closed down. Nobody can deny that sawmills throughout the State have closed. We all know those figures from the Commonwealth Statistician. I will not quote them now because I want to get on to other important aspects of the debate. However, I remind the Committee that they are closing down and causing more widespread unemployment. They are all suffering from the effects of the maladministration of this inefficient Government, who, although they try to legislate for sectional interests and private enterprise, are actually ruining private enterprise and creating more unemployment. Scores of firms are being forced to close down and discontinue production.

Mr. Ewan: Where are those firms? Tell us.

Mr. BROMLEY: You read the papers. I think you can read. If you don't want to read, get out among your electors. Get out among the people of Queensland.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gaven): Order! I ask the hon. member to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BROMLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Gaven. I got carried away because the hon. member for Roma has been continually interjecting just to get his name in "Hansard". We do not hear him often and when he speaks he does not say anything important, so he is trying to make his speech by interjection. If he likes to go with me into the Parliamentary Library I will show him some headlines in the papers about 600 dismissed here, 1,000 somewhere else, and so on. Only recently we read of 9,000 unemployed in the motor-car industry. The building industry has been affected not only by dismissals in private enterprise but also by dismissals in the Department of Public Works. These things are common, unfortunately. Members of the Australian Labour Party are very concerned about the position. We want to see full employment and to see the pound go into circulation, not only for the benefit of the workers but also for the benefit of the business people and the people of Australia generally.

Mr. Hughes interjected.

Mr. BROMLEY: All the hon. member for Kurilpa worries about is dirty pornographic literature and fruit barrows.

Mr. Hughes: I only pick it up after you have finished with it.

Mr. BROMLEY: I shall have something to say about the hon. member later. He first produced it in the House and then passed it around. I was away for a week at a conference and I had occasion to interview many business people in the South.

Mr. Smith: Who did the talking? You, or them?

Mr. BROMLEY: We all spoke sensibly, which is more than the hon. member ever does. I warn this Government and the Federal Government that all the big businessmen in the South are sympathetic to the Australian Labour Party in Queensland and Australia today, so much so that they are going against their usual grain and supporting it because they know it is the crisis party and the people have to turn to it to rehabilitate the country.

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gaven): Order! I ask hon. members on both sides of the Chamber to allow the hon. member to make his speech.

Mr. BROMLEY: As I have often said before, I do not mind hon. members on the Government benches interjecting, because very often their interjections are so inane that they can be ignored altogether.

I shall tell hon. members what one big businessman who controls a large number of employees told me, although I do not intend to mention the name of the firm. He said, as others have said—probably many hon. members have heard this—"If the workers

haven't got a quid, how do you expect us to get a quid?" They have known it all along, but they are now saying it out in the open—"If the worker has not got a quid, how will it get into circulation? How will we get a quid, and how will Australia continue to progress?" I ask hon. members opposite to wake up to that.

Mr. Ewan: Where was this? At No. 67 Kings Cross?

Mr. BROMLEY: It was down in Sydney, and the hon. member has never heard of some of the firms. As a matter of fact, they would have nothing to do with him.

I think these matters should be mentioned in the Chamber and brought to the notice of the Treasurer. After all, he has an important job to do and we are trying to assist him and the Government. I point out to him that there are other adverse factors besides the drought and the credit squeeze affecting Queensland's economy today, and the present coalition Government are doing nothing to create prosperity and full employment.

I do not know whether this editorial in the "Telegraph" dated 25 May, 1961, has been quoted before, but I think it is worth recording in "Hansard." The few intelligent members on my left would be well advised to listen to it. It will give some indication of what the Press think of the coalition. It is headed "Public issues need airing" and goes on to say—

"It is time the State Government, now well into its second term of office after long years in the political wilderness, took stock of its attitude towards important important public questions.

Its sensitive reaction to the slightest breath of criticism is not in the best interests of Queensland. It tends to breed a situation in which the proper public discussion of important matters becomes a sort of live-or-die battle between the Government and its critics.

"This has been discernible in almost every major issue that has been raised during the past two or three years. It goes back to the hotly contested decision to build the new morgue in a public park; it was reflected in the head-on collision between State and City Council on traffic control measures and the future of the municipal electricity undertaking.

"This hyper-sensitivity has brought the Government's heavy calibre guns strongly into action in defence of its land administration policy . . ."

In the last year or two we have heard criticisms from their own side of the land administration policy.

" . . . the future of road and rail transport, and shopping hours."

We have heard criticism of the Government in respect of all those matters. But they will not listen to criticism. They are not

interested in learning anything. All they say is, "Tell us something, tell us something." You tell them something constructive and sensible but they continue to ignore it. The editorial continues—

"The latest examples are the cloak of secrecy it has chosen to throw over the Westbrook Home inquiry and the Premier's ultimatum to his own party over a resolution seeking an investigation into the State's hospital administration which is kept a closely guarded secret from the public."

Let me deviate slightly here. The editorial speaks of hospital administration but this so-called democratic Government are not going to debate the Estimates for the Department of Health and Home Affairs this year. They have too much to hide. They do not want a discussion on the Westbrook inquiry or on matters relating to aborigines. That is why the State's hospital administration is being kept a closely guarded secret. The editorial goes on—

"This is not the sort of atmosphere in which the interests of Queensland's full development can best be served."

I wholeheartedly agree.

"All these matters are of prime importance to substantial sections of the community. It is only reasonable in a democratic system of government, that the people should be given not only every opportunity but every encouragement to express their views on questions that affect their lives and well-being.

"This is not possible if every Cabinet Minister is going to regard it almost as a personal affront if a question is asked about some aspect of his administration."

This morning Mr. Speaker spoke about the asking of questions concerning matters of public interest. The editorial continues—

"In place of this sensitive approach the Government should be doing its best to stimulate public discussion so that it can better align itself with the public's wishes. It never should forget that it holds its mandate as an instrument of the people."

The people will exercise that mandate on 9 December next at the Federal elections, and again in 1963 at the State elections if the coalition Government last that long. The "Telegraph" should be congratulated on its excellent editorial. That is the sort of thing we want to see.

Even in the second paragraph of his Financial Statement deep gloom replaced the Treasurer's usual suave approach to problems and difficulties. His famous carnation was beginning to droop. I don't know if this indicated he is a flirt, or if he is just flirting with finance. He mentioned in the Financial Statement the record value of production in mining, sugar and tobacco. I am afraid he must have prepared the statement long before the main series of tobacco sales. We all know what happened there. We all know of the prices ring that operated, of the

rackets and of the poor deal the growers received. I have here an article in "The Courier-Mail" headed "Tobacco 'Low' Bewildering." It is by "The Courier-Mail"'s land writer, Mr. F. Cornish, who knows what he is talking about. Another headline to an article by Mr. Cornish reads, "Tobacco Collapse Inevitable Unless . . ." He says—

"Virtual collapse of tobacco-growing is inevitable in many south-western areas unless the industry is able to conform with the higher quality standards now being demanded by manufacturers.

"Rightly or wrongly, manufacturers have insisted that they no longer can conceal the larger volume of inferior Australian leaf in their blends with imported tobacco."

Who is responsible for the importing of all these items—chicken, ham, tobacco, bread, everything that we in Australia are producing to create employment? What about giving Australia a go instead of selling Australia to overseas interests?

Mr. Hughes: Is it not up to Australians to buy Australian-made goods?

Mr. BROMLEY: It is up to the Australian Government to look after Australia for the good of the Australian people. That is more than Iron. members opposite have ever done.

Mr. Hughes: What are you doing?

Mr. BROMLEY: I am doing my best, in my small way, to contribute something to this debate to force the Government to act towards improving the economy of the State. I will not be sidetracked by these interjections.

I should like to quote in full Mr. Cornish's article on the collapse of the tobacco industry but it is there for anybody who wishes to see it. I know what the conditions in the industry are like. I spent two years growing tobacco for experience and I know a little about it. All hon. members opposite know about tobacco is that they smoke it. They probably hold shares in tobacco companies, probably overseas companies, not Australian.

I shall move quickly through the Financial Statement. On the second page the Treasurer moved more quickly still when showing the upward trend of unemployment.

On the deficit, I am in complete agreement with my Leader. I am not opposed to deficits in times of crisis and unemployment as serious as it is today.

Mr. Smith: I take it that you do not support the amendment?

Mr. BROMLEY: I have told the hon. member that I honestly believe what my Leader has already expressed, that I am not against a deficit in times of crisis and unemployment. We have heard comments on the lack of sense in interjections. Listening to the hon. member for Windsor all I can hear is "whingeing from Windsor." I wish to inject something constructive into this debate yet all I hear from the other side are these stupid interjections.

The Treasurer should have taken a bold marching step and budgeted for a larger deficit if it would create more employment. We must have full employment. The Treasurer said—

"Revenue was £1,106,529 less than forecast and expenditure was £704,572 below the estimate for the year."

Reading between the lines we can see that the Treasurer must hate his Federal colleagues in Canberra. In the Budget he castigates them not by name but by inference, in saying that the credit squeeze "had its greatest impact on revenues derived from Stamp, Succession and Probate Duties and Titles Office fees." The combined collections were the best part of £1,000,000 less than expected. So will the Treasurer be honest with me, as I know him to be, and admit that the Menzies coalition Government have done irreparable harm to Queensland?

I should like to refer briefly to the tables to the Financial Statement. Time does not allow me to dwell at length on the depressing financial affairs of the State.

The hon. member for Roma is not in the Chamber.

An A.L.P. Member: You have knocked him out.

Mr. BROMLEY: I have knocked him out. I remember his asking by way of interjection what ideas we could put forward to improve the economy of Queensland. I have already given a few and I can assure hon. members that we shall continue to put forward progressive ideas. In my opinion five words provide the key to a stable economy: "Full employment is the answer."

Mr. Hughes: What is your plan for it?

Mr. BROMLEY: For the information of the ignorant member for Kurilpa I say that if we occupied the Government benches there would be no unemployment. Even if unemployment was brought about by the Menzies coalition Government, we would correct it. If we were on the Government benches we would soon show that we could correct it.

Government members generally have asked, "What are your ideas?" I have listened to them during this debate. Apparently not many are going to speak after me. They have asked, "What sensible ideas can you put up? What are you going to do to overcome unemployment?" The hon. member for Kurilpa asked that question. I want to ask them the question, "What sensible ideas has any Government member put forward?" We have listened to all sorts of stupid ideas. As a matter of fact some of the speeches almost made me sick, and it takes quite a lot to make me sick. We heard poppycock from the hon. member for Roma, wild and fantastic dreams and maniacal murmurings from the hon. member for Merthyr and a tirade of

filth and perversion from the hon. member for Kurilpa. He cannot deny it; it is recorded in "Hansard". It would appear to me that he delights in reading pornographic literature. Then we had the whingeing of the hon. member for Windsor. And they ask us what ideas we can put forward!

Mr. SMITH: I rise to a point of order. I am desirous of correcting one of the many errors that are apparent in the hon. member's speech. I have not spoken in this debate, so if he wants to be accurate he should withdraw that statement.

Mr. BROMLEY: Thank you Mr. Gaven. I did not have the chance to finish what I was saying before the hon. member for Windsor was on his feet, as quick as a flash. I intended to say that we had this "whingeing from Windsor" in the Address in Reply debate. I know it was not on the Financial Statement because he has not had the time, thanks to his outside practice, that takes up most of his time—when he should be looking after his electorate—to look at or study the Budget. He has not risen to his feet to speak on it. If he had only waited a minute for me to tell him that the whingeing came from him during the Address in Reply debate there would have been no need for him to raise to his feet.

Mr. Duggan: Even the messengers had difficulty in recognising him.

Mr. BROMLEY: As my leader states, even the messengers have difficulty recognising him. I saw the hon. member bailed up as he came to the door one day, and I thought, "Who goes there?"

There has not been one constructive idea advanced by any member of the Coalition Government to help the Treasurer in his very difficult job, and I am the first to admit that his job is very difficult.

Mr. Tucker: And it is made more difficult by those behind him.

Mr. BROMLEY: I am trying to point that out. Not one progressive idea has been forthcoming from Government members to help him. We must feel sorry for him in his position.

There are two nasty statements in the summary on page 19 of the Financial Statement.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BROMLEY: Now, boys, turn to page 19. First of all, there is the new racing turnover tax.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gaven): I ask the hon. member to address members of the Chamber as hon. members, and not "boys."

Mr. BROMLEY: I thought we were back in the Fourth Form at St. Percy's the way

they were interjecting, and I just said, "Now, boys." I will not repeat it, Mr. Gaven, and I thank you for correcting me and putting me on the correct path.

I will point out the two nasty statements, one of which is the racing and betting tax, and the second is the new liquor fees to be imposed. We all know about that one. Our Leader and other Opposition members have spoken on it. On page 20 there is to be found one item that pleases me greatly; it is long overdue. Provision is made for an increase in the Police Force. In my opinion, when the Government pass the legislation for the relaxation of the liquor laws we will need more police. That is shocking legislation. On page 21 the Treasurer said—

"... our economy is vulnerable to and can be vitally affected by adverse seasonal conditions, the United Kingdom's application to join the European Common Market..."

Great Britain's proposed entry into the European Common Market has caused quite a deal of apprehension about the immediate economic effects of this threat to our exports of primary produces—and rightly so. Perhaps even greater apprehension will arise from a possible weakening of Commonwealth ties and the fear that it may be the beginning of the end of the Commonwealth concept. Now we have something to worry about, the weakening of Commonwealth ties and the fear that it may be the beginning of the end of the Commonwealth concept. The development of the Common Market in Europe represents to my mind the most momentous political event in modern history. I think we in Australia should be quite clear in our minds what it really means. The important thing to grasp, I think, is that the Market belies its name. It is not by any means only an economic conception; rather than that, in essence it is a political conception and therefore of great significance to the world. It has probably sprung from the terrible history of Europe in this century and the feeling deep-rooted in the thoughts of Europeans that things could not go on as they have in the past and that somehow or other a new Europe had to be created.

Unfortunately the Federal Government do not appear to understand fully the implications and the meaning of the entry of Britain into the Common Market or, if they do, they have not indicated to the people of Australia, in terms that they can understand, anyway, what it could mean to Australia. No-one can deny that. It is of tremendous importance to the people of Australia and Queensland in particular, as we are in the first instance a primary-producing State. We must fully understand the possible implications. Whether the Common Market is an end in itself or whether it is the means to an end and where it will eventually lead perhaps no-one can say. Some say the ultimate outcome could be a United States of Europe. That bears thinking about.

Can any of us say how Australia may come out in the final reckoning from the entry of Britain into the Common Market? So, irrespective of the final result to Australia's trade with Britain, the Government should without delay negotiate trade relations with countries as close to Australia as possible irrespective of political outlook. We must trade with people we can get money from. We have to get money to get for Australia the best progress possible and the soundest economy. These countries desire trade because of their teeming populations. Australia cannot afford to ignore any country that is desirous of trading with her and that is in a position to pay for the goods supplied.

It might be of interest to hon. members to know and will probably surprise many, that Britain has over 60 selling agencies in Russia alone, yet hon. members opposite talk about no trading with Communist countries. Why do they not wake up to themselves and do something about trading with those countries irrespective of their political outlook?

I pose this question to the Federal Government and I know that the answer will be of great significance to the people of Australia—"Will our preferences on the British market disappear entirely, as seems possible, or will we get assurances that our primary producers will not suffer?" The Country Party people should be very concerned about that.

Mr. Low: They have the matter well in hand.

Mr. BROMLEY: They have nothing of the sort. They would not know the first thing about it. The hon. member has just come into the Chamber and already he is trying to butt in. What I want to know is: will we get the time to adjust our trade relations with these countries before Britain does enter the Common Market? That is the least we are entitled to expect.

Much as I should like to continue speaking on the Financial Statement, I should like to get before the people of Queensland this quotation from the London "Observer"—

"Guide to the Common Market

"The European Economic Community consists of six countries—Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and The Netherlands.

"The Aims of the Common Market

"The aim of the European Economic Community is to eliminate the traditional system of economic frontiers between national States in Europe."

This is what the Federal Government should tell the people. It goes on—

"The final target is not precisely defined. The Treaty of Rome merely talks of establishing 'an ever-closer union' among the States of Europe—but if the

Community is effective in creating common economic policies, that will involve making many political decisions in common too.

"The kind of European union to which members of the Common Market commit themselves is an open-ended affair: there are no limits set to the process of integration."

On the other hand there is no commitment to join a Federation of Europe. What is specifically promised is:—

"(a) EQUALITY of economic opportunity for everyone throughout the Community. By the time it is fully established an Italian will have the right to set up a shop anywhere in Germany; a German worker will be free to displace a Frenchman in a French factory if he is better qualified for the job; and the French worker will have the same rights in Germany. Meanwhile goods, as well as people, will move freely, unimpeded by any form of national protection, throughout the area.

"(b) Member-States commit themselves to a COMMON policy on a number of issues—notably trade relations towards the rest of the world (i.e., abolition of separate trade treaties), agriculture and transport. For other purposes, there will be co-ordination of national policies, i.e., although national policies of members will not be identical, they will have to be designed to take account of the needs of the rest of the Community.

"2. THE COMMON MARKETS TIMETABLE

"The European Economic Community comes into full operation in three stages, each of which is to be four years' long. The end of the first stage is due at the end of December, 1962. The Common Market will be in full operation not later than 1973; but, if no delay takes place, full operation will be by 1970.

"Tariff Changes

"Already, the members have cut internal tariffs by 40 per cent. and they may be cut by a further 10 per cent. next year. All remaining internal tariffs must be removed by 1973 at the very latest."

I notice that Country Party members are leaving the Chamber. They are not interested in Queensland's position in relation to the United Kingdom's entry into the Common Market.

The article continues—

"Common External Tariff

"The first moves have already been made towards a common external tariff, by raising or lowering national tariffs towards the eventual common level.

"Agriculture

"By 1970-1973 at the latest, member States will establish a common agricultural

policy designed to protect farmers within the Community against the full force of outside competition (generally by duties or levies on imports).

"Freedom of Labour Movement

"FREE MOVEMENT of workers is to be ensured by 1970-1973. This must include the right of workers to "accept offers of employment actually made" by an employer in another country.

"Professional men and businessmen will be free to work in any country in the Community.

"Transport

"There will be a common transport policy, including common rules applicable to international transport and limited permission for one member country to operate transport services within another.

"The Community's General Policy

"The drafters of the Treaty did not consider that a simple removal of trade restrictions and restrictions on labour movement would, in themselves, lead to a sufficient degree of equality of economic opportunity or of co-ordination of national economic policies. Provision was therefore made for rules to establish and maintain fair competition and to co-ordinate economic and social policy.

"Economic Policy

"NATIONAL economic policies are to be a matter of common interest and consultation. The aims are stated to be to maintain balance-of-payments equilibrium, a high level of employment, and price stability. Exchange rate policy is to be a matter of 'common interest' (though Germany did not consult her partners before revaluing the mark this year). Action to deal with balance-of-payment difficulties is to be taken after consultation with the Commission.

"The Treaty does not provide for or envisage the need for common budgetary policies. Monetary policies are to be co-ordinated by a Monetary Committee with consultative status. In practice, close consultation on overall economic policy between governments will prove necessary if the Common Market is to work satisfactorily.

"Social Policies

"By 1962, there must be equal pay for equal work by men and women workers. There shall also be 'close collaboration' between members in matters of labour legislation and social security.

"3. INSTITUTIONS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

"The main centres of power lie in the international bureaucracy, which is independent of national Governments, and in the Council of Ministers, which represents the Governments. In addition, there is a European Parliamentary Assembly and a Court of Justice."

Mr. Ramsden: Who said all this? It is so long ago that I have forgotten.

Mr. BROMLEY: The hon. member was not in the Chamber when I began to read it. For his benefit, I shall mention that it is an extract from an article in "The Observer" from London. Hon. members who have the good of Queensland and Australia at heart will find it worth listening to because it deals with the aims of the Common Market, which, as I said, are not publicised by the Commonwealth Government.

The article continues—

"The bureaucracy has three branches for the three organisations of the Community:—

1. The Common Market Commission—nine members.

2. The High Authority of the Coal and Steel Community—nine members. Set up to pool the member countries' resources of coal, iron and steel, in a single market without frontier barriers.

3. The Euratom Commission—five members. Set up to give the Community a powerful nuclear industry for peaceful uses.

"The Common Market Commission has the power to issue certain directives to member Governments. These directives generally cover minor matters, but include certain more important matters, notably the power to grant tariff quotas to member countries on foodstuffs and on certain raw materials, and to permit action to prevent dumping.

"On other major matters, the Commission can only make proposals to the Council of Ministers. The Commission is essentially a European civil service not a federal Government: while it can propose, national Governments in the Council of Ministers have the power to dispose, and are responsible for the implementation of decisions.

"The Commission also administers the EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND, which can make retraining and resettlement grants and temporary unemployment grants to workers displaced by competition in the Common Market.

"The EUROPEAN INVESTMENT BANK, which makes development loans, is administered by a Board of Governors composed of Ministers appointed by member States.

"The PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY of 142 members is currently elected by and from national Parliaments, but will eventually be elected by direct suffrage. Its duties are primarily to discuss the work of the bureaucracies of the three organisations of the Community and it has the power to question the bureaucrats.

"The COURT OF JUSTICE is also common to all three organisations of the

Community. It consists of seven judges to 'ensure observance of law and justice in the interpretation and application of the Treaty'."

As I have mentioned before, we are not to be given the opportunity to debate the Estimates of the Department of Health and Home Affairs because it is such a hot potato, but as those Estimates are part of the Budget I am at liberty to speak about them now. Fewer persons are to be employed in that department this financial year. I read with particular concern that in the important field of mental hygiene 111 fewer persons will be employed. We must recognise that with the maladministration of the coalition Government in Queensland and their temporary cohorts in the Federal sphere—I say "temporary" advisedly—people are being driven crazy worrying about their future. But it is rather a tragedy that in a most important field like mental hygiene 111 fewer people are to be employed.

I have a letter here that I think should be read to the Committee as it concerns not only the Department of Health and Home Affairs but also the Department of Justice. It states—

"X-ray Department,
"General Hospital,
"Townsville, Q.

"Dear Mr. Ward,

"In the course of my normal duties at the X-ray department at this hospital, I had occasion on 1 January, 1961, to take X-ray films on a patient who had been in a shooting incident.

"A court case arose from this incident, and I was called upon firstly to give a statement to the police to the effect that I had taken certain X-ray films on the patient at that time, and then I had to attend a sitting of the District Court as a witness for the Crown. The times I had to attend the Court sitting were during my normal working hours. The attending doctor who saw the patient at the time of his admission also had to attend during his normal working hours. We were both told to be at the Court by 10 a.m. that morning, and left work here about 9.50 a.m. to be present.

"When they decided we were no longer required at the Court, we were both paid witness fees by cheque, my fees being £4 2s. 1d.

"I have now received a notice from the clerk at the office of the local Supreme Court, that because——"

(Time expired.)

Mr. DUFFICY (Warrego) (9.30 p.m.): It seems rather a pity that such excellent speeches are being made from this side to a completely complacent Government who consider themselves entirely right in all circumstances. Hon. members opposite are

not prepared to defend their own Treasurer in this debate and I sincerely hope that I do not get too many interjections from them during my brief remarks. Hon. members who might wish to interject have had ample opportunity, had they so desired, to state their own cases on the floor of the Chamber, but they have not done so. As I say, I hope they have not the temerity to interject with me.

During my time in this Parliament I have never known an instance when three members of the Opposition speak consecutively with not one member of the Government supporting their own policy or the Budget introduced by their Treasurer. I think it is a shocking indictment of the Government. It demonstrates that the majority of backbenchers are not in accord with what appears in the Budget. If they were they would surely support it.

I can understand their reluctance to support a Budget which was very adequately described by our Leader as "a booze and betting budget." I can also understand their reluctance to support the policy of the Government who offer so little.

When we look at the Government's record, what do we find? They have a record of deficits in this and the three previous years; there is a record number of unemployed in the State and record losses in the Railway Department. I am pleased to see the Minister for Lands and Irrigation in the Chamber because I cannot imagine anybody, even the hon. member for Roma, supporting their record on land matters so, as I say, there is, after all, some excuse for hon. members opposite being reluctant to stand up and support a Government with a record such as I have mentioned.

Now, let us look at some of the things that the Government have done in the very short, but for the people of Queensland, very unfortunate period they have occupied the Treasury benches. Despite the fact that the Mt. Isa dispute has been debated very adequately by hon. members on this side, I feel it is my duty as an industrialist to make some brief comments on the unfortunate position. I hope I state the facts more fairly than they were stated by Government members, including the hon. member for Aspley. He not only misrepresented the position but proved conclusively that he knew nothing about it or the causes of it. He spoke very briefly because he could not find anything good to say about the Government and could not support their actions.

Most hon. members know that I had lengthy industrial experience before entering Parliament. During the whole of that time, going back to the sugar strike of 1911, I know of no industrial dispute in Queensland, whether it lasted for three days, three weeks or three months, that was not settled eventually by the Industrial Court.

Men have taken direct action. They demonstrated in that way their complete and absolute denial that they were getting justice in their working conditions, but sooner or later the dispute was settled by the Industrial Court.

We recall the unfortunate position that existed in Western Queensland during the shearers' strike but I will not go into all the ramifications of that dispute. Although it lasted many months, eventually it was settled by the Industrial Court. What is the history of the lead bonus, a prosperity bonus or any other type of bonus in industry? The bonus is fixed by the Court and accepted by employees. I challenge hon. members opposite to deny my statement that since the introduction of the lead bonus at Mt. Isa, which was subsequently altered to a prosperity bonus, there has not been a scrap of industrial trouble at Mt. Isa arising out of bonus payments. Even reductions granted by the Court were accepted by the employees. Men who are now on strike at Mt. Isa have always accepted the Court's decision on bonus payments. The men are not on strike; they have been locked out. The dispute exists simply because the Government denied those men the right of arbitration. The dispute occurred only because the Government removed consideration of bonus payments from the Court's jurisdiction. If the hon. member for Aspley or any other hon. member denies that, he is not telling the truth. When the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill was introduced into the Chamber there was then an application before the Court by the unions concerned for extra bonus payments and at that time the Court ordered an investigation to be made into the profits and the financial condition of the company so that it could decide what was a fair and reasonable bonus for the men employed on the field. It is true, too, and may not be denied, that when the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill was passed that inquiry had to be discontinued because the Act took away from the Court the power to make a decision on bonuses. That, too, cannot be denied. When hon. members speak about Mt. Isa they should speak factually. If the Court had been allowed to adjudicate on bonus payments, I venture to say that whether the bonus remained at £8 a week or whether it was increased, the men would have accepted the decision. Hon. members must remember that I am fortified when I make that remark because since the inception of bonus payments the men have accepted the decision of the Court on bonuses. We must not be hypocritical about it. I believe there is more in this than meets the eye. In my opinion there is a very good reason for the Mt. Isa Mines Company to lock the men out. However, I will not go into that because it would be merely supposition on my part and I do not believe in making statements in this Chamber that I cannot prove. I assure hon. members that all the statements I have made about Mt. Isa are true, and I challenge any Government member to deny what I have said.

I was on the A.W.U. Executive on the first occasion when the lead bonus was discussed and I know the history of the lead bonus from its inception. I was in court on numerous occasions when bonus payments for Mt. Isa Mines employees were under discussion. Although on numerous occasions we did not receive from the Court what we thought the employees were entitled to, on every occasion the employees accepted the bonus because the Court said it was a fair and reasonable thing. In all sincerity and honesty I suggest that the position in Mt. Isa today is most unfortunate.

It appeared in the paper recently that the Government were losing thousands and thousands of pounds a week because of the loss of freight on the Mt. Isa line. In Mt. Isa there are 13,000 people whose livelihood depends on that mine. Here we have an industry that a Labour Government subsidised and helped to establish in the State, to their everlasting credit.

So we have a community of 13,000 people and an industry that is of tremendous economic value to the State. We have the employer on the one hand and the employees on the other locked in a struggle and it seems that that struggle may go on for months and months.

What can the Government do about it? While the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act for which they were responsible remains in operation they can do nothing about it simply because the court has no authority to deal with it. But what the Government can do, if they have the intestinal fortitude to face up to their responsibilities, is amend that legislation to give the court the right to decide what is fair between employer and employee.

We hear hon. members opposite giving lip service to arbitration. They say, "Why doesn't the worker abide by arbitration?" Here we have an instance where they have deliberately taken away the right of arbitration from thousands of employees. If they want to face up to their responsibilities in the matter—and surely to goodness in the interests of Queensland and in the interests of 13,000 people in Mt. Isa they must—the Government should have the intestinal fortitude to say, "We made a mistake in this matter and because we made that mistake this unfortunate position exists today. If they have the intestinal fortitude to do that and to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, giving the court the right to decide what is a fair and reasonable bonus—and that is the only way the court can function—in my opinion (and I am speaking advisedly and with past history to back me up) the men in Mt. Isa will accept the court's decision. They are entitled to go to the court.

I make that suggestion in all seriousness. It is not good enough to sit back and say, "Let the men in Mt. Isa starve." Rest assured that the shareholders in Mt. Isa will not starve because the company made a

profit of almost £6,000,000 last financial year and paid a dividend of something like 25 per cent. to its shareholders. If the mine is closed for the next 12 months the shareholders will not be very seriously inconvenienced because over the two-year period they will get 12½ per cent. per annum as dividend. But what are the men getting out of it? And who was responsible for making that £6,000,000 profit and that 25 per cent. dividend? Surely to goodness the men who worked there were partly responsible for it! They played an important part in it. If we talk about the necessity for capital on the one hand and labour on the other, surely labour is entitled to its share of the prosperity of an industry if capital is entitled to its share. The shareholders who received a dividend of 25 per cent. from Mt. Isa Mines Ltd. did not have to appeal to anybody to get it; they did not have to go on strike or be locked out. It was paid to them and that was all about it. So surely it is only fair and just that the men employed there should have the right of appeal to an independent tribunal that can decide what proportion of the prosperity they are entitled to by way of bonus payments.

Let me conclude my remarks on the situation at Mt. Isa by making a final appeal to the Premier. If I have not a great deal of confidence in the Premier's political foresight, or, to use the vernacular, nous, I do believe in his personal integrity and fairness. In the interests of the economy of the State, in the interests of everybody associated with Mt. Isa, particularly the workers and the business community, and in the interests of the Railway Department, I believe that the Premier, as Leader of the Government, should take the earliest opportunity of amending the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to enable the Commission to give a decision on this matter. Every industrial dispute in Queensland with which I have been associated over the years has finally been settled by the Court. Under existing conditions the Commission cannot function, and I am suggesting that the Premier should give it that opportunity.

I am very pleased to see that the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation is in the Chamber, because I now wish to deal with land matters. During the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply I spoke very briefly about land ballots. Unfortunately, my time expired and I did not have an opportunity then of developing my argument. As the Estimates for the Department of Public Lands will not come before the Chamber, this is the only opportunity I have of speaking on land matters.

In dealing with land ballots we are dealing with something that involves a good deal of money. When a person is fortunate enough to draw a block of land, he obtains an asset worth a considerable amount of money. Just as the drawing of a Golden Casket or any other type of ballot is

important, the drawing of land ballots is particularly important because of the value of the commodity involved. If hon. members do not believe that, I should like to bring to their notice that a block of land in the Pentland district about 80 or 90 square miles in area was sold for £25,250 12 months after it was drawn. That sum was paid for it although it was unstocked and unfenced and in exactly the same condition as it was in when the ballot was conducted. I notice that the Minister for Public Lands is taking a note, so I shall save him the trouble. I know very well that in normal circumstances it is not possible to sell a block you have drawn, under 12 months. But in this particular case, to put the Minister in the picture, I point out that the block was drawn by a man named J. M. Huntress. Shortly after he drew the block he passed away. Consequently the block went to his wife. The Minister, very rightly I think, gave the wife the right to sell it. That was quite reasonable in the circumstances because obviously she could not have worked it. I mention that only because of the price that was paid for it. It was not paid by an adjoining grazier but by a Mr. Collins of Kelso Station near Marlborough, the block of land in question being at Pentland in North Queensland. He paid £25,250 for the block that had previously been drawn by Huntress. The block was unstocked—in exactly the same condition. It indicates the value of a block of land immediately it is drawn. Consequently it is important that the people who are allowed to enter land ballots should be considered very closely. At least the Government should have a policy on these matters, but I say advisedly that the Government have no policy at all on land matters.

Mr. Dewar: You are wrong there.

Mr. DUFFICY: I will point out how wrong I am and let the Minister correct me! I gave the instance of Nive Downs in south-western Queensland where a screening took place. I was told that the reason that applicants for Nive Downs were screened was to prevent New South Wales applicants from entering the ballot.

Mr. Fletcher interjected.

Mr. DUFFICY: I am not saying the Minister told me. That was true.

Mr. Fletcher: Are you saying the information was true or your informant—

Mr. DUFFICY: I was informed through a reliable source. I am not telling the Minister who informed me. That was the information I received on an official basis—let me put it that way. I took the opportunity to attend the Nive Downs ballot. The first person to draw a block lived in New South Wales. I made inquiries from officers of the Department of Public Lands. Let me say right now that I have no complaints whatsoever to make about any officer of that department. I think they are competent. I have received every courtesy from them

on all occasions. I am not complaining about them. When I made inquiries from departmental officers about the Nive Downs ballot I learned that of the six applicants I inquired about, only one was admitted. Strange as it may seem he was a relative of a grazier. The others who had been guaranteed by financial companies and graziers, men who had spent a lifetime in the industry who could not under any circumstances be rejected because of lack of experience in the industry, were not accepted in that ballot. Now let us pass from that.

Mr. Fletcher: I should like you to give me some information on this.

Mr. DUFFICY: I wrote the Minister a letter and he replied to it. I pointed out the stupidity of the conditions laid down in connection with Nive Downs and I belatedly received a reply after the Minister had changed the conditions and published them in "Country Life," which I considered not altogether courteous to me. That actually happened, and, if the Minister wants verification of it I refer him to the files of the "Charleville Times," where I published my letter to him and his reply.

Passing from Nive Downs, to support my contention that the Government have no policy in connection with land ballots, let us go to Kyabra. It also is in south-western Queensland. The Minister rejected the people I spoke of in connection with the Nive Downs ballot but in the Kyabra ballot a girl of 21 years of age, absolutely without any experience at all was admitted to the ballot and drew one of the blocks. If the Minister calls that a policy, I wish to know what the policy is.

Mr. Fletcher: Apparently you do not know very much about it.

Mr. DUFFICY: I do not know anything about it. I am simply telling the Minister exactly what happened. I can tell him the names of the people, but I do not want to mention them here. He rejected hundreds of applicants in connection with Nive Downs. I know he will say that was in a group ballot and that the other was an open ballot but I wish to know why the Nive Downs block was balloted for as a group ballot and the Kyabra blocks as an open ballot. Where is the policy there? That is what the western people want to know. The Government have no policy.

Mr. Fletcher: Do you think they should all be in group ballots?

Mr. DUFFICY: No, I did not say they should all be groups.

Mr. Fletcher: I am just asking.

Mr. DUFFICY: I am not laying down a policy in this Chamber; I am telling the Government that they have no policy. I am saying that in the two ballots in south-west Queensland the conditions were entirely different. One man was rejected in Nive

Downs. He was a resident of Charleville who had managed some of the biggest properties in that area. He was regarded as one of the most capable men in the Charleville district and was financially guaranteed by a grazier in the district. I am not going to mention his name here, but if the Minister wants to know his name, I will tell him privately.

Mr. Fletcher: I do, of course.

Mr. DUFFICY: He is only one of many. As I say, he was rejected in the Nive Downs ballot whilst a Kyabra block was drawn by a 21-year-old girl, the daughter of a grazier, who was obviously incapable of conducting the block herself and who obviously had no experience. She was admitted to the ballot and was successful. If the Government are going to have a group ballot, let them tell us so and justify the decision. If they are going to establish open ballots, tell the people out there so and justify the decision. But do not jump from one policy to another. Lay down a definite policy and, having done so, justify it and stick to it. It is not any wonder that there is discontent among the people of the West in relation to the land policy of the Government. The Government cannot even make up their mind about what is a reasonable living area or any other fundamental matter.

Mr. Ewan: Do you believe we should have group ballots in grazing areas in the West or not?

Mr. Fletcher: He does not know. He is all mixed up.

Mr. DUFFICY: Do not tell me I am mixed up. I am here as a critic. I am stating exactly what happened and it is not much use the Minister's asking me questions as to what I believe or do not believe. I am asking the Government to state their policy. I believe in open ballots but I also agree there should be a measure of screening of people from New South Wales. Under existing conditions, whether the ballot is open or a group ballot, applicants from New South Wales who own hundreds of thousands of acres there may take part in it. The same conditions do not apply to local applicants. A local applicant who owns a living area cannot take part in a land ballot in Queensland. The Minister knows very well that New South Wales graziers have been successful in Queensland ballots that they would not have been allowed to take part in if they owned in Queensland the area of land they own in New South Wales.

Mr. Fletcher: Did your own Government screen them?

Mr. DUFFICY: I am not talking about my Government; I am talking about the present Government's policy.

Mr. Fletcher: You are getting all mixed up.

Mr. DUFFICY: I am particularly sorry the Minister's Estimates are not coming up

for discussion. I should be pleased to debate land matters with him in the Chamber, and more than pleased to discuss them with him on the public platform in Western Queensland. I know who would get the greater support. I know who would be regarded in Western Queensland as having the greater knowledge of land matters.

Mr. Fletcher: You are not demonstrating it very clearly.

Mr. DUFFICY: The Minister is not putting up much of an argument in reply. If he takes the opportunity of speaking before the debate concludes I should like him to answer one or two simple questions, first, the reason for the difference in policy on Nive Downs and Kyabra, and, second, why for the first time to my knowledge the group ballot system was adopted in far western pastoral areas. If the Minister is prepared to give his policy, I shall be prepared to listen, but I do not think he has one, nor do the people of the West, or the paper of the Minister's party, "Country Life". That is all I am going to say on land matters.

Mr. Fletcher: That will be plenty.

Mr. DUFFICY: I am sorry for the Minister when I attack him because I feel that I have him at a distinct disadvantage. I know the West and have lived there for many years. I was interested in and have rather a good knowledge of pastoral matters and with all due respect to the Minister I do not think he can afford to get sarcastic with me. Just before he became a Minister I was present in Cunnamulla when he opened the Show and among other things he said in his speech, "This is the first occasion I have ever been West in my life." The Minister said that publicly so I advise him not to get sarcastic with me when referring to my knowledge of pastoral matters and Western matters generally. I could quite easily lose the Minister on those subjects.

Without wearying the Committee any further with land matters, let me say in conclusion that the Treasurer introduced his Budget to which an amendment was moved by my Leader, which, of course, I support. The Treasurer and Cabinet Ministers, in my opinion, have received very little support from their back benchers. I feel rather sorry for them because no matter what their capabilities may be as debaters they find it difficult to advance convincing arguments in support of the Budget produced by the Treasurer. Without doubt, it was a "booze" and "betting" Budget and the extra £1,500,000 that the Treasurer expects to receive will come in the main from the person who likes to put a pound on a horse, or likes a glass of beer. In the main, it will come from the pockets of the class represented by hon. members on this side of the Chamber for which hon. members opposite have very little regard.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 10.13 p.m.