

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 28 AUGUST 1962

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 28 AUGUST, 1962

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

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 1

Assent reported by Mr. Speaker.

QUESTIONS

**PUBLIC WORKS AND EMPLOYMENT,
TOWNSVILLE**

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) asked the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—

“What provision has been made in the near future for the commencement of public works in Townsville to prevent further dismissals of carpenters and builders’ labourers and to absorb as many as possible of those recently paid off?”

Hon. H. RICHTER (Somerset) replied—

“It is the function of the Department of Public Works to provide buildings, furniture and equipment where required by other Departments for Governmental purposes. Buildings are erected as quickly as possible to the full extent of the funds allocated for expenditure by my Department. During the year ended June 30, 1962, the Department of Public Works made a maximum contribution to providing employment, not only in the building trades, but in associated industries by expending the whole of the funds allocated to it including the sum of £890,000 made available in the second half of the financial year from the Commonwealth Grant for the relief of unemployment. The strength at which the Department’s work force can be maintained in any particular area is dependent upon the volume of work to be carried out in the area. As the rate of building construction varies from time to time, the work force in an area cannot be maintained at a constant level. It is the practice to employ local tradesmen if available and suitable. When work for which the tradesmen were engaged is completed and there is insufficient other work available to keep them gainfully employed, the retention of their services could not be justified, nor could the erection of buildings in excess of immediate requirements to keep men employed in one area in preference to providing the buildings urgently required elsewhere. For the past three (3) years the building construction programmes of the Department of Public Works in the Townsville district have been much heavier than usual due principally to the erection of buildings at Townsville for University use. An expenditure of £735,057 was approved for these buildings, erection of which was commenced in March, 1960. The building now under construction will satisfy University

requirements for the time being. It follows that as the heavy building activity at Townsville is tapering off, it has been and will be necessary to terminate the services of building trades employees. The extent to which this will be necessary cannot be indicated but it can be stated that the staffing of jobs will be maintained at an economic level. Planning of additions and alterations to the Railway Estate State School was expedited to provide additional work at Townsville. An expenditure of £20,300 was approved by the Executive Council for this work on Thursday last. Since August 1, 1962, the services of fourteen (14) building workers from day labour projects in Townsville have been terminated. Before the erection of the first section of the University College at Townsville was commenced in March, 1960, one hundred and fifty-nine (159) building workers were employed by the Department of Public Works in the Townsville district. In January, 1962—before the Commonwealth Unemployment Relief Grant was received—one hundred and seventy-three (173) workers were employed in the district. At present the number of employees is two hundred and six (206) which is seventy-two (72) greater than the one hundred and thirty-four (134) employees in the district when my Government took office in 1957.”

**CROWN LEASE RENTALS, SOUTH COAST
ELECTORATE**

Mr. GAVEN (South Coast) asked the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation—

“With reference to Crown land leasehold allotments in the South Coast Electorate—

(1) How many leasehold allotments in my Electorate are controlled by the Crown for rental purposes?

(2) What is the total value of such allotments (a) Crown valuation for rental purposes and (b) Valuer-General’s unimproved valuation?

(3) How much revenue per annum does the Crown obtain from such allotments?

(4) As many of my constituents are paying land rentals ranging from one pound (£1) to nine pounds (£9) per week for the privilege of living on home sites controlled by the Crown, does he agree that these charges are both excessive and unrealistic?

(5) If the answer to Question (4) is in the affirmative, will he take speedy action to alleviate the position? If not, why not?”

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

“(1) 1,545 allotments.”

“(2) Total Crown valuation for rental purposes, £737,091 9s.; Valuer-General’s total unimproved valuation, £2,852,277.”

"(3) Total rent paid, £22,113 1s. 10d. (Average approx. £14 10s. per allotment) per annum."

"(4) Annual rents payable on Perpetual Leases of allotments are fixed by Statute at 3 per cent. of the unimproved capital value of the land. When lots are made available at public competition under this tenure, the Crown fixes an upset price which it deems to be fair and reasonable, having regard to Land Court determinations in the locality. However, it has most clearly been the case that in recent years purchasers have held the Crown valuations to be ridiculously low and have bid to many times the figure quoted as the upset price. The Honourable Member and Members of this House generally, will have sufficient knowledge of what has transpired on the Gold Coast to realise how innocent the Lands Department has been in the regrettable boom which has occurred in Gold Coast values. The rents payable in respect of Perpetual Leases for the first 15-year period reflect the capital value which the respective purchasers establish by their bidding at sale and surely their misfortune is of their own making. The rents payable on Perpetual Leases which are out of their first 15-year period are subject to reappraisal on a value determined by the Court and there is Legislative provision for any lessee who feels he has been harshly treated to appeal to the Land Appeal Court. Significantly, the records show that over the last 10 years, for instance, there hasn't been a case of any appeal being lodged. I emphasise that the Land Court determines the unimproved value of the land and my Department is only a party to proceedings before the Court. It is not for me to comment on the Court's fixation of unimproved values and the Honourable Member knows full well that I cannot properly do anything to reduce a valuation which has been established by actual prices paid by incautious or speculative buying of land on the Gold Coast."

"(5) As announced by my Cabinet Colleague, the Honourable H. Richter, M.L.A., a special inter-Departmental Committee is currently examining the question of valuations and the possibilities of co-ordination of the several valuing authorities. The plight of the permanent residents who are unwittingly caught up in the effects of the land boom is one which excites my sympathy. I assure the Honourable Member and the Association he supports that any suggestion which could be put into effect to help this section without cutting across public interest will be very readily taken into account. Finally, I make the comment that the disadvantage inherent in Perpetual Lease tenure can be, and has been, obviated to a large extent by our present policy of making allotments available under freeholding tenure. By this method purchasers know precisely what their money commitment is going to be.

With Perpetual Lease, the tendency has been to bid to the skies and then hope that a sympathetic Crown will cure their own self-inflicted economic wounds by reducing values."

ANTI-COMMUNISM LECTURES IN STATE SCHOOLS

Mr. DIPLOCK (Aubigny), for **Hon. P. J. R. HILTON** (Carnarvon), asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"(1) Was permission sought in June last from the Principal of the Stanthorpe High School by Pastor Bickerton, acting on behalf of the Stanthorpe Ministers' Fraternal, for Mr. Elton A. Wilson, an accredited speaker of the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, to deliver a lecture against Communism at an appropriate time to the students of the Stanthorpe High School?"

"(2) Was permission also sought and given for the Ministers' Fraternal to deliver leaflets to the students which indicated the nature of Mr. Wilson's talks and his authority to speak on behalf of the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade?"

"(3) Was permission given for Mr. Wilson to address the students and for the leaflets mentioned to be distributed by the Ministers' Fraternal?"

"(4) Did an officer of his Department ring the Principal of the High School shortly before 9 a.m. on June 22 regarding Mr. Wilson's lecture which was to commence at 9.5 a.m. on that date and as a result of this telephone call was the lecture cancelled?"

"(5) What was the reason for the unusual time at which this telephone call was made to the Principal of the High School and which obviously placed this gentleman of high repute at a great disadvantage and in a most embarrassing position?"

"(6) Were representations on a political level made to my Department to have this lecture cancelled and, if so, by whom and at what time were such representations made?"

"(7) Was his Department informed that Mr. D. G. T. Gow, President of the Stanthorpe Branch of the Australian Labour Party and the endorsed candidate of that Party for the Electorate of Carnarvon, had stated that he objected to the lecture being delivered and would take action to have it stopped?"

"(8) Was a similar lecture delivered by Mr. Wilson to the students of the Warwick High School and, if so, was any objection raised by any person?"

"(9) In future will he allow lectures against Communism given or sponsored by accredited ministers of religion to be delivered in State schools under the provisions now governing religious instruction?"

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis) replied—

“(1) I understand that the Stanthorpe Ministers' Fraternal suggested to the Principal that Mr. Elton A. Wilson be invited to attend the High School assembly as Guest Speaker.”

“(2 to 6) In the late afternoon of June 21, 1962, the Leader of the Opposition, J. E. Duggan, Esq., M.L.A., telephoned an Officer of my Department advising that he had been informed that Mr. Elton Wilson, a speaker for the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, was to address students of the Stanthorpe High School. He enquired whether the Department was aware of this arrangement. Unsuccessful attempts were made on the afternoon of June 21 to communicate with the Principal with whom the matter was subsequently discussed by telephone before 8.45 on the morning of June 22. The time set down for the address was not known by the Department Officer until the discussion with the Principal. After the telephone call, the Principal withdrew permission for the address. Application to address the students was not made to my Department, but the Principal later confirmed that he had accepted the invitation by the Stanthorpe Ministers' Fraternal for Mr. Elton Wilson to address the students.”

“(7) My Department was not informed whether Mr. D. G. T. Gow, President of the Stanthorpe Branch of the A.L.P. had stated his objection to the delivery of the address.”

“(8) My Department was not aware that a similar lecture had been given by Mr. Wilson to students of Warwick High School until some time after the lecture had been given.”

“(9) Ministers of Religion or their accredited representatives are permitted to give religious instruction to pupils during school hours in accordance with the State Education Acts. No restriction in respect of the subject matter of lectures is placed on the Minister who is free to discuss any subject he wishes with his own denominational group during the Religious Instruction period. Applications to address a general Assembly of school pupils on political subjects are not approved.”

SKIN RASH AMONG RESIDENTS OF “EVENTIDE”, SANDGATE

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

“(1) Is he aware that a certain number of Eventide residents at Sandgate are suffering from an irritating skin rash and, if so, has he ascertained whether the particular skin infection was brought to Eventide by recent inmates from Goodna?”

“(2) In the circumstances would he not consider it advisable to set up an isolation ward with specialist treatment for the purpose of checking any further spread of infection?”

“(3) In view of approximately one thousand inmates at Eventide would he consider appointing a full-time resident doctor?”

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

“(1) Yes. No patient suffering from a skin rash is transferred to Eventide and before the recent transfers took place patients were examined by two Medical Officers to make certain they were suitable for transfer.”

“(2) The visiting Medical Officer is of the opinion that the rashes which are prevalent at Eventide are not communicable and that the building of an isolation ward for the isolation of skin rashes is not justified. If a patient needs specialist treatment he is taken to the Brisbane Hospital.”

“(3) Until such time as the shortage of doctors, which has resulted in some hospitals in the State being without a Medical Superintendent, is overcome it is not intended to appoint a full time resident doctor to Eventide.”

CULTURAL CENTRE PROJECT, BRISBANE

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

“(1) Has he read the statement appearing in ‘The Courier-Mail’ of August 22, 1962, which stated that the Centenary project to provide a £600,000 Cultural Centre had lapsed nearly two years ago?”

“(2) If so, is it true that this project has been abandoned, when was it abandoned, by whom was the decision made and for what reasons?”

“(3) What plans does the Government have in mind to provide the much needed extra accommodation for the Art Gallery and the Museum?”

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

“(1) Yes.”

“(2) No, the plan has not been abandoned, only deferred until such time as there would be a reasonable chance of raising at least £250,000 by public subscription. The Government agreed to contribute up to £250,000 on a £ for £ basis over a period of five years and will honour its promise. However, in view of other heavy commitments in the Education field it cannot see its way clear to finance the whole cost of the project. It must be borne in mind that the Finance Committee set up by the Centenary Executive Committee deferred its appeal two years ago to allow the Great Hall of the University Appeal to proceed. There followed in rapid succession very large appeals for the Cancer Fund, the Heart Campaign and the Red Cross Building Appeal. The Honourable Member would agree that it would be

asking too much of the public to support another large appeal whilst the other appeals were still in progress."

"(3) As in other States, where such projects as an Opera House in Sydney and a Cultural Centre in Melbourne are being financed by a generous giving by the public, assisted by Government finance, it is hoped that within the next twelve months an appeal will be launched. The public response to this appeal will be the determining factor in deciding when the project will be commenced."

SECONDMENT OF MR. F. J. MCGUINNESS TO
DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR AND INDUSTRY

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

"Is any financial obligation involved, in so far as the State Government is concerned, in the secondment of Mr. F. J. McGuinness from the Commonwealth Department of Trade to increase secondary industry investment in this State, and what status and authority will Mr. McGuinness have in relation to other officers of the Department of Labour and Industry?"

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

"Mr. McGuinness is seconded by the Commonwealth Department of Trade for service in my Department on the same financial basis as that which applied when his services were made available in a similar capacity to Western Australia during the last two years, namely, a salary of £3,400 per annum, fares of Mr. and Mrs. McGuinness from Sydney to Brisbane and return, storage charges of 12s. 6d. per week on furniture, and living allowance in accordance with the normal Commonwealth Public Service scale. Mr. McGuinness is employed on specialised work under my direct control."

CARDIAC BOARD HEARINGS, WORKERS'
COMPENSATION ACTS

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

"(1) How many cases were heard by the Cardiac Board constituted under the Workers' Compensation Acts during the twelve months preceding the latest date most convenient to his advisers?"

"(2) In how many cases was the decision in favour of the applicant?"

"(3) Will he consider granting the right of appeal to an Industrial Magistrate as is the right with other Medical Boards?"

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

"(1) For the period August 22, 1961, to August 21, 1962, a total of 275 cases were heard by the Board."

"(2) Thirty-six fatal claims were allowed and 76 rejected. Seventy-one non-fatal claims were allowed and 92 rejected."

"(3) No. The Board consists of three eminent physician specialists experienced in cardiology. There are six alternate members all of whom are physician specialists in the same field. All of these members are persons in private practice and are entirely independent of the State Government Insurance Office. The whole purpose of constituting the Board was to relieve lay Stipendiary Magistrates of the onus of making decisions relating to what is essentially a medical problem requiring highly skilled determination. Might I add that there is already indication that a much higher percentage of claims succeed before the Cardiac Board than was previously the case on appeal to Industrial Magistrates. Of the five cases heard by Industrial Magistrates in the period August, 1960, to August, 1961, one succeeded. In the period August, 1961, to August, 1962, four cases out of 16 succeeded."

POLICE WARNING ON LIQUOR AT BACHELORS'
BALL

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

"(1) What were the circumstances of the police warning to the organisers of the 'Bachelors at Home' function prior to their function being held at the Wanganui Gardens on August 17 last?"

"(2) Did he take any action to ensure that the function went on without a further visit from the police?"

"(3) If he did not take any action, is it usual for the police to give warnings and then not see that the warning is taken notice of?"

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis) replied—

"(1) Following upon information received by Police of the possibility of breaches of the Liquor Acts being committed at functions held at Wanganui Gardens during the recent Show week, Police personnel brought to the notice of persons associated with the organisation of such functions the provisions of Section 166A of the Liquor Acts relating to possession of liquor in the vicinity of a dance hall."

"(2) No."

"(3) Whilst a function known as the Bachelors' Ball was being conducted at Wanganui Gardens on August 17, 1962, certain investigations were made by a Police Officer in the vicinity of those premises, but he did not discover anything which would indicate that any breach of the law was being committed which would justify Police entry to the premises on that occasion, and consequently no such entry was made."

MARKETING OF WHEAT CROPS

Mr. MANN (Brisbane), for **Mr. LLOYD** (Kedron), asked the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry—

“(1) What is the quantity of carry-over wheat at present stored by the Australian Wheat Board?”

“(2) What information is available in relation to marketing of the estimated Australian 1961-1962 wheat crop of 220 million bushels?”

“(3) Can he give any information in regard to world markets for the 1962-1963 wheat crop, with particular reference to last season's reduced Canadian crop and heavy Chinese buying, two factors which influenced the overseas selling of Australia's 1961-1962 crop?”

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

“(1) At the end of June, the Minister for Primary Industry reported that the Australian Wheat Board then had on hand only about 20 million bushels of wheat available for further export sale. This quantity did not include domestic requirements for the remainder of the current cereal year or normal carry-over stocks which are required to ensure continuity of supply.”

“(2) The marketing of the 1961-1962 wheat crop is proceeding very satisfactorily. The total deliveries of approximately 224 million bushels are expected to be sold by the end of the cereal year on November 30 next with the exception of a bare minimum carry-over which is required to ensure continuity of supplies from one year to the next. A combination of circumstances led to the improved market situation this year. Chinese buying on a very large scale, poor crops in Canada and Europe, heavy buying by Spain and Italy and the purchase of substantial quantities by regular buyers such as Germany, Japan and India have all contributed to the much improved wheat position. Two very pleasing features of the market this year have been the general firming of prices by about 1s. per bushel and the fact that large quantities of “off-grade” wheat have been cleared.”

“(3) It is not usually wise to attempt to predict what will happen in the World's wheat markets twelve months or more ahead. However, Australia will enter the 1962-1963 cereal year in a very sound position. We shall have no burdensome carry-over stocks. Of the four major traditional exporters only the United States of America now has very large stocks. Latest reports indicate that the United States crop is expected to be smaller this year by about 140 million bushels. The widening of the new International Wheat Agreement, the accession of the U.S.S.R. to the Agreement and the increase in the

maximum and minimum prices by 12½ Canadian cents per bushel also give rise to optimism regarding the wheat market this year. It is too early yet to say what the Australian crop will be, but with an estimated 16 million acres under wheat this year, the crop is expected to be at least comparable with last year, i.e. over 200 million bushels.”

INTERMEDIATE WARD CHARGES, NORTH AND SOUTH BRISBANE HOSPITALS

Mr. MANN (Brisbane), for **Mr. LLOYD** (Kedron), asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

“(1) What are the weekly charges against inpatients of the intermediate wards at the North and South Brisbane Hospitals?”

“(2) What is the table of other charges in intermediate wards at these hospitals, e.g. (a) hospital theatre fees, (b) X-rays, (c) pathological tests and (d) anaesthetics, &c.?”

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

“(1 and 2) The charge for In-Patients in Intermediate Wards at the North and South Brisbane Hospitals is £3 2s. per day. Other ancillary charges provide for a very large number of different types of tests which are set out in the Regulations under the Hospitals Act.”

HENDRIKUS PLOMP CASE INQUIRY

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) asked the Premier—

“(1) Was he correctly reported in ‘The Courier-Mail’ of August 10, 1962, as stating that State Cabinet had not decided whether the Plomp case evidence investigation should be open or closed to the public and that this question was one to be decided solely by the investigator?”

“(2) Did Mr. A. Bennett, Q.C., on the same day tell ‘The Courier-Mail’ that he had not at that stage even read the terms of his appointment?”

“(3) As it would appear that Mr. Bennett had not at that stage made the decision which the Premier stated was solely his, under what authority did the Justice Minister, Hon. A. W. Munro, take it upon himself to contradict the Premier the same evening in a statement from Rockhampton as reported in ‘The Courier-Mail’ of August 10, 1962, that the actual enquiry would not be open to the public?”

“(4) In view of the Premier's statement, should not the announcement as to whether the inquiry would be open or closed have come initially from Mr. A. Bennett, Q.C., without any urging one way or another from Mr. Munro?”

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

"(1 to 4) I refer the Honourable Member to the answers given by my colleague, the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, to the group of questions listed as No. 1 in the Votes and Proceedings of the House on August 23, 1962. These answers set out very fully the nature of the appointment of Mr. A. L. Bennett, Q.C. As mentioned, the only instructions given to Mr. Arnold Bennett were those contained in the Executive Minute whereunder he was appointed. The terms of the minute clearly indicate the inquiry was to be an administrative one. It is inherent in an administrative inquiry that it is made on a confidential basis. This is the interpretation of such minute made by Mr. Bennett. Such interpretation is clearly in accordance with precedent and practice."

INVESTIGATION INTO USE OF Oakey AND BARRATTA SOILS, BURDEKIN RIVER PROJECT

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin) asked the Premier—

"As it is believed that the failure to solve the problem of the use of the Oakey and the Barratta soils for profitable production of crops and pastures if irrigation were available, is the main reason for the Government's decision not to proceed with the Burdekin River Irrigation, Hydro-electric and Flood Mitigation Project, will he make an approach to the Federal Minister in charge of the C.S.I.R.O. and request that officers of that organisation be made available to work in conjunction with officers of the Queensland Department of Agriculture and Stock in an endeavour to find the solution to the profitable use, under irrigation, of the Oakey and the Barratta soils, at the earliest possible time?"

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

"Whilst it is true that both Oakey and Barratta soil types offer many difficulties to the growing of crops and pastures, the essential problems to be solved embrace the economic usage of the areas rather than the mere discovery of what plants can be grown and how. The Department of Agriculture and Stock has carried out experiments on an all-embracing range of crops and pastures and has very good information on growing aspects. However, the utilisation of the land on an economic basis does offer difficulties and these can only be solved by rather long-term experiments which are now being conducted and which will be extended as quickly as facilities become available. To this end, work is being expanded on both the Millaroo and Swan's Lagoon Experiment Stations and there is excellent liaison between the Department of Agriculture and Stock and C.S.I.R.O. Arrangements have now been completed to strengthen the

technical staff by the addition of a soil physicist, a soil chemist and an agrostologist. In view of the commitments which C.S.I.R.O. has now entered into in the Townsville Region, it is not felt that the time would be opportune to make any further special requests, but the Honourable Member can rest assured that the liaison between the two Organisations will be developed as far and as fast as practicable."

RAISING OF SCHOOL-LEAVING AGE

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"(1) Is it intended to raise the school-leaving age in 1963 or 1964?"

"(2) How is it intended to deal with increased attendances at Townsville High Schools in 1964, following upon the implementation of the new education policy, and from where will the required extra teachers be recruited?"

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis) replied—

"(1) No."

"(2) Additional classroom accommodation will be provided at Pimlico High School and on a new site. An increase in the secondary school teaching staff will be obtained by the transfer of some teachers with the necessary qualifications from the primary field and by recruits from a special teacher scholarship scheme."

COST OF SEALED ROAD CONSTRUCTION

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

"What was the cost per mile for the construction of a first-class sealed road in 1952 and what is the present cost?"

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

"As there are so many varying conditions which have to be taken into account, it is difficult and, in fact, misleading to make comparisons between the cost of road construction."

SPECIALIST IN OBSTETRICS, TOWNSVILLE GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"Has the Townsville Hospital Board made application for the appointment of a specialist in obstetrics and gynaecology to the Townsville General Hospital and, if so, when is the appointment likely to be made?"

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

"The Townsville General Hospital has had a part-time specialist gynaecologist for many years and approval has been given by me for the addition to the consultant

staff of a specialist in obstetrics. An appointment will be made as soon as an application from a suitable qualified obstetrician is received."

CONTROL OF MEAT PRICES

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) asked the Minister for Justice—

"(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article appearing in 'Truth' newspaper of Sunday, April 1, 1962, under the heading 'Meat Prices are Open Robbery', wherein it was claimed that butchers were robbing Queensland families of tens of thousands of pounds each week in a State-wide meat scandal which the State Government was doing nothing to check?"

"(2) Has he taken any steps to check the authenticity of the claims made by this newspaper?"

"(3) Is it a fact that saleyard prices have slumped to their lowest level since July, 1958, while retail prices have skyrocketed?"

"(4) Does he agree that, if the claims of this newspaper can be substantiated, a case exists for the re-introduction of price control, as stated by the Minister, where there was evidence of inflation or restrictive trade practices?"

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowoong) replied—

"(1 to 4) My views, generally, with regard to the harmful effects of arbitrary governmental price fixation have been expressed in this House on a number of occasions and in this connection I would particularly refer the Honourable Member to my Speech of August 30, 1961, as recorded on pages 139 to 141 of Proof Hansard No. 2 of the 1961-1962 Session. In addition, on August 23, 1962, in answer to Parliamentary Question number 4, I dealt with the matter of pork and beef prices. I pointed out that pork has not been subject to price control since September 20, 1948, and beef was decontrolled on June 8, 1961. In my Speech of August 30, 1961, I emphasised that price-fixing orders can temporarily control prices but in their long-term effect they just as often aggravate the evil. In my Answer to the Question of August 23, 1962, I pointed out that notwithstanding the relaxation of Governmental Price Control the price increases during the term of the present Government have been materially less than during the comparable term of its predecessors."

HYGIENE IN DELIVERY OF FOODSTUFFS TO BRISBANE SHOPS

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough), for **Mr. MELLOY** (Nudgee), asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"(1) Is he aware of statements made in the 'Telegraph' of August 22 in regard to the delivery of food to shops in the City?"

3

"(2) In view of five instances quoted, including that of a bread basket being left uncovered in a wet gutter and contents of other bakers' and pastrycooks' vans being exposed to dust, flies and insects, does he not consider it time that adequate supervision and inspection was exercised over these deliveries?"

"(3) Is his Department satisfied with conditions of delivery of foodstuffs generally?"

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

"(1) Yes."

"(2 and 3) As far as deliveries for which my Department is responsible, that is, delivery of food other than meat or meat products, sold wholesale, corrective measures are taken when breaches of the Regulations are observed. It will be appreciated it is impossible to police every delivery of food and doubtless breaches do occur and are not observed by my limited inspectorial staff. It is considered that generally food deliveries in Brisbane are carried out in reasonable compliance with the Regulations."

EGG PRICES

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) asked the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry—

"In view of the resentment shown against the Egg Board by the housewives to the board's policy expressed by the manager that the board fixes the highest price the market will bear without any consideration for the consumer, will he see that action is taken to appoint a consumer representative to the board and at the same time see that price stability is applied to the benefit of the consumer and the producer to overcome seasonal conditions that apply in the industry?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

"To the best of my information The Egg Marketing Board has not acted at any time without consideration for the consumer. Neither the chairman nor members of the Board have associated themselves with the statement attributed to the business manager of the Board. With the deterioration of the United Kingdom market the Board of recent years has paid close attention to the local market. This is evidenced in the attention given to improving standards of quality, packaging and service to its customers as well as having a due regard to prices. The actual average local prices for all grades of eggs marketed by The South Queensland Board during the six months January to June in the last four years were as follows:—1959 (January to June), 58.64 pence per dozen; 1960 (January to June), 56.85 pence per dozen; 1961 (January to June), 57.25 pence per dozen; 1962 (January to June), 55.68 pence per dozen. The figures I have quoted demonstrate that, on the average, prices this

year have been lower than in any of the previous three years. It must always be borne in mind that the most important single factor in determining costs of production in the poultry industry is the price of feed grains. The poultry industry has no control whatsoever over this factor. Although Queensland Egg Marketing Board prices at the moment are higher than in some other States this is not always the case. More often than not in recent years Queensland prices have been lower on the average than those in most other States. Egg production fluctuates seasonally and although a stable price throughout the year would be welcomed by both producers and consumers this is not completely practicable. The Egg Marketing Board is one of eighteen producer controlled marketing boards set up in Queensland at the wishes of the producers concerned to market their own commodity. In order to provide for a consumer representative on The Egg Marketing Board an amendment to the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts would be necessary. In view of the nature of marketing boards of this type and in the light of the information provided it is not considered that this is warranted."

HOMES AND HOSTELS FOR ABORIGINALS

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"(1) In view of the money held by the Government in the Native Welfare Trust Fund for the aboriginal people, how much of this fund has been used to provide homes and hostels outside of Government and Mission settlements for these people?"

"(2) What has been the number provided in both categories and in what parts of the State have these homes and hostels been provided?"

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

"(1 and 2) Homes and hostels for aboriginal wards of the Native Affairs Department are provided from Government Loan Funds and are not made a charge against the Aboriginal Welfare Fund. The programme for this year provides for the purchase of a hostel at Russell Street, South Brisbane, and the erection of the following houses:—Birdsville, 4; Herberton, 3; Malanda, 3; Mareeba, 3; Mossman, 5; Mount Garnet, 4; Ravenshoe, 2."

EVICION OF TENANTS, STATE RENTAL HOMES

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"(1) How many formal eviction orders were served by the Queensland Housing Commission on tenants occupying State rental homes from August 1, 1961, to July 31, 1962?"

"(2) Of this number how many were evicted by the Commission with a Warrant of Possession from the Court?"

"(3) Of those evicted through a Court Order how many were given (a) seven days and (b) the full forty-five days to meet the arrears?"

"(4) For the same period how many houses were repossessed from people buying homes from the Commission?"

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

"(1 and 2) For the period August 1, 1961, to July 31, 1962, 1,340 Notices to Quit were served on tenants of State rental houses. In respect of these, 731 Warrants of Possession were issued, resulting in 19 evictions. Of these evictions tenancy of two of the houses was given to the wives of the evicted tenants."

"(3) Two were given 14 days, one 20, one 21, one 26, eight 28, one 42, one 49, one 56, one 81, one 105 and one 126, from dates Warrants were issued. Time to meet arrears was given months earlier when Notices to Quit were served."

"(4) Nine where vacant possession was taken and twenty where purchasers were allowed to remain in occupation on a tenancy basis."

PROTECTION OF PEARLING INDUSTRY, THURSDAY ISLAND

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) asked the Premier—

"As the northern boundary of the Cook electorate borders the New Guinea coast line and as the transfer of West New Guinea from Dutch to Indonesian control could be a serious threat to the islands of the Torres Strait and the pearling industry at Thursday Island, will he ascertain from the Commonwealth Government what steps are being taken to protect those engaged in the industry against infiltration of Indonesians?"

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

"As the Honourable Member appreciates, this is basically a Commonwealth responsibility and I shall bring the matter to the attention of that Government."

SEALING, BIBOOHRA-MT. MOLLOY ROAD

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

"Owing to the heavy motor traffic now using the main road from Biboohra to Mt. Molloy and as this section cuts up badly during the wet season, will he give consideration to having it sealed with bitumen as early as possible?"

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

"It is hoped later this financial year to release a scheme for the construction, including bitumen sealing, of five miles of this road."

JETTIES AND STORAGE SHEDS, PORT STEWART AND MARINA PLAINS

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"As Port Stewart and Marina Plains are the main ports for Coen and the graziers of Cape York Peninsula, will he have an officer of the Department of Harbours and Marine inspect these areas with a view to constructing jetties and goods storage sheds at both of these ports at an early date?"

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

"Plans of a proposed storage shed and ramp at Port Stewart have been prepared by the Department of Harbours and Marine and were forwarded in June last to Coen for local critical examination and advice which is now awaited by the Department. At this stage there is no necessity for local inspection by an officer of the Department. Waterfront facilities for Marina Plains will be considered following on some finality to the proposals for Port Stewart."

EMPLOYEES ON LOCOMOTIVE REPAIRS, ROCKHAMPTON

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

"(1) What is the number of employees engaged in all sections of running repairs and major overhauls of steam locomotives in Rockhampton in (a) running shed and (b) workshops?"

"(2) How many men are engaged in the servicing of diesel-electric engines at Rockhampton?"

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

"(1) (a) 129; (b) 421."

"(2) Nine."

RETAIL PRICE OF PETROL, ROCKHAMPTON

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

"(1) In view of his reply to my Question on June 7, 1962, has the Commissioner of Prices investigated the retail price of petrol at Rockhampton?"

"(2) Does the Commissioner of Prices agree that the retail price of petrol should be reduced at least another $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per gallon seeing that there was 2d. per gallon reduction on freight rates from Gladstone to Rockhampton and only $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. was passed on to the motorists?"

"(3) If the Commissioner of Prices does not agree, does that mean that oil companies are allowed to fleece motorists in Rockhampton to the extent of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per gallon?"

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

"(1) The Commissioner of Prices advises that the investigation into the retail price of petrol at Rockhampton commenced some time ago but is not yet completed. It is expected to be completed at an early date."

"(2 and 3) See Answer to Question (1)."

EXPENDITURE BY QUEENSLAND HOUSING COMMISSION IN MACKAY ELECTORATE

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

"What amount of expenditure was incurred by the Queensland Housing Commission in the Electorate of Mackay during the years 1957 to 1961 respectively on (a) repairs and maintenance and (b) new buildings?"

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

"Payments made during each of the financial years 1956-1957 to 1960-1961 were (a) £763, £1,675, £298, £237 and £276 respectively and (b) £81,171, £58,623, £20,202, £29 and Nil respectively."

ESTIMATED COST, COOKTOWN-LAURA ROAD

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

"In view of the announcement by him which appeared in 'The Cairns Post' of February 2 that more work on the Cooktown-Laura Road was to be carried out, comprising earthworks, drainage and paving of one and a quarter miles commencing at Hell's Gate and going north-westerly towards Laura, at an estimated expenditure of £17,872, will he advise if the estimated cost for that particular section can be taken as a fair and reasonable indication of the cost per mile of the whole project?"

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

"No."

SUBSIDY, CLAUSEN SHIPPING LINE

Mr. WALLACE (Cairns) asked the Minister for Labour and Industry—

"In view of the inability of the Clausen Shipping Line to gain the confidence of the graziers of the Gulf and Cape York areas, will he advise what amount, if any, of the developmental subsidy has been paid to that company and whether his Government has given consideration to withdrawing the subsidy offer to Clausens with a view to making it available to other interested companies?"

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

"This question is based on incorrect premises. From personal discussions I have had with a high percentage of North Australian graziers, they have great confidence

in the reliability of the Clausen Line. They do not forget that that Company actually operated for part of the 1960 season, during which they proved that their world experience enabled them to operate with a reliability never previously experienced in North-East Australia. One of the critically important aspects of such an operation is the necessity of adherence to strict time tables, because otherwise shippers are forced to find some emergency method of feeding and watering cattle held at shipping points and, in some areas, this is almost impossible and, in all, extremely expensive. As I stated previously, the Clausen Line demonstrated their recognition of this problem in 1960 but experienced financial losses of approximately £70,000 in the process. Recognising the importance of an efficient and reliable service, the Government entered into a short-term agreement with Clausens to cover the establishment costs of such a quality service. At this time, no portion of that subsidy has been paid. I would most strenuously oppose the payment of any subsidy to any shipping service until they proved over a period, by actual operations, that they could be relied upon to give an efficient service. This cannot be demonstrated by words, and, to a great degree, depends on experience. Two further aspects of a sea-beef service are critically important, especially from shipping points in the Gulf and west thereof. These are—(1) Vessel speed sufficient to prevent a too lengthy voyage; and (2) Suitable cattle accommodation to avoid transport injury. As regards (1), I think a minimum of 10 m.p.h. essential and 12 m.p.h. desirable; and, as regards (2), a vessel must conform to the many accommodation standards proved by experience to be suitable for the purpose. Cut transport rates do not compensate for the loss of these other important factors.”

ISSUE OF FOLDING WALKING STICKS TO BLIND PEOPLE

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

“(1) Is he aware that folding white sticks which, when folded can fit into a handbag, for the use of blind people, are manufactured in Australia and retailed at the low cost of fifteen shillings?”

“(2) Will he give consideration to the free issue of these sticks to blind people, so they may have additional protection from accidents?”

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

“(1) No, neither my Department nor the Queensland Industrial Institution for the Blind is aware of any Australian firm manufacturing Folding White Walking Sticks, which retail at 15s. each, but over the past six years the Queensland Industrial Institution for the Blind has been

obtaining a similar make of stick from the Royal National Institute for the Blind, London, and has arranged distribution, at a cost of 10s. each, to blind persons requiring such a stick.”

“(2) The Queensland Industrial Institution for the Blind issues free of charge to any blind person or organisation for the blind, White Wooden Canes fitted with White Reflectorised Tape for night travelling, and this practice will be continued.”

BONA FIDES, QUEENSLAND OIL CONSOLIDATED LTD.

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) asked the Minister for Justice—

“(1) Has his Department made any inquiries in relation to the bona fides, if any, of a firm registered as Queensland Oil Consolidated Ltd.?”

“(2) Is he aware that two of the Directors, namely C. Jensen and A. G. Laidlaw, are both former directors of Vending Sales Pty. Ltd. which have shamelessly robbed the investing public of some £250,000?”

“(3) If so, what steps have been taken to protect the public from investing in this Company?”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

“(1) Queensland Oil Consolidated Ltd. is not a firm; it is an incorporated company. It was registered as a company in the Companies Registration Office on June 26, 1962. The application was in order and registration automatically followed.”

“(2) Two of the directors, namely C. Jensen and A. G. Laidlaw were original directors of Queensland Oil Consolidated Ltd. but Mr. Jensen resigned his directorship on July 13, 1962. Both were directors of Vending Sales Pty. Ltd. for varying periods. Jensen was a director of Vending Sales Pty. Ltd. but Laidlaw still is. Vending Sales Pty. Ltd., together with two associated companies are at present in the course of investigation by an inspector appointed by the Governor in Council.”

“(3) Queensland Oil Consolidated Ltd. has been registered and as far as is known has not commenced to raise capital from the public in Queensland. Its activities are being kept under review by the appropriate authorities.”

USE OF SAFETY BELTS IN MOTOR VEHICLES

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

“With reference to his regular statements to the ‘Telegraph’ under the heading of ‘Road Toll’, will he give consideration in those statements to stressing the necessity of the installation of car safety-belts as

an extra precaution against serious injury and possible prevention of loss of lives in cases of road accidents?"

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

"The installation of car safety belts is only one of many aspects of safety which could be stressed but matters such as the provision of safety belts are incidental to the great problem of endeavouring to impress upon the irresponsible and careless section of motorists that not only are they endangering their own lives but the lives of other human beings. My comments made under the heading of 'Road Toll' on each occasion are made with this prime purpose in view and I do not feel it would be desirable to extend the field in this regard. Furthermore the comments I make must be as succinct as possible and in relation to the space which is made available to me for this purpose through the courtesy of the 'Telegraph'."

WAGES, TOTALISATOR ADMINISTRATION BOARD

Mr. MANN (Brisbane), for **Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane), asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"What is the weekly wage bill paid out by the Totalisator Administration Board?"

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

"This is not information which comes within the knowledge of my Department."

RUNNING OF ROCKHAMPTON-BRISBANE MAIL TRAIN INTO MARYBOROUGH STATION

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) asked the Minister for Transport—

"(1) How many times during the present month has the Rockhampton-Brisbane mail train passed through Baddow without running in to Maryborough station?"

"(2) What was the reason on each occasion?"

"(3) On each occasion that late running was the cause, how many minutes late was the train?"

"(4) Will he give instructions that this mail to Brisbane run in to Maryborough station on every occasion, as failure to do so causes great inconvenience to passengers and is decidedly unfair to the licensee of the Maryborough Railway Refreshment Rooms, who is giving excellent service to the travelling public?"

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

"(1) Five."

"(2) Late running of the trains."

"(3) August 9, 45 minutes; August 11, 74 minutes; August 12, 27 minutes; August 14, 88 minutes; August 16, 20 minutes."

"(4) Having regard to the late running of the trains and the numbers of passengers detraining for Maryborough or joining from Maryborough, the running of the trains into Maryborough was not warranted. On August 9, 12 and 16 there were no passengers joining from Maryborough or alighting for Maryborough. On August 11 two passengers detrained for Maryborough and three passengers joined from Maryborough, whilst on August 14 two passengers detrained for Maryborough and none joined from Maryborough."

BUILDING OF LIGHTHOUSE TENDERS AT WALKERS LTD., MARYBOROUGH

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) asked the Premier—

"(1) As it is the intention of the Commonwealth Government to have two lighthouse tenders built, will he make representations to that Government to have these ships built at Walkers Ltd., Maryborough, in order (a) to provide employment, and (b) to save this most northern shipbuilding yard in Australia from close-down?"

"(2) Will he request the Government, for defence reasons, to allot this order to Walkers Ltd. without calling tenders on the condition that Walkers submit satisfactory terms?"

"(3) As there is ample evidence from workers in workshops throughout the State that B.H.P. is frequently very slow in forwarding steel orders and, as employers hesitate to complain to this firm which has a monopoly of the manufacture of steel products, will he make enquiries and request top priority for Queensland orders?"

"(4) As it is reported that fabricated steel from Italy is likely to be used for a contract in which 5,500 tons of steel will be used, will he make enquiries as to the correctness of this report and, if the report is true, will he protest against the importation of such material in view of the fact that such an order could be fulfilled in this country?"

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

"(1) The necessary representations were made some time ago and Walkers Ltd. have been kept fully informed."

"(2) The Honourable Member is surely not serious in proposing that defence reasons exist for the purchasing of two lighthouse tenders. Such a proposition could not be supported nor could his further suggestion that tenders be not called and that the job be allotted to Walkers Ltd. Considerable public funds are involved and there would be quite naturally an outcry should the Commonwealth Shipbuilding Board act as is suggested. The State Government is anxious to see Walkers get the job and we will continue to do our utmost to see that they do, consistent always with proper practices."

"(3 and 4) If the Honourable Member can furnish me with more factual evidence in both instances, I shall be prepared to consider making representations to the appropriate authorities."

PAPERS

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

Report of the Chief Inspector of Explosives for the year 1961-1962.

Report of the Agent-General of Queensland for the year 1961-1962.

Report of the Council of the Queensland Institute of Medical Research for the year 1961-1962.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under the State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1962.

Orders in Council under the Southern Electric Authority of Queensland Acts, 1952 to 1958.

Proclamation under the Southern Electric Authority of Queensland Acts, 1952 to 1958.

Regulations under the Swine Compensation Fund Act of 1962.

Proposal by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration as a Reserve for State Forest of so much of Reserve for State Forest R. 326, Parish of Tamborine, County of Ward, as is comprised in all that piece or part thereof commencing at the north-east corner of Portion 133, Parish of Tamborine and bounded thence by that Portion and Portion 119, west to the road along the eastern boundary of Portion 18v, by that road northerly to Portion 10v, by that Portion, a line and Portion 16v east to Portion 2v, by Portions 2v and 11, south and thence by the latter Portion west and south to the point of commencement—exclusive of a road, containing an area of about 412 acres.

QUESTIONS TO PRIVATE MEMBERS

INTERPRETATION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 68

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (11.52 a.m.): As you know, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday I took advantage of your suggestion to the Leader of the Opposition that I should forward to you a copy of the question that I sought to ask the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt. I have received your reply indicating that you confirm your ruling that questions should not be addressed to private members, and in compliance with that ruling I do not propose at this stage to refer any further to that particular question. However, for the guidance of myself and other hon. members in relation to the general question that arises as to the rights of members under the Standing Orders as against what might be regarded as rules

of custom and practice, I seek your guidance on the Standing Rules and Orders as set out in the edition dated 1951, which is the latest edition, and which contains the words, "Rules of Practice printed in Italics". Is it to be understood that any rights of members as set out specifically in the Standing Orders are valid only in so far as they are not abrogated by any rule of custom and practice which may be declared not only by you, but by other Speakers, past or future? I point out that in the front of this edition of the Standing Orders, which is the latest one available on the table, there is a reference to "Standing Rules and Orders (Rules of Practice printed in Italics)". There is no reference after Standing Order No. 68 to any rule of practice that denies the right of one private member to ask a question of another private member.

Mr. Aikens: I wish they would give me a go at it.

Mr. HANLON: I do not wish to delay the House or to take this matter any further at this stage. I appreciate the necessity for preventing members from asking questions of a personal nature that would not be connected with the business of the House. However, as there is a stated right under Standing Order No. 68, which provides specifically for a question to be addressed to "any other member,"—the word "Minister" is not mentioned—and as there is no mention of a rule of practice that takes away that right, I seek your guidance as to whether Standing Orders are valid only so far as they are not abrogated by ruling of the Speaker, past or present, on custom and practice.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members, I more or less expected that the hon. member for Baroona would pursue this matter. The disallowance of questions from one private member to another is a custom and practice that has grown over the years, and indeed in a search by the clerks and myself over many hours through the journals of this Parliament we could find only two occasions on which an hon. member had ever endeavoured to ask another private member a question. Those questions were ruled out of order by the Speakers of the day. The first was Speaker Elliott in 1865. The record is headed "Legislative Assembly, Thursday, 25 May, 1865. Question to Private Member."

The question was raised by a Mr. Walsh. After some debate Mr. Speaker ruled—

"I am quite sure that the hon. member is out of order in putting a question to a private member."

In 1945-1946 another ruling, or a statement, along similar lines was made by Speaker Brassington. He mentioned that he had previously rejected a question asked of a private member. We have searched the records but have not been able to find his earlier ruling, but he mentioned in a later statement to the House that he would not allow the question

and added that he had previously ruled on it in answer to Mr. Paterson, the then hon. member for Bowen. He said—

“I ruled last session that questions from one private member to another would not be allowed.”

Hon. members, I feel that, in the interests of the decorum of the House, if I were to allow the hon. member for Baroona to ask a question of another private member it would create a precedent which would not permit me to disallow any other member's question to a private member. I think all hon. members will agree that that could quite easily get out of hand and I feel sure that the majority of hon. members have no desire to see this Assembly, particularly at question time, develop into what one could term a shambles. So I ask all members to interpret the rules of the House as they have been interpreted over the past years and not to take a mean advantage because the word “member” is used in the Standing Order instead of “Minister”. I believe the word “member” has been interpreted over the years to mean “Minister” and I intend to continue to interpret it as such.

Mr. HANLON: I should not like the House to feel that I was taking a mean advantage. I do not think a member who takes advantage of the Standing Orders is taking a mean advantage. I am fully aware of the reasons advanced against the desirability of allowing a general freedom on Rule 68, and indeed I agree with those reasons, because it might lead to the asking of personal questions. I want to make it clear—and I think you will verify it—that the question I submitted to you was not a personal question; it did not contain any element of a personal nature which could not be said outside the House. But I do not think you have quite followed the point I rose to make this morning. I am not at this stage wishing to debate, or ask you about, or to challenge your ruling on, the disallowance of a question by a private member to another private member. I am raising the more general question, which I think is of the utmost importance to all hon. members, whether a right under a Standing Order can be abrogated by a Speaker, whether it be wise or unwise, if you want to use that term. The thing is written there. We have had a lot of jokes about that type of thing before, but, after all, these are the Standing Orders of the House, and I am dealing with the right of an hon. member, not this particular subject of Rule 68. That is why I am proceeding with the matter. I do not want to take up the time of the House unduly but I believe this is important to hon. members, not as to whether a private member may ask another private member a question but as to whether a right under a Standing Order can be abrogated by a Speaker, not necessarily yourself—a Speaker in the past or the present—merely by saying there is a rule of custom and practice. I understand that the Standing Orders are under consideration by

the Standing Orders Committee at the moment, and I suggest that they should be made specific in this regard. I do not think it is fair to say that a member takes a mean advantage by taking advantage of the Standing Orders any more than it is to say that the Crown takes a mean advantage when it takes advantage of the provision of any law of this land.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member has more than covered the point, but I draw attention to a remark made in the course of this debate by the hon. member for Townsville South as illustrating how the matter could get out of hand and giving ample reason why this practice should not be introduced. He said, “I wish they would give me a go” or words to that effect.

Mr. Mann: He is not in control of the House. Surely he is not going to be allowed to control the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Standing Orders of this House are at present being reviewed by the Standing Orders Committee, and only at the last meeting I said that the changing of “Member” to “Minister” was something that could well be looked at. I have every intention of bringing the matter before the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. Aikens: The ruling by Speaker Brassington was given in reply to a remark by me. I know how such a question would have been received when the hon. member for Brisbane was Speaker. The hon. member for Baroona wants to know when the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt is going to be on the Supreme Court Bench. I shall tell him later.

ACTS INTERPRETATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Acts Interpretation Acts, 1954 to 1960, in certain particulars, and for another purpose.”

Motion agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF COMMERCIAL LAWS BILL

INITIATION

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to provide for the appointment of certain officers for the purposes of the administration of the Companies Act of 1961 and certain other commercial Acts and for purposes incidental thereto.”

Motion agreed to.

CHARITABLE FUNDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice): I move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Charitable Funds Act of 1958, in a certain particular."

Motion agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER No. 17

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY DEBATE

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier) (12.9 p.m.): I move—

"That during this session, the provisions of Standing Order No. 17 shall not apply to the debate on the Address in Reply."

The purpose of this motion is to enable the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to continue on Tuesday and Thursday nights of each week. That would not be possible if I did not move this motion, which removes the limitation of Standing Order No. 17 on the debate on the Address in Reply. The limitation imposed by Standing Order No. 17 is that the debate on the Address in Reply shall continue for seven full sitting days and shall conclude at 5.30 p.m. on each day. If the motion is agreed to by the House, there will be no limitation on the debate on the Address in Reply; it will continue at the will of the House. I should like to point out to hon. members that the motion will not have the effect of removing from Standing Order No. 17 the proviso that, on the days allotted, formal motions and Government business may be taken up to 12 o'clock noon, and that after 5.30 p.m. other business may be proceeded with as usual, or the further proviso that until the Address in Reply is disposed of no private business or motion for adjournment under Standing Order No. 137 shall intervene.

Mr. Mann: Do you propose that 5.30 p.m. today will conclude one day and that another day will then start?

Mr. NICKLIN: No. Days do not count. As I have already said, the debate on the Address in Reply will continue at the will of the House.

Mr. Houston: You can gag it at any time you want to?

Mr. NICKLIN: The gag has never been applied in this House, and it will not be applied on the debate on the Address in Reply. The effect of the motion is to enable the debate on the Address in Reply to continue without being restricted by the provisions of Standing Order No. 17.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (12.12 p.m.): The reason I called "Not formal" was to give the Premier an opportunity to explain

the motion. If he had not done so in the way in which he did I would have asked for an explanation, because Standing Order No. 17 comes under the heading of "Debate on Address in Reply".

I realise that the effect of suspending the Standing Order will be, as the Premier has said, to give every member of the House an opportunity to speak on the Address in Reply, and I think we should give the Premier credit for not taking something away from us. As a matter of fact, he is extending the scope of the debate. It will mean, of course, that if a member is not in his place the motion could be put, even if only three or four members have spoken, but there should be greater scope for debate on the Address in Reply.

Another matter that concerned me was the provision in the Standing Order that until the Address in Reply is disposed of no private business or motion for adjournment under Standing Order No. 137 shall intervene. I wanted it made quite clear that the rights of members in that direction were not being taken away.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (12.14 p.m.): I support the motion because it will mean that members of this House will be sitting a reasonable number of hours each week. I know that at public meetings that I have addressed since I came into this House, the people have been surprised to learn that for about the first seven weeks of each session members of Parliament exhaust themselves by sitting about nine or 10 hours a week.

When I come down here from North Queensland, and other members come from their electorates, we want to do our work and get it finished and get home to our electorates again. I have always regarded with considerable dissatisfaction the fact I have to come down here and dawdle along for six or seven weeks while the House is sitting nine or 10 hours a week.

It is true, as the hon. member for Bundaberg says, that if speakers are not available the debate can collapse in one, two, or three days. I remember a particularly memorable occasion when the then Labour Party, in control of the House, was going to allow the Address in Reply to collapse on the second day, and I remember that a former member for Toowoomba, Mr. Yeates, was rushed into the Chamber in order to stem the tide, as it were, and rambled on for 40 minutes to save the debate until the next day.

I welcome this motion. When Parliament is assembled it should get on with its business. I know that over the years—and I suppose it will be so in the future—Parliament has been conducted purely and simply for the benefit and convenience of metropolitan members and those members who live in Brisbane. They like it to be open as long as it can be open for a few hours a

day and a few hours a week, so that they can come here and enjoy the privileges of the club services and atmosphere and the friendship of members from the country.

My conception of Parliament is that it should commence sitting about 40 hours a week from the opening day, get rid of its business, and let those members who want to, go back to the country.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (12.16 p.m.): The Premier indicated to me his intention of moving this motion. When I called "Not formal" there were one or two aspects of the proposal on which I wanted information. I am not in a position to dispute the Premier's statement that he wishes to widen the debate to give everybody an opportunity of speaking.

I cannot recall any occasion when members of this House have been denied the opportunity of speaking on the Address in Reply during the hours that obtained, unless of course they did not want to participate in the debate. Frequently there was a prolongation of the period of debate in order to cope with the demands of people who would not be able to speak within the period laid down by the Standing Orders.

Frankly, my interpretation of the matter is—and the Premier did not intimate this officially, but privately—that it is an effort to avoid the Friday sitting for as long as possible. What is behind the Government's mind in this matter is that they are hoping, with night sittings that in the aggregate this debate will occupy fewer days than under the Standing Order. I believe the real reason is that the Government, because of the late start of the session are anxious to make up time.

I dispute what the member for Townsville South had to say. If he likes to place himself in the category of people who work less than 40 hours a week, he is entitled to do that. I think that members of the Ministry, and many other members of the House, work many more hours than that in dealing with their parliamentary affairs.

Personally, I am not over-enthusiastic about starting the session with double days. It is all right at the start, but towards the end of the year there is a heavy physical demand on members because of the added hours. It could be argued that they do it in the Federal House, but, against that, they do not commence proceedings until 2.30 p.m. I have no quarrel with the proposal except that I hope the Premier will not cause us to remain here unnecessarily late to make up for the late convening of Parliament. We all have official business to complete and if the House could meet earlier without any additional cost or inconvenience, I see no reason why Parliament should not be carried on in the conventional way, at the conventional times,

to allow many hon. members to take their places at the many functions that are held. Of course, they must be subordinate to Parliament itself, but it is desirable that members of the Government and of the Opposition should be permitted to attend official functions. Personally, I should like to hear the view of the hon. member for Clayfield, the Chairman of Committees, who is about to retire from this Parliament. He has many commitments and it might be more appropriate to hear his views after so many years in this House. I only hope that if the Premier has a choice between sitting double days on Tuesdays and Thursdays and sitting on Fridays, he will choose the latter. On this occasion Parliament was convened later in the year than usual because of the Exhibition, but I should like to see a return to the practice of starting the session a week or two before the Exhibition if the proposed procedure is to have the effect of hurrying up Government legislation towards the end of the year.

Motion (Mr. Nicklin) agreed to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 22 August (see p. 20) on Mr. Lonergan's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (12.20 p.m.): As is customary, on behalf of the Opposition I tender my hearty congratulations to His Excellency the Governor on the work done by him and Lady May in the last 12 months. On this occasion the Governor's Speech contained the announcement that the Government of the day had seen fit to extend his term of office, that the extension had been approved by Her Majesty the Queen, and that Sir Henry had indicated his willingness and desire to take advantage of the extension. I think that Labour's attitude towards the appointment of Governors is well known. We believe, as a general principle, that there are worthy Australians capable of filling this very important post, and, if there is to be a change, we believe there should be some reciprocal arrangement whereby people from Australia could qualify for appointment as Governors in other parts of the Commonwealth and people from those areas could come here.

In deference to His Excellency, I repeat that he has performed his services with outstanding ability and has not spared himself physically. His various speeches certainly indicate that he spends a great deal of time familiarising himself with the problems of the State, and all in all he has been an outstandingly successful Governor. I know of no man who has done more to uphold the high prestige of his office. He has certainly been an extraordinary representative of Her Majesty the Queen.

It is also customary to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply and I congratulate them for being selected for the signal honour of opening the proceedings of Parliament. I had great difficulty following the hon. member for Flinders. For the sake of greater accuracy I was tempted to ask Mr. Lack for a copy of the speech so that I could follow it more closely, but I thought that might not fall on sympathetic ears so I waited until I could peruse the proofs. As this is shortly prior to the next State elections the hon. member considered it necessary to galvanise himself into some activity and he made a frenzied attack on the Opposition. He went to great pains, of course, to show how excellently his area had been represented since he has been a member of this House. I am afraid he is in for a great disillusionment, for what has been done is not likely to meet with the same approbation outside this Chamber as it received when he was moving the Address in Reply.

The seconder of the motion, of course, adopted his customary role of working himself into a state of anger. If one eliminated his angry remarks one would find there was very little of a worth-while nature in the hon. member's speech.

Perhaps I am taking this out of the order of precedence. I come now to the visit of Her Majesty the Queen. No doubt she should have taken precedence in my opening remarks. However, the statement about the Governor's term came in the Address-in-Reply speech before the reference to Her Majesty the Queen.

Once again I should like to affirm on behalf of the Opposition our loyalty to the Queen and to say how pleased we are that she will be able to come to Australia next year. I think it is appropriate to draw attention to the very heavy demands made on Royalty throughout the world. In all countries still under the monarchical system of government the reigning kings and queens are held in very high esteem; but today to an increasing extent we are living in a world of propaganda where great pressure is being applied to get people to align themselves with one group or another and it seems to me that Royal families are to a degree caught up in this great propaganda movement. If it were customary for the reigning monarch to visit the outlying parts of the Commonwealth frequently it would be accepted as the normal thing, but I think it will be agreed that today there is a feeling that these visits to cement more closely ties of friendship with Great Britain and the need for cementing those ties have been occasioned by political and economic policies that threaten somewhat to tear asunder the fabric of the Commonwealth of Nations. On a propaganda level we have seen the visit of the Czech Philharmonic Orchestra, which ordinarily would be treated as a purely musical offering, but, because of the possible political implications of that cultural visit, the United States of America

immediately arranged for a tour of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, and then the London Philharmonic Orchestra comes out, each one trying to gain some initial advantage or to neutralise any advantage that might have been secured by those ahead. So with the Royal family. Increasingly in the West Indies and Africa and South America, and other parts of the world, Royal visits have assumed political and economic significance. Prince Philip has been called upon there to assume the role of ambassador for Great Britain and to try to strengthen trade ties. I suggest, without intending any disrespect to the Royal family, that the main reason and the motivating force was the commercial success that attended the efforts of Prince Bernhardt of the Netherlands in getting together a group of business men and exporters generally to promote the sale of products from the Netherlands to South America. Conspicuous success attended his efforts. Obviously the visit of Prince Philip was at least in part designed to let that part of the world see that Great Britain was in a position to supply its goods.

I can only express the hope that these Royal visits, welcome as they are, will not be used by any Government chiefly for the purpose of trying to sell the idea outside Parliament that they are on much closer terms with members of the Royal family than are members of Opposition parties. We take second place to no-one in our desire to express our very deep loyalty to the person of Her Majesty and what is represented by the monarchical system. I sincerely hope that Royal visits will not be used for any political considerations. We should, as loyal subjects of the Queen, expect her to come out here at intervals, obviously less frequent than is possible with countries closer to Britain. She can be assured of a very warm welcome. It is a matter for regret that the Brisbane Line will be observed and that only the V.I.P.'s and others in the metropolitan area will be able to see Her Majesty; it does not seem to matter very much about the people in the remote parts of the State. Just as one of the chief reasons for the Royal visit is the cementing of ties between Australia and the Mother Country because we are one of the farflung parts of the Commonwealth, it would seem to me to be fitting that we take advantage of the opportunity to cement more strongly the ties between the country areas and the metropolis. Consequently it is a matter for regret that people in those parts of the State, with fewer amenities than those in the capital city, will not, except at great personal inconvenience and cost, be able to see the Royal couple next year.

I think you, Mr. Speaker, with all your tolerance from listening to speeches in the House, will agree with me that the speech read to us on the opening of Parliament on this occasion was one of the most anaemic documents it has been our misfortune to listen to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman could hardly expect me to agree with that.

Mr. DUGGAN: I would not expect you to do so here, but, knowing how impartial you are and how carefully you analyse these things, I feel that probably you would privately confirm what I have said about it. The speech had only one redeeming feature and that was its brevity. It was certainly shorter than most of the Opening Speeches we have listened to previously. It occupied only about 25 minutes of His Excellency's time. If you read the document you will find that, apart from a recital of certain statistical information about the operations of various departments, it contains very little of value. Indeed, some of the statistical information in it was hardly worth the cost of printing.

Mention is made of £25,000 being spent on access roads to Crown land. When that amount is specifically mentioned in a Budget of over £100,000,000, the Government are certainly digging deeply into the political barrel trying to get some propaganda for their programme. Reference is made also to the great times in which we live and the vistas of industrial development unfolding before us. We find that last year £43,000 was made available for assistance to industries under the Labour and Industry Act. Surely that is a trifling sum when dealing with matters of great importance to the industrial expansion of the State.

For reasons that do not seem to have any proper connection with the document as a whole, reference is made to the fact that 48,000 British migrants have come to Queensland since 1947. I am trying to work out the significance of that. In the 10 years from 1947 to 1957 inclusive, under a Labour Government, 32,732 migrants came to this country, or an annual average of 3,273. That included the 1947 period, which was abnormally low, in which the figure was 1,139. That was following the war, when there was virtually a cessation of migration, and before the administrative machinery was re-established to deal with the flow of migrants. Then we had the Horror Budget, and in the 1953-1954 period the figure dropped to fewer than 2,000. Despite that, there was an average of 3,273 over those 10 years, whereas in the period of four years under this Government the figure is 3,172. In 1957-1958 the figure was 4,157, and in each succeeding year there has been a decline in the number of migrants from Great Britain to Queensland. The figures declined progressively in 1958-1959, 1959-1960, and 1960-1961.

Mr. Pizzey: You had the Suez crisis and the fear of war which stimulated migration.

Mr. DUGGAN: If the Government feel that that was the reason, why did they not put that in?

I am surprised that the Government could not find something of more general interest to the community than the mere extracting of information from some documents. Some of the figures have no real significance, and those that have show that the State was better off under the Labour Government than under the present Government. In the words of the Minister for Labour and Industry, this was going to be a period of intense development, with more jobs than men to fill them, and in influx of capital on an unprecedented scale.

Having mentioned the Minister for Labour and Industry, I should like to go on record as saying that I do not like to feel that the activities of a member or, in particular, the Minister, are circumscribed by considerations of ill-health. If the Minister's resignation from his position as Leader of the Liberal Party was caused by internal pressures within his own party or a feeling that he could not do his job adequately, I would have no compunction in welcoming it. However, it was on medical advice, and I do not think that we really needed to be told that; we have all seen the apparent deterioration in his health over the last year or two.

I think I can speak on behalf of the Opposition when I say that we have had many clashes with the Minister, and no doubt will continue to in the future, but I am sorry indeed that his health has been, I believe, the sole reason for his stepping down from the position of Leader of his party, which he held for some years. He carried out his responsibilities with characteristic enthusiasm; that is one of the things about him that we have never criticised. He has certainly been hard-working and enthusiastic.

Despite the clashes that we have had—none of which I retract—and despite those that we may have in the future, I do hope that a rest from the heavy duties of Leader of the Liberal Party will permit him to regain his former health, and that he will be spared, as long as the electors have confidence in him, to serve the State with the enthusiasm that he would desire.

Apart from the hon gentleman's ill-health, it appears to me that the outside executive who run the Liberal Party have been dissatisfied with the leadership available within the House, and have felt it necessary to import a political foreigner, Mr. John Murray, for the so-called blue-ribbon seat of Clayfield.

Dr. Noble: Wouldn't that apply when you went out to contest the Gregory seat?

Mr. DUGGAN: There is quite a difference. The hon. gentleman is usually a bit of a political fox in these matters and does not stick his head out unless he thinks he is safe. On this occasion, however, he leaves himself open to the risk of political decapitation. In the case of Gregory I think this ought

to be put on record. It was stated by a Q.L.P. spokesman following the 1957 State General Election that Q.L.P. candidates had obtained more votes in every western seat in Queensland than A.L.P. candidates. Consequently, because of the way in which things were developing at that particular time, it was very important from the point of view of the A.L.P. that we should arrest this thought that the A.L.P. was on the decline. It was not a question of my having to submit myself to a plebiscite with local people. It was at the unanimous request of the local body that I contested the seat of Gregory, and I came back with no hard feelings about being the victim. My own feelings were conveyed to the president and the secretary of the Q.C.E. at that time. I told them that I had no personal wish to contest the poll in the Gregory electorate but thought that I had a duty to the party to do so. I have no regrets for having done so. It gave me the opportunity of seeing more intimately parts of the State through which I had not travelled extensively, and of making many friendships. I think this enabled me to pave the way for the return of that seat to the A.L.P. At no stage was it suggested that I stand for that seat against local people in the Gregory electorate.

The position is quite different here. No fewer than four candidates offered themselves for selection for Clayfield, and one candidate was a member of this Assembly, who said that he had been persuaded, on advice from the executive of the Liberal Party, to confine his nomination to the seat of Windsor. In other words, Windsor was his second choice, not his first choice, and I hope that the electors will remember that when the time comes for them to cast their votes.

Mr. Aikens: Did you say at a street meeting in Longreach that you thought the long blow was five minutes added to their smoko time?

Mr. DUGGAN: As a matter of fact, in Longreach in 1957 I can recall the hon. member's name being mentioned to me as that of a fairly active member of the House and several questions being addressed to me about him. Unfortunately, he seems to have slipped in public importance, because his name was not mentioned to me on the last occasion on which I was in Longreach. He has been relegated to the limbo of forgotten members.

Mr. Murray, incidentally, is quite a personable man, and it will be interesting to hon. members on this side of the Chamber to see the reaction to his selection. Already some dissatisfied people have been fulminating against it and saying that they might stand as Independent Liberals. Despite his so-called strong personality, Mr. Murray must have done a lot of good talking to convince the executive that he was a true-blue Liberal, because he won his original endorsement as a Country Party man. However, when he entered the Federal Parliament he had no compunction in repudiating that affiliation. I think that Mr. Murray will have to be a little more consistent if he flukes a win in

the Clayfield seat, which is not such a blue-ribbon Liberal seat as many people think. If he does come here, I am sure there will be a feeling of uneasiness in the Liberal and Country Party sections of the Government because they will not know on which side of the fence Mr. Murray might come down. If there is a predominance of Country Party members, he might want to come down on the Country Party side and challenge the hon. member for Isis, who seems to have the inside running at the moment, for the leadership of the party when the Premier decides to lay aside the cares of office. I do not think that his performance in the Federal sphere will engender a feeling of confidence.

I should now like to touch briefly on the declaration by the Government parties of their intention to set up a body to examine the implications of preferential voting. I want to repeat that the A.L.P. is not concerned about the Government's decision on that matter. True it may be that there was a time—I am speaking now of the last five years—when, being realists, we might have been a little apprehensive about the implications of a move of that kind; but events that have occurred since then have enabled the A.L.P. to view with complete equanimity any decisions that may affect voting issues for the parties. It is purely a domestic issue between the Liberal Party and the Country Party.

Mr. Hanlon: And the Q.L.P.

Mr. DUGGAN: I will come to that in a few moments. One would ordinarily expect that this body would be competent, within its own personnel, to determine what was best from its own point of view, or, to put it more bluntly, what was best from the Government's point of view rather than the point of view of Queensland. I think the people outside Parliament are getting rather fed up with hearing that everything the Government do is actuated by a desire to benefit the State, and this is obviously a clumsy attempt on their part to find out which is likely to be the method most advantageous to themselves. At the end of their first term of office, the Government said they had an outstanding record of administration, and one would have thought, seeing that they won the Government on the former boundaries, and since they declaimed strongly that they had a record term of office, that they could have won again on those boundaries. However, they felt that it could not be attempted with safety, so they entered upon a major gerrymander of the electorates. Having done that, now they want to examine what may be the way from there on.

It seems extraordinary that a person in the employ of the Government, a former Leader of the Q.L.P., should warn the Government, in a public statement, about the need for a change in the method of voting. It is strange that a man in the employ of the Government as adviser on the development of secondary industries

should take it upon himself to make a statement, which was given a good deal of publicity in "The Sunday Mail", that the Government parties should wake up. He pointed out, among other things, that—

"Preference voting gives us something to sell."

What does he want to sell? He goes on to say, among other things—

"... under preference voting, party members would be told to give their preferences to Liberal and Country Party candidates."

It is not a question of saying, "You can exercise your own discretion in this matter." After all, the reason for that sort of statement lies behind the fact that it was allegedly to give people freedom of action and conscience.

Mr. Pizzey: Do members of the A.L.P. exercise discretion?

Mr. DUGGAN: Over many years, as an official organisation, we have taken upon ourselves the task of advising our voters what we think they should do, and we make no apology for that. But in this case it is said that unless preference voting is introduced, this party would fold up. I suppose the leader of a party is entitled to say that, but it is an extraordinary situation, particularly when there has been some slowness in filling the nominations for seats where it is felt that preference might be exercised in some way or another.

I think the crux of the matter is contained in a subsequent statement attributed to the same gentleman, which appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of 27 August in which he criticised everybody—the A.L.P. and the Country Party, too—on what they might be doing in this particular matter.

It is more than passing strange that this gentleman feels, as a matter of conviction, so strongly on this matter, because in the 5½ years that he was the Premier of this State, when he had the opportunity of recommending to his party a change from first-past-the-post to a system of preferential voting, he took no action to initiate anything of that kind. It is important that that should be remembered, because at no stage during the time he was Premier was it officially raised that there should be a change to that system of voting. When the Government of the day decided to introduce the first-past-the-post system, my informants within the party—and I know this of my own knowledge, too—told me that he was not a dissenter from that decision.

I shall not make a great song and dance about this matter, because it is outside my control. I am not particularly worried about it as a tremendous number of people have come back to the A.L.P. We do not have to fear the effects of the exercise of preference today as might have been the case five years ago. We have no need to worry

about that. The people who need to worry are Government members in shaky seats.

I look forward with a great deal of amusement to what will happen, because we know that if some of these changes are made, there are a number of independent gentlemen, with general Country Party convictions, who will look at this matter. Many of them have indicated to us that they will have no hesitation in recommending to supporters where their preferences should go, so I look forward with a great deal of interest to what the Government will do in an effort to extricate themselves from this dilemma. Fortunately, on this occasion, compared with the people about whom we are talking, we have nothing to fear. That is the important thing. I do not want the Government parties to think that the A.L.P. are concerned about this, because we are not. We will win with or without the first-past-the-post system; we expect that without any reservation whatsoever.

Even in one or two of the seats that are alleged to be traditionally strong Country Party seats, some exceptionally strong Independent candidates are nibbling, and I can only hope, so far as they are concerned, that the nibble will be more than a nibble and will become an effective bite. Conditions vary. Some of the gentlemen do not know which way to jump. The crux of the matter is this: theoretically, even if there is a swing against the A.L.P., the Country Party cannot expect to increase its representation by more than a couple of seats. There are a couple of traditional Country Party seats that are held at present by other than Liberal or Country Party supporters. If there was a swing against the sitting members or the A.L.P., they could go to one of those parties. However, except in those circumstances, by no stretch of the imagination can one see how the Country Party could increase its representation.

Theoretically, if there was a swing against Labour, the Liberal Party could increase its representation. This is a position where I think an onlooker would be somewhat amused if he was to speculate on it without worrying about it. He would see that the Country Party can lose some seats, not only theoretically but also actually. We have a grip on some Country Party seats at present and they will most assuredly return to Labour. They could win two seats if the swing is against us, but we could win many if there is a swing against them. That means that the Liberal Party can win some seats and the Country Party can lose some and the hon. member for Toowong will probably be the premier of the day if the Liberal Party comes back in great numbers. That is very disquieting. I know that the Deputy Premier is working very hard. The fact that he went out to Quilpie and decked himself in a cowboy outfit shows that he is trying to sell himself to the West. No doubt, on the Tablelands, we will find the Minister in charge of tourism with a butterfly net,

trying to catch some of those exotic butterflies to show the local people how much he is looking after the tourist industry. It is all too ridiculous!

An extraordinary situation seems to be developing. Some people are trying to tell the Government what they must do in this matter, and that all they have to sell are their preferences. I think every Country Party member and every Liberal Party member—whether or not he acknowledges it voluntarily—believes that he can sell the electors some policy points. Hon. members do not say, "The only thing we have to sell is our preferences." Assuredly the Labour Party has a considerable number of things to sell. Yet a former Premier of this State has said, "All we have to sell is our preference votes." I leave it to the people to decide just how worthy that contribution is. For fear that I may be accused of spending more time on that than its importance warrants I will pass to another matter, but I did not wish to allow the occasion to slip by without comment.

The Address-in-Reply debate allows us to encompass many subjects. As Leader of the Opposition I am not at all impressed with the Government's record. We on this side believe that when all the bally-hoo is taken away from the Press releases through a sympathetic Press that bolsters and shields the Government from attacks levelled at them, we find that the Government have lost the confidence of the people. I therefore propose to move the following amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply—

"Add to the question the following words—

'However, it is the opinion of this Legislature that—

(a) due in great measure to your present advisers having failed to take practical and efficacious steps to remedy the disproportionately high percentage rate of unemployment in this State;

(b) the tragedy of thousands of young Queenslanders whose future has been jeopardised by the denial of the right to work, to the detriment of their moral and physical well-being;

(c) the adverse effects to the well-being of the State if the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report is implemented;

(d) the increasing tendency to abrogate the functions of Government to private and semi-private bodies;

(e) the failure of the Government to promote large-scale secondary industries, as promised in their election policy speeches;

(f) the inability of the Government to effectively deal with the increased cost of living;

and, accordingly, we desire to inform your Excellency that for these, and other reasons, this Government does not possess the confidence of the House'."

A good deal of information could be furnished by the Opposition to support those general charges. Obviously, one of the most important questions is unemployment because this Government came to power largely on the promise that, if returned to power, they would overcome the problem of unemployment. After all, if any political party puts up a programme and says, "This is an alternative to the programme of the party in office", and the people give a mandate for the policy to be carried out, naturally one would expect that there should be some evidence forthcoming of the success of that programme.

I suppose members of the Government are rather tired of our repeating these phrases. Nevertheless, it is on record that both the Premier and then the Deputy Premier and Leader of the Liberal Party, now the Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr. Morris, gave a solemn assurance that, through their more effective means of representing the claims of Queensland to the Federal authorities, the gaining of confidence, the removal of red tape, the removal of restrictions, and the opportunities they would provide to private enterprise to expand the economy of the State, they would be able to solve this very great social problem. They have been wrong for so long and so often that only a matter of three or four months ago the present Minister for Labour and Industry said that by August of this year the unemployment figures would be down to 1 per cent. So it is not a matter of going back five years, or three years, but of going back three months. We find that in all the estimates made by the Government from time to time on this problem of unemployment they have been very much astray. It is not much good saying Queensland is subject to seasonal employment. That seasonal nature of employment has been accentuated by several factors. First, we have experienced a decline in population in country areas and provincial towns—a drift to the city that has been accentuated under this Government. Later I shall cite some figures relating to factories which will indicate that, with the exception of two or three provincial cities, there has been a decline in the number of employees in factories throughout Queensland.

The development of the bulk loading of sugar has taken away a great labour force from the wharves of various ports on the eastern seaboard. We have seen the introduction of the mechanical cane harvester, and I suppose you could say in round figures that every mechanical cane harvester takes away employment from 10 cane-cutters. With diminishing orders for coal from the Blair Athol field the labour force there has been reduced from something like 100 to 50.

With the motor car and the modern aeroplane many shearers who previously lived in the provincial towns now elect to live in the larger cities or in Brisbane. Many cane-cutters, of course, come from other countries. There has been a great influx of Spanish cane-cutters. Few, if any, have been naturalised. So they are not eligible to vote.

All these factors are perhaps tending to accentuate the problem of unemployment generally but perhaps the impact of unemployment in those areas has been lessened by people gravitating away from them. There are no jobs for them. It will be said that this Government set out to overcome the problem by tackling it realistically, that there is to be a flow of money, and that all sorts of things will happen to enable this great development to take place. It was said, of course, that under the Labour Government there had been no planning for these things at all. And so one of the great promotional activities of the present Government was the establishment of a Queensland Promotion Delegation to sell Queensland to overseas investors and to get money flowing into this country. We had as Chairman of that delegation the then Deputy Premier, Mr. Morris, and, as members: Sir Leon Trout, Mr. Hyne, a timber executive from Maryborough, Mr. Garland, Chief Inspector of the Bank of New South Wales, Sir William Gunn, President of the United Graziers' Association, Mr. Gargett, an architect, Mr. Bruce Shearer, well-known managing director of a company here, and Mr. A. C. Robertson, a stock and share broker from Toowoomba. If you read the files in the Parliamentary Library you will find that those people interviewed hundreds of industrialists overseas, and they were all going to come out here. I have checked, but I have not found evidence of one single large-scale industry that has established itself in Queensland as a result of the overseas trip of the Queensland Promotion Delegation team; yet when they were appointed we were assured by the Minister that they comprised Queensland's leading business men, that they felt so strongly on the matter that, with the exception of the Minister, they went over at their own expense. If they were so outstandingly successful it is extraordinary that a separate State Industrial Advisory Committee should have been set up to do the very same job for which the Minister for Labour and Industry set up the Queensland Promotion Delegation four years earlier.

The members of the State Industrial Advisory Committee are:

Sir Albert Axon,
Mr. G. R. Fisher,
Mr. J. R. Gibson,
Mr. N. Jameson,
Mr. R. J. C. O'Loan,
Mr. A. H. Petfield,
Mr. T. H. F. Spalding, and
Mr. A. J. Stratigos.

All are outstanding and successful men in their own private-enterprise organisations; but not one of those originally on the promotion delegation has been retained on the advisory body. That is either a confession that the Government were dissatisfied with what had been done or an admission that those men had been frustrated by lack of co-operation by the Government and had not been able to achieve the results envisaged at the time of their appointment.

So the facts are that the Government, because of their own ineptitude in the matter, have increasingly, as I have pointed out in the amendment, abrogated the functions of government and entrusted them to outside bodies, people who are not answerable to Parliament. The members of the original promotional body that went overseas were not obliged to furnish a report to the Premier. When it suits their convenience they can walk out and resume their normal occupations, as indeed can the members of the advisory committee.

It is a very sad reflection on public servants presently employed by the State that the Government of the day feel that they cannot co-opt from their ranks men to help in this programme.

Before taking up where I left off, I should like to make brief reference to a matter that might be misconstrued if it is not corrected. The Minister for Education and Migration this morning answered a question asked by the hon. member for Carnarvon on the refusal of permission to a representative of the Ministers' Fraternal to deliver an address in Stanthorpe some time ago. I wish to point out that I played a minor role in this matter.

I was telephoned and informed that approval had been granted for an address of a political nature to be given at the Stanthorpe State High School. I immediately rang the Director-General of Education, Dr. Watkin, and pointed out that I was not aware of any of the facts of the matter but, if it was true that an address of a political character was to be delivered, I felt that it would open up a situation that would have rather damaging implications to any Government in power. I asked if he would check to see whether there was any substance in the allegations. If there was not, he would be a free agent, of course, to take whatever action was necessary in accordance with general practice.

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

Mr. DUGGAN: I thank the hon. member for Wynnum for moving the extension of my time, and hon. members for agreeing. All I need say is that the reply of the Minister this morning sets out the position very succinctly, and I agree with the statement that he made.

I did not want to appear to be in any way associated with people who are in favour of Communism or anything of that sort, nor do I wish to offend any member

of the Ministers' Fraternal, with whom I have had a long and happy association over the years. I think that the Minister's statement this morning was true and correct. There is ample opportunity to deal with these subjects in other ways and in other places.

I was dealing at the adjournment with the way in which the Minister for Labour and Industry endeavours to build round himself an atmosphere of success in injecting tremendous sums of money into the economy of Queensland, mobilising private enterprise, and, in general, getting the tempo of development in this State to an exciting stage. At many functions I have heard the Premier speak in the same general terms of the tremendous potential of Queensland and the exciting times in which we live, and that this is the State of the future. People are getting rather sick of this sort of thing. I suppose, in general, they are true. This is the State of the future. We have an exciting potential, but what I am concerned about is the political credit sought to be taken by the Government on these matters.

Let us look at the latest Monthly Bulletin of Employment Statistics of May, 1962, No. 246. There is a more recent one, but that does not alter the basis on which I make these general calculations. On page 6 is a table showing wage and salary-earners in civilian employment in the various States, excluding wage-earners in rural industry, female private domestics, and the defence forces. In June, 1958, which is a fair measuring stick, there were 282.8 thousand in Queensland. Before that there was an increase in the number of employees. During the period between June, 1958, and May, 1962, there was a net increase in New South Wales of 78,000 people. In Victoria there was a net increase of 60,300; in Queensland, 9,000; in South Australia, 21,300; Western Australia, 14,300. We are dragging behind all the other mainland States in the number of people that have obtained employment. That gives the lie to the statement that we are developing at a faster rate than the other States. When Labour were in power, we had the shortest working week, the highest basic wage, and the lowest cost of living. That position has been lost to a very great degree.

Again referring to the Monthly Bulletin of Employment Statistics, Table 19, at page 23 shows the minimum weekly wage rates. From 1957 to 31 May, 1962, there has been an increase, brought about largely by wage determinations based on cost of living and adjustments flowing therefrom, of 48s. in New South Wales, 47s. in Victoria, 55s. in Queensland, 47s. in South Australia, and 42s. in Western Australia. That shows that the impact of increased costs is higher in Queensland than it is in the other States of the Commonwealth. We find, also, that the average weekly hours in Queensland are slightly lower than those in any other State.

This industrial picture discloses very definitely that Queensland is not in the vanguard of development.

Despite the seasonal conditions, the figures that I have up to 29 June, 1962, disclose that the following people are receiving social service benefits—

Metropolitan area	..	3,375
Bundaberg	..	892
Toowoomba	..	476
Maryborough	..	411
Townsville	..	379
Rockhampton	..	363
Ipswich	..	314
Mackay	..	307
Cairns	..	272
Ayr	..	148
Warwick	..	121
Innsfail	..	116

Warwick is not noted for a great deal of unemployment, and the figures generally show that there is a disquieteningly high percentage of unemployment in Queensland.

Mr. Coburn: The figures do not apply to the towns. They apply to the employment office in the particular town.

Mr. DUGGAN: That is true. We could not expect them to run round getting figures for every small siding in Queensland.

Mr. Coburn: It is misleading to say that the figure for Ayr is 148.

Mr. DUGGAN: I am quite prepared to accept that they are the statistical records for the particular areas.

We still have more than 14,000 unemployed in Queensland. That does not reflect the true incidence of unemployment, because many single men elect to take casual work rather than wait in a town to get work, and married women who have lost their employment are not permitted to register. For these and other reasons the figures are much higher than those that I have enumerated.

The Minister for Labour and Industry said that the figure would be down to 1 per cent. in August this year. Again he has been proved wrong. The last return given by Mr. McMahon, the Federal Minister for Labour and National Service, disclosed that Queenslanders worked the lowest number of overtime hours of persons working in Australia during the week ended 22 June, namely, 6.6 hours against the national average of 7.2. It also disclosed that there was a higher proportion of Queensland factories working short time and that the persons working short time worked, on an average, 13½ hours in that week, which again was higher than the figure in any other State. These figures cannot be disputed, because they are, as I say, taken from recent Federal returns.

The censure motion discloses that we are perturbed about the incidence of unemployment among the youth of the community.

There are still 4,715 juniors under 21 registered as unemployed. When we look back, we find that in 1929-1932 the clarion cry went out, "Give the boy a chance", but during the Moore Government's term of office not one boy was indentured in the Railway Department. During the present Government's term of office, many men coming out of their time in the department have been told to seek work elsewhere. Tradesmen were told to do fencing work in the Railway Department. Builders and others say that there is a dearth of tradesmen, yet the State cannot absorb all the trained personnel turned out after having served their apprenticeship. What a dismal future for these people. I have seen quite a number of them, and I am sure that other hon. members have, too. The Government boasts about the secondary school facilities they have provided, and I am glad to see that they have done it. But they are doing no more than any other State. In New South Wales, where a Labour Government is in office, the per capita expenditure is higher than it is in Queensland, and in this regard we have to find out whether we can plan our economy in such a way that the people having this higher education can take advantage of it.

I was at Mt. Isa only a fortnight ago, and there were 120 students in the Junior class at Mt. Isa High School. I went to Mount Isa Mines Limited and spoke to Mr. Fisher and the employment officer of the company, and I was told that their maximum intake is 30 apprentices—they generally stipulate Junior standard, if possible—and 20 girl clerks and typists. So out of 120 students at the school doing Junior, and disregarding Senior pupils entirely, 70 will have to be absorbed in local employment at Mt. Isa. Frankly, there are not those opportunities in Mt. Isa. That position is reflected in other centres throughout the State. I know one lad who has passed Senior, a good type of lad with a pleasant personality. I sent him to eight or nine places where it is normally possible to get a position and he met nothing but refusals all along the line. The Government are in a miserable position when the employers' advocate, Mr. James, who is probably the best defender of the Government outside the House against the criticism they have had levelled at them from time to time, has publicly decried the lack of employment opportunities for young people throughout the State. While this Government constantly proclaimed what it was doing in providing incentives, the Premier admitted that private enterprise was not taking its share of the intake. Then there was the application to the Loan Council by Mr. Bolte of Victoria, who complained about the special allocation of funds to Queensland for the alleviation of unemployment which he said was not justified because of the mismanagement of public affairs by the Queensland Government.

Then to cap it all there is the action of the Treasurer. As a result of the combined representations of himself and the Premier there was an allocation of over £3,000,000 for the specific purpose of relieving unemployment in this State. This was done because the confidence of the Commonwealth Government was shaken to the very foundations by the number of votes cast against them last December. This Government have refused to release the money made available, on the ground that it will be released in the second, third, and fourth quarters of this financial year.

That money was made available for the specific purpose of relieving unemployment, and the Treasurer proposes to release it at a time to coincide with the next State election. Why not do it now? The money was not made available on the basis of what the unemployment position might be in the second or third quarters of this year, but on the basis of what it was at the time the case was presented to the Federal authorities. That special appropriation was made available for that purpose. If the people of this State allow themselves to be hoodwinked in that way, we deserve the type of Government that we have.

The same pattern reflects itself in all sorts of directions. The hon. member for Maryborough has given notice of a private member's motion which discloses the alarming position of the timber industry. It gives cause for disquiet. I shall not canvass it at length because the hon. member will do that in detail at the appropriate time.

At a time when there is a record low cut from the timber reserves in this State, when we find a greater number of sawmills closing than at any other time, and when plymills are closing down, this Government, supposedly in such close union with Canberra, are allowing the importation of Borneo pine, pine from the Philippines, and pine from South-east Asia. It is time the people realised that this is a Government of words and little positive action. The only way we can focus attention on this matter is by drawing attention to the way in which they have messed up the job generally.

The other day the Premier claimed that the reason they could not get out of the morass was the legacy left by a Socialist Government over a period of years. They have been in power long enough to stand on their feet. I will give them their first year in office; they said they had a contractual account that they had to honour. I can understand that.

Let us have a look at the figures for the last four years of Labour and for the four years to 1960-1961 of the Nicklin-Morris Government. These figures are taken from

the Queensland Pocket Year Book, and exclude those for heat, light, and power. The figures are—

—	1953-54- 1956-57 Increase	1957-58- 1960-61 Increase
Employment	9,988	993
Number of Establish- ments	465	344
Production	£38,391,000	£29,148,000
Salaries and Wages ..	£18,738,000	£13,995,000

As I pointed out this morning, employment in factories in this State, with the exception of Toowoomba, Ipswich, Townsville, and, I think one other provincial town, which had previously been increasing, showed a decline compared with when Labour went out of office in 1957. So much for the vaunted claims about development taking place.

How do the Government meet this? They talk about the exciting things that are going to happen. They talk about Weipa, about Mt. Isa mines, and the sale of coal to interests in other States of Australia. The New South Wales Government have been exporting coal to Japan on a very substantial and extensive basis for many years. A proposal for the expanded export of coal from Queensland will be examined by the House in due course. Everybody knows about Weipa. There was a series of consultations, and the agreement reached was substantially the same as the one signed by this Government.

In regard to Mt. Isa, I have pointed out on various occasions that we have to thank the Commonwealth Government for nothing in regard to that. They gave us a loan, but imposed the highest possible interest charges and the shortest possible redemption period. Every other State received handsome subsidies but were given longer periods of redemption than Queensland and lower interest rates. Of the £12,000,000, £8,000,000 is represented by the Mt. Isa railway rehabilitation. Why did Labour do nothing about it? The moment Mount Isa Mines Ltd. made known to the Government of the day their intention to increase their productive capacity was the time for action, and not until then was it necessary to consider major reconstruction of Mt. Isa railway line. The moment that took place the representations followed. Sir Arthur Fadden met representatives of the then State Government in the Executive Buildings and said that everything was in order for the provision of funds for that proposal. We were told, however, to wait until the announcement came from him. He did not want any premature disclosure or trouble in the Loan Council on how this arrangement was to be made. If anyone says that the Labour Government did nothing about providing for the Mt. Isa railway line, I say categorically that he is a liar. We did make provision for it.

On the discovery of oil, I heard a prominent member of the Government say of the Queen's proposed visit, "We are in a bit of a quandary to know what to do because it is such a short stay. We do not know if there is any building she can open but if oil is discovered in commercial quantities, she could turn it on." That would simply be prostituting Royalty and the oil industry, because no Government are responsible for oil being deposited below the surface of the ground in Queensland. What this Government have done in regard to oil is not necessarily something to be ashamed of, nor is it something that no-one else could have done, would have done, or should have done.

On these various matters, it appears evident that the Government, because of their policy of indecision and compromise, and their tendency to yield to pressure groups in the community, are responsible in a large measure for the present unsatisfactory position. In my no-confidence motion I referred to the increasing tendency to abrogate the functions of government and to entrust them to private and semi-private bodies. For example, we had the Hytten Committee, the Merz and McLellan Committee, and the Ford, Bacon and Davis Committee, and reports were furnished to the Government by other quasi-political organisations. There were reports on liquor reform, gambling, and so on, yet immediately things progressed to a certain stage nothing very much was done about them. The economists' report contained tabulated information of statistics that was already available. It merely showed the figures in a convenient form, but we paid a great deal of money for it. Very much the same thing applies to the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report.

If the Government are constituted, as they say, of outstanding successful private business men, graziers, lawyers, doctors, and so on, why can't they say, just as any self-respecting Government would, "This is our policy and we will implement it. You can judge us on our record?" But they do not do that. They put the responsibility elsewhere. On the racing and betting legislation I was chided by the Treasurer about not knowing my homework, yet 12 months ago he said he intended to impose a tax of £1,000,000 on betting. He said later that he knew nothing about racing and handed over the control of betting to an outside agency. If they had not been fortunate in getting the services of Mr. Sakzewski, who is a very successful business man, accountant, and racing man, they would be in a bigger quandary than they are. They are leaving the policing of this important legislation to an outside body. When an hon. member asked a question about the wages being paid by this body, the Treasurer said that it was not within the knowledge of his department what the wages were. The

legislation setting up the facilities for the revenue is available to him so why should not the other information also be available?

The same remarks apply to the liquor legislation. When we were the Government we were told how Labour's laws were flouted. If there was any flouting or breaching of the law relating to betting or liquor consumption in Labour's day, it is on a much wider scale now than ever before. One has only to travel through the State to find that that is the case, yet this morning the Minister said that the police were officially warned of the possibility of a challenge to authority, and we had a weak sort of a reply to a question that a police officer was in attendance but could find no evidence of any contravention of the Liquor Act. There was a public statement about a mock police raid. We are told that one policeman went through the place in the early hours of the morning, and the Minister says that there was no evidence to justify any action. I have a recollection of the Minister for Justice saying previously that the law would be enforced with great exactitude, fairly and impartially for all sections of the community. It is obvious that some of these grazing people have complained about this matter, and because of that complaint someone has been asked to turn a blind eye on what is happening. I do not wish to cramp anybody's style, but I am sick to death of this Government placating the temperance people and encouraging them to say, "We are lucky to have the Minister we have. The trading hours will not be extended and they will be fully enforced." There is no need to extend the hours because people can drink whenever they want to. The golf clubs have arranged their hours so that one may drink from early morning until late afternoon. I do not want to cramp their style either, but let us get away from this mockery of the Government being the defenders of the law in these matters when they are not. It is because I want to tear this veil of hypocrisy from the Government that I feel we should make these strong attacks on them.

Their attitude is clear even in the Department of Public Lands, where they have very good officers. The hon. member for Fassifern could tell us some interesting tales if he wanted to. Because of pressure the Government again by-passed trained personnel in that department and went to Mr. Archer, a man for whom I have great respect as he is a very knowledgeable grazier. I am not attacking him personally at all, but he is there in some unknown, undesigned role, personally advising the Minister on these matters. Surely to goodness we have in the department people who can indicate just what the authority of these people is from time to time.

Then we had the incident on the Tableland in connection with the transport laws of this State where the hon. member for Tablelands did something quite unprecedented.

He took advantage of a meeting of the Country Women's Association, of all places, to launch an attack on me over the Jonsson family. I have in my file a letter that I will read later, because I have not time today, written by the brother of Mr. Jonsson. But this man gets up and castigates me, of all places in the C.W.A. meeting, and says to the brother of Jonsson, "I will cross the floor of the House. I will take strong action in Caucus. I will take this action or that action unless the Government measure up to their responsibilities." And when the hue and cry has died down he supports weakly and supinely this Government on their transport operations.

Talk about there being no swing back to Labour! I met 30-odd farmers on the Atherton Tableland, none of whom has been closely associated with the Labour Party before, who made no bones about where their sympathies lay and the action they propose to take at the next elections. It is because we have to rekindle this enthusiasm throughout that I want to expose the failure of the Government in these matters.

In my association with this Parliament never have I read a more anaemic document than the Opening Speech of His Excellency. It was merely a statistical recital, at the end of which five Bills were listed. Would you not think a Government who had been in power for five years and who talked about there still being so much developmental work to be done could say, "All right, we are going to deal positively with these facets of development" and so on, and so on! But not a word of any of these things other than pinning their hopes on oil being found in commercial quantities in this State. I hope it will be, too, but when it is found we want a Government that can mobilise the resources of the State more intelligently and more effectively than this one.

The same sort of vacillation is disclosed with the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report. American consultants are called in, yet all the evidence discloses that if ever there was a national railway system facing bankruptcy it is the American railway system. The Minister for Transport said that their report was a good report if rigidly implemented, but he immediately gave about 10 reasons why it could not be implemented. Surely to goodness, as I started to say the other day when considerations of time beat me, if you pay £115,000 for advice, you are rather foolish unless it is sound advice. As the Minister said it was sound advice and would salvage the railways, why not accept it? But again the Government are actuated not by considerations of State but by party-political considerations. They know they will lose the Roma seat for sure. They know they will lose Tablelands, Flinders, and Gregory, because the report recommends economies in those areas. What is the use of saying it is a good report and a sound

report if on every major aspect of the recommendations the Government refuse to take action? They lack the courage to measure up to the report, if it is a good report.

Of course railway employment will be secure in due course. If more and more branch lines are closed down—another 10 per cent. in the next few years making well over 1,000 miles of track in all—of course railwaymen's employment will be secure for those who are in it; but we can wipe off the railways as a major instrumentality in helping to provide for the development of the State as a whole.

As to the electrification of the suburban rail system, despite what has been said to the contrary I think that what Victoria did the other day could be emulated here. Victoria offered the aluminium people electricity at a cost of less than one penny a unit. Why do we not do that with Comalco? Victoria subsidised the generation of electricity for that purpose and I think a similar scheme could be developed in Queensland in association with the electrification of the suburban railway service in Brisbane. It would do a great deal to bring back traffic to the railways. Of course we are losing suburban rail traffic. I was aware of that years ago. People would not travel in carriages soiled by soot and grime and coal smoke when they could travel by bus or some other cleaner method of transport; but figures disclose definitely that in the countries that have electrification the traffic is heavy. Even the Minister's own report after he returned from his overseas trip disclosed that in England dieselisation was only a phase in the programme of modernisation; electrification was the ultimate aim. That is the report the Minister himself signed only a few months ago with Mr. Lee, Commissioner-elect, and Mr. Goldstein, the engineer from Rockhampton.

Despite the extension of time I have not been able to cover every aspect, but I have dealt with the position in a general way. I feel that the Government should be indicted for their apathy, and I hope that the people of Queensland will realise that the only way in which the State can truly prosper and develop is by the injection of new political blood into the Government benches. That can be done effectively only from this side of the House. I accordingly move the amendment on the lines that I indicated earlier.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (2.46 p.m.): I rise to second the amendment which has been so lucidly and forcefully put by the Leader of the Opposition. It reflects the feelings of hundreds of thousands of Queenslanders towards a Government in whom they have lost confidence to a degree and extent that will shatter and astound this Government, in its arrogance, as were their Federal colleagues last December. It reflects the

feeling of people in this State for a Government in whom they have not only lost confidence but for whom they have lost respect. Worse than that, this is a Government that has lost respect for itself, which is the most frightening thing that can happen to any Government. This Government have shown that they are ever-willing to resort to any device, any deceit, or any subterfuge that will serve their miserable political ends. I know that that is fairly strong language to use, but I believe it to be true. I believe that to be the opinion of the people of this State. This Government resent what English journalist Mr. Francis Williams very well described as the real guarantee and true characteristic of democracy—that necessary and constant challenge and cross-examination by Parliament, Press, and the public of Government administrative actions and policies. Time and time again this Government have run headlong, like a thief in the night, from the torchlight of public opinion and public inquiry. At the week-end there were Press reports of changes in the procedure at question time, which, if reliable, will do little to improve this position. We often hear talk of the alternative Government. I think this is an appropriate time, with an election coming on, to refer to hon. members opposite as the alternative Opposition, because they will be the Opposition—or those of them who are left—after the election.

This Government, in their period of office have set a number of interesting precedents which might not wear nearly so well on hon. members opposite in Opposition as they do in Government.

This Government have not the confidence of the people because they resent criticism, not only by their foes but also by their friends. On the question of hospital administration alone, the Government ran away from their own Country Party conference. They ran away from a resolution passed by that conference for a public inquiry into hospital administration. That cannot be denied.

Mr. Hodges: What about three weeks' leave?

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member asks about three weeks' leave. He takes the words out of my mouth, because at the Country Party conference Mr. Nicklin successfully appealed to those present to rescind the motion for the holding of a public inquiry into hospitalisation under his Government, three years after he had been elected as Premier. He asked them to rescind it because, if they did not, he would have to regard it as an instruction. The Premier sought the approval of the Country Party conference to reverse a decision which they had made for the holding of a public inquiry into the hospital administration of the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, because he said that he would otherwise have to

take it as an instruction. That is an admission, in itself. He said that it would lead to demands for the spending of money on hospitals that this Government, in its bankrupt state, was apparently unable and unwilling to spend.

This is the same Mr. Nicklin who was horrified by an alleged direction to the Labour Government on a previous occasion. This is the same Mr. Nicklin who dismissed Mr. Muller from the Cabinet after he claimed that he had told him an untruth, but who unblushingly himself told a million or more Queenslanders a blatant untruth as to why Mr. Muller would no longer continue in Cabinet. This is the same Mr. Nicklin who is to be paraded as the leader you can trust before the people of this State at the next election. This is the same Mr. Nicklin who gave his legal blessing to off-course betting and Sunday drinking, but who had neither the honesty nor the courage to put them in his policy speech not much more than 12 months before he introduced legislation into this House for what are quite revolutionary changes in the statutes of this State, whether you agree with them or not.

Mr. Pizzey interjected.

Mr. HANLON: The Minister for Education and Migration, who is being widely tipped as the possible successor to the Premier if he ever lays down the leadership of the Country Party, should be the last one to talk about not enforcing them. After the weak and apathetic answer that he gave to the hon. member for Bulimba this morning on the subject of a specific warning being given by his department about a function held in Brisbane during Exhibition Week, I might well ask whether there has been a change in the attitude of the ministerial administration of the Police Force since the Minister took over from the Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr. Morris, because the Minister for Labour and Industry stated categorically that he would not interfere in any way with the police in relation to matters of that sort.

Mr. Pizzey: Are you suggesting that I interfered?

Mr. HANLON: I am suggesting that the Minister did not give a satisfactory answer to a very straightforward question that was put to him. If he is satisfied with that answer, I suggest that we should leave it to the people to consider it and give their decision.

As I said, the Premier deliberately misled the public of Queensland during the 1960 election campaign by not indicating that he was going to introduce these revolutionary changes of off-course betting and Sunday drinking. Not one word did he say about them in his policy speech. Then the Treasurer, when introducing the Betting Bill at the end of last year, if I might borrow his type of terminology, posed a monumental detachment to legalised off-course betting in Brisbane. We could hardly get him to say anything about it. I think the hon. member for

Bulimba finally forced him into a corner and he said that it was possible under the Act for off-course betting to be introduced legally in the metropolitan area. He wanted to say nothing about it and misled some interested sections of the community, who have openly stated that he did mislead them, on that occasion. What has happened? Within six months the Treasurer was going along merrily issuing regulations, which are not in the form of Acts to be discussed in the House, for metropolitan tote shops. These shops appear likely, if the trend continues, to become an adjunct of every hotel in Brisbane. I do not think this will displease the breweries, and in my opinion the viewpoint of the breweries could be regarded as not entirely unrepresented on the Totalisator Administration Board in an indirect way. That is a matter to which the Government might give some serious consideration.

As mentioned in the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, the Government have sought to evade the issue on every occasion. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, there has been an increasing tendency to abrogate the functions of government by entrusting them to private and semi-private bodies. Evasion, subterfuge and deceit have been the trademarks of the Government ever since they came to office, yet they will parade themselves at the next election as "The Government you can trust." I think it is of importance that the people of Queensland should be told that government in secrecy can never be trusted. This Government are a government of secrecy and have often governed in secrecy. I ask hon. members to recall the smother tactics the Government attempted to use in relation to the Westbrook charges, which were not made by members of this Assembly but which came from other sources. We received the same bland assurance from Dr. Noble at that time that all was well—that the charges were only dreamed up for political advantage, that they were only stirred up by trouble-makers, Communists, or somebody else—as we received in relation to the charges made by the hon. member for Fassifern against the administration of the Department of Public Lands. We received assurances of the same type from the Minister for Transport in relation to the astounding charges that were made by Mr. Bolton and others against his administration of road transport, and similar assurances were given by the Government in relation to the remarkable siting of the Inala hotel.

The whole history of the Government has been a history of smother-up and cover-up all along the line to the latest instance of the restriction on public attendance at the investigation that is being conducted into the evidence in the Plomp case. I was amazed to hear the Premier's reply to a question I asked him about this investigation. He had said that the matter of whether or not it would be an open or closed inquiry was solely a matter for the investigating Queen's Counsel. I asked him whether, before Mr.

Bennett had a chance to consider the matter, the Minister for Justice had stated that it would be a closed inquiry, and I asked under what authority the Minister for Justice had done this. The Premier then told me that it had all been explained previously by the Minister for Justice in the terms of the Executive Council minute and that apparently there was nothing to contradict what he had said. I can only say that in his answer this morning the Premier indicated that he had made a statement to the public about this matter when he did not know what he was talking about, because his own Minister came out and openly stated within a matter of hours that he had decided, without any reference to Mr. Bennett, that this Executive Council minute implied in itself that the inquiry would not be open to the public.

In relation to the Plomp investigation, I take this opportunity of issuing to the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt a challenge that I intended to offer by way of a question; I feel that it serves the same purpose in the course of debate. The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt is president of the Queensland Bar Association and is well respected in that position. Recently, as president of that association, through the columns of "The Courier Mail" he made a public call to the Government for the Plomp investigation to be an open inquiry, and he used quite strong terms as to why the Bar Association thought that way.

I realise that there is some difficulty when a member of Parliament holds an outside position, and that the views stated on behalf of the Association are not necessarily his own views, but I challenge the hon. member to tell us whether he endorses the call by the Bar Association for an open inquiry. If he does he is very much offside with his own Government, and should get up and say so if he accepts his responsibility as a member of Parliament. If not, he is very much offside with his own Bar Association.

As to the general record of this Government, they have endeavoured to smother up and cover up their activities. They were forced into an inquiry in regard to Westbrook, because the place practically exploded in the face of Dr. Noble, who was on television telling the people about the "happy valley" that existed there. The Government attempted to thwart the inquiry into those charges by making it secret, as they have on this occasion in the Plomp case. On the other matters concerning the Lands Department charges, the transport charges, and so on, they have resolutely turned their back on a public inquiry. So much for the general outlook of the Government.

Let us now look more particularly at their administration. The Leader of the Opposition has referred to the high percentage of unemployment in this State. It is quite evident, as he pointed out, that under

the guidance of the Nicklin-Morris Government, and now the Nicklin-Munro Government, this State has enjoyed almost continually the dishonour of being the State with the highest percentage of unemployed. Even in a period of peak seasonal activity last year, and up to last month, we find Queensland still enjoying the dishonour of being the State with the highest per-capita percentage of unemployment.

This Government are like the cricketer who, having made 10 ducks, suddenly gets into double figures. After having made many ducks so far as employment is concerned, the Government have managed to scratch up a couple of runs in reducing the number of unemployed. Now they tell us they have unemployment under control.

Mr. Ewan: You sound as if you are very displeased about the situation.

Mr. HANLON: I am very displeased about the 15,000 who are still unemployed. It amazes me that people like the hon. member for Roma, or the Treasurer, seem to think that the 15,000 who remain unemployed, drawing £7 or £8 a week for a family—if they are able to draw it after a qualifying period in social service—are better off because 4,000 or 5,000 others are working. I cannot understand their reasoning. It is good that we have 4,000 or 5,000 fewer unemployed, but it is shameful that there are still 15,000 unemployed. The sooner the hon. member and the Government realise it, the sooner we will have those 15,000 working, and not drawing the dole.

I searched His Excellency's Speech, which is prepared almost exclusively by his advisers in Cabinet, to find some examination of this unemployment situation, and in particular to find some constructive suggestion on what the Government intend to do to meet the alarming situation that will resurrect itself at the end of the year with the return of seasonal unemployment.

Mr. Row: You have always had that.

Mr. HANLON: This Government have record figures for unemployment, compared with Labour's figures.

On behalf of the Government, His Excellency said on unemployment—

"This season I pray that the patience, courage, and hard work of the men of the land will receive reward in full measure.

"I trust that the revival in our greatest of all industries, the produce of the land, will stimulate secondary and tertiary industries so that our aim of full employment may be attained."

We have those remarks about aiming and trusting, but many people are facing unemployment today. It is not enough to trust and it is not enough to aim. It may help

to pray, but we must remember that God helps those who help themselves. This Government are not helping themselves to employ people in the State. The Leader of the Opposition has pointed out that instead of spending the money the Commonwealth Government have given them, this Government have put it away to spend before the next elections regardless of the plight of those who are unemployed. Quite callously, the Government are not at all interested in what is happening. There are 15,000 unemployed now and as long as they can keep the number at 15,000 in another three or four months' time it is all right. What logic is there in that? It is a confidence trick.

A Government Member: You speak for yourself.

Mr. HANLON: I am speaking for the people who are unemployed. I do not know whether they go to the hon. member, but they certainly come to me.

I know the Government will blame the Federal Government's credit squeeze and economic policies for a great deal of what has happened in Queensland, but let me say that this Government endorsed those policies at the Country Party conference in 1960, when a delegate, with perhaps more sense than the others, moved a motion condemning the policy of the Menzies-McEwen Government in introducing the credit squeeze. What happened to the Ewans, the Nicklins, the Richters, and members of the State party who were there? Did they get up and oppose it? No! They passed a vote of confidence in the Federal Government's policy at that time. Do not let them try to tell us that the credit squeeze and other things emanating from Canberra are only the baby from Canberra and are not connected with this Government. They have identified themselves with them. I submit that this Government are identified, whether they like it or not, with what Mr. Whitlam rightly called the morally unjustifiable policy of the Menzies Government that believes it is right to have unemployment so long as you get stability, and in using unemployment as a weapon to achieve what they think is economic stability.

Very often the Labour Party is accused of living in the past. We are told that we are living on out-dated slogans and economic theories. Is there anything more out-dated than curing economic ills by unemployment? I thought that type of thinking went out in 1932. It is alarming to think that we have a Federal Government, supported by this Government, who believe that you can cure things by putting men out of work and by stopping them from working. That is what the Federal Government did. They deliberately threw hundreds of thousands of adult workers out of employment. Why? Because they thought it was a correct economic policy and would achieve stability.

Mr. Hodges: You sacked 2,000 Government employees in 1957.

Mr. HANLON: They did not take a fraction of the time to get back.

Mr. Hodges: You sacked them in 1957.

Mr. HANLON: That was because of the policy of the Federal Government at the time.

Mr. Ewan interjected.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member may be old enough to go back to the McCormack Government's time, but I am not. It will not be of much help to the unemployed if the hon. member for Roma talks about the McCormack Government of 30 or 40 years ago. The unemployed want to know what Nicklin is going to do about it, and not what Smith, Hanlon, or anybody else did about it. They want to know what this Government are doing about it. If I wanted to be rude I could tell them.

The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition refers to the tragedy of thousands of young Queenslanders whose future has been jeopardised by the denial of the right to work, to the detriment of their morale and physical well-being. Is there anything more conducive to juvenile delinquency than the loss of confidence in young people who leave school with their heads held high looking for employment but find there is nothing offering and are told they are not wanted, to come back next week, and next week are told to come back next month? There are still hundreds and hundreds who left school last year who are still unemployed.

Mr. Pizzey: How many?

Mr. HANLON: There are hundreds.

Mr. Mann: There are 4,000.

Mr. HANLON: There are 4,700 under 21. This time last year there were 818 who had left school at the end of 1960. I suggest that this year there are far more than that who left school last year and who are still unemployed.

Mr. Ewan: This morning three pages of vacancies were advertised in "The Courier-Mail".

Mr. HANLON: I advise the hon. member to study them because he will need one of those positions next year.

These young people lose confidence in themselves, in their country, and in democracy, and, disillusioned, they become the natural fodder on which Communism thrives. This has been proved time and time again in many parts of the world. This type of unemployment, of youth particularly, provides a breeding ground for Communism. That is why the Australian Labour Party is not interested in allegedly fighting Communism by devoting itself, as the Country-Liberal Party and their Q.L.P. subsidiary are, to deals on preferential voting or to brawling over, of all things, peace

at Centenary Place. We are interested in fighting Communism in Australia by destroying the conditions on which it thrives, by providing jobs for those 15,000 Queenslanders who have not got them at the moment and for the 20,000 to 30,000 who probably will not have them at the end of this year and the beginning of next year.

Mr. Pizzey: What would you do to cut out the strikes up north?

Mr. HANLON: The Minister should not be talking about the people who provoke strikes because we read in the Press the comments of the Conciliation Commissioner on the conduct of one of the white-haired boys of this Government in the meat company up there. I would say the people who are provoking the strikes and causing the trouble are very clearly indicated by the Conciliation Commissioner as being the meat company themselves.

We are interested in fighting Communism within Australia by providing jobs, homes and welfare services to produce a contented and united community who will want no truck with Communism. The question of any external threat to Australia is obviously bound up largely with foreign affairs, and such threats of an international military nature are just as real whether they come under the guise of Communism, or of Fascism, or of nationalism, or of any other "ism." The A.L.P. has never been found wanting in such circumstances. Indeed, the people of this country have repeatedly turned to the A.L.P. as a government in those times. We take second place to nobody in our readiness to protect our country and its people but we are conscious of the vital need to prevent, and not idly provoke, a situation in which there can be no winners, not indeed that there ever was, even in what is now regarded as an old-fashioned war.

Do not let us in this session of Parliament, or in the coming election campaign, be side-tracked from the problems of unemployment, the housing shortage and the distress of many thousands of Queenslanders—matters that are the responsibility of this State Government and the next State Government, too. Do not let us be diverted by people who, for their own purposes, want to get us talking in the State election campaign about the Berlin wall and such international matters, which no doubt are of grave concern. The election of one Government or another here in Queensland will have no effect whatever on such matters. Are the people of Hungary, whose troubles were prostituted to such a degree by the Q.L.P. in the 1957 election campaign, any better off because the Country Party-Liberal Government were elected in Queensland? Of course not! Are they any worse off because Mr. Gair and his Q.L.P. did not win? Of course not! But Queenslanders are very much worse off following the election of this Government, and they will be far worse off still if they are

foolish enough to return them again—this Government who are skiting about a surplus of £109,719.

We read in the Governor's Opening Speech—

"My Ministers inform me that the financial year which has just concluded resulted in a surplus of £109,719. This was an improvement of £753,293 on the deficit of £643,574 anticipated when the budget was presented."

They are actually skiting about the surplus. For four years they ran into deficit. Why? According to the Treasurer, Mr. Hiley, it was because they wanted to spend until it hurt, until they were able to arrest unemployment. And what do they do in a year with the peak unemployment in the history of the State since the war? They come out with a surplus! How much rubbish can we get from the Treasurer in this matter? He tells us that he wants to spend until it hurts and he has a deficit for about four years. Our argument with those deficits was not that we were opposed to deficit financing to give people work but that the Government were monotonously producing deficits at the same time as they were producing record unemployment figures. What does he do after producing these deficits for four years? He comes out and brags about a surplus of £100,000 in a year in which unemployment in this State was at its very peak. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, he has publicly stated his intention to hang onto much of his present resources to suit his requirements in the pre-election period. That is not the way to get people back to work in Queensland. Surely to goodness the Government's job is to spend now the money they have available to assist those people who are unemployed. Having spent it, surely they are not going to suggest that at the end of this year, in a period when seasonal unemployment is having its effect and when all these young people will be coming from school onto the employment market, the Commonwealth Government will tell this Government that they will not give them any additional funds! They certainly will say it if they get to the end of this year and still have in the hip pocket some millions of pounds given by the Federal Government to combat unemployment.

This Government can be condemned on quite a number of grounds. We know that the Minister for Education and Migration is being groomed as a possible successor to the Leader of the Country Party. Propaganda is being built up about the job that the hon. gentleman is doing for education. There are now 38,000 children at high schools compared with 17,000 five years ago, but everybody in Queensland knows the reason for that; it is because those children are of high-school age. What benefit would have been derived from accommodation to that extent five or six years ago? That would merely have been providing accommodation for children who were not due to

attain high-school age till this year. The previous Government set in train operations for the construction of additional high schools which this Government followed.

The Minister cannot have it both ways. He wants to tell us that there are over 20,000 more children going through high schools now who were denied it under the Labour Government. In that case, there should be 20,000 fewer people on the unemployment market in this State under this Government than there were during the term of office of the Labour Government.

I want to say two things to the Minister. Firstly, I do not think that he is making a good job of the Education portfolio. I ask him to go to the Kelvin Grove High School. He is always telling us of his plans for this and that, and of what is going to happen in the field of education. If he goes to the Central Practising School, which is a primary school on St. Paul's Terrace, a couple of miles from Kelvin Grove, he will find what has happened to Kelvin Grove High School. Three hundred students of the Kelvin Grove High School are being educated at the Central Practising School. Had we been the Government, we would have provided high schools at Bardon—which has been completely overlooked, Ithaca, and Newmarket. The Kelvin Grove High School would then not have been as seriously overcrowded as it is now. I do not think that the Minister for Education and Migration is doing as good a job as could, and will, be done in that portfolio by an hon. member from this side of the House in another year's time.

Secondly, if there are an additional 20,000 young people at high school now, where will there be jobs for them next year and the year after?

Mr. Sullivan: Don't you like to see them educated?

Mr. HANLON: Of course I like to see them educated, but if you go to Junior or Senior standard, or to the University and come out with all the degrees under the sun, unless there is an opening for you you do not work and you do not eat—you go on the dole. That is what is happening in this State today. Do not tell me that these young children are not getting jobs because they have not been educated to a sufficiently high standard. Every member of this House will know personally of seven or eight young people who have good Junior passes but who are unable to get jobs. It is no use the Government telling us that they are going to solve this problem by keeping children at school until Junior. It is a good thing for them to have that extra schooling, which is something that was suggested to the Education Committee by members of the Australian Labour Party. We have no argument with that, but we do not want the people of this State to be misled by a lot of propaganda ballyhoo to the effect that in some magical way young people will get

jobs by staying at school for another couple of years. All it amounts to is that a large number of young people will be coming out with higher qualifications. Unless jobs are available for them, they will not get employment.

I say advisedly that the Government have to face up to the problem of unemployment. I had not seen arrogance surpassing that displayed by the Federal Government last year until I listened to the Treasurer's speech last Thursday on the Appropriation Bill, when he more or less preened himself on the Government's performance in these fields. It was arrogance and self-confidence similar to that which marked the Menzies-McEwen Government's actions up until December last, an arrogance and self-confidence that they still retain in some degree. This Government are going into the coming election campaign in the same way. They are saying, "Everything is all right. It is just too bad that there are 10,000 or 15,000 people unemployed."

Mr. Sullivan: Would you agree that under Labour Governments children in the country generally were denied secondary education for many years?

Mr. HANLON: I do not agree with that. I say that unless the Government increase substantially the allowances to people who are sending children to high schools, even to State high schools, many will find it almost impossible to give their children the advantage of the extended educational opportunities that will be opened up with the abolition of the Scholarship. It is no good giving £15 or £20 a year to equip a child for high school. I suggest that the Government should give consideration to some of these items instead of talking all this ballyhoo about their performance.

I believe that the Government have failed in education, just as they have failed in employment and economically. It does not matter which way one looks, one finds that no Minister has a right to be proud of his administration. If the Minister for Transport had come to the House and said, "I have made a mess of the railways, but I did a good job on road transport," at least the people would have been somewhat sympathetic. If he had come to the House and said, "I have made a mess of road transport, but I have done a good job with the railways," again he might have expected some sympathy. Instead, he has made a mess of both in this State—

Mr. Sullivan: You know that is not right.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member was one of those who wailed loudest. We know that the Government are closing their ranks at this stage, but the hon. member for Condamine, the hon. member for Barambah, and some other hon. members, were loudest in their condemnation of the Minister for Transport not many months ago, and it is purely political self-preservation that is motivating them now in trying, as hurriedly

as they can, to close their ranks. Unfortunately, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, they were not quick enough to close them against John Murray, who managed to shoot through under the neck of the hon. member for Windsor for the Clayfield seat at the next State election.

Three years ago, just prior to the last State election, the Government put out a piece of propaganda under the title "Achievement". It was very conveniently worked out and published, I suppose, at the expense of the State Public Relations Bureau, not by the Liberal-Country Party.

(Time expired.)

Mr. TAYLOR (Clayfield) (3.27 p.m.): Five years ago, when the House accepted the Premier's nomination that I be Chairman of Committees, I realised that if I were to retain that respect for the Chair which is essential to the proper conduct of the Committee, I must put aside party interests and be, at all times, strictly impartial. Consequently I decided that if, at any time whilst I remained Chairman of Committees, I rose as member for Clayfield, to express views in any debate on legislation or administration, it would be prejudicial to my determined attitude of impartiality as Chairman. For that reason alone I have not spoken in debate for five years, and I hasten to say that today I have no intention of departing from my past attitude. I shall consequently not express any party-political opinions. I will neither criticise nor commend.

This debate on the Address in Reply, however, is the last opportunity I will have, before my retirement at the end of this Parliament, to express some views on certain matters which I believe would be in the best interests of government, this Parliament, and hon. members. Those matters are, first, that serious consideration be given as quickly as possible to the introduction of a Bill to provide for a Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, and I hope to give ample evidence to justify such a Bill. Next, I will again, as I did in 1955, urge that Parliament establish a committee of subordinate legislation similarly to other States, and I think I will be able to justify this recommendation. Then I wish to say something about the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, of which we are all equal members, and, as I have already announced that the reason for my retirement is that I have passed the age of 70 and that I consider it a suitable age for Parliamentarians to retire, I must say something on "how old is too young to enter Parliament, and how young is too old to continue in Parliament?"

Mr. Aikens: What about Horrie Davies? What are you having a go at him for?

Mr. TAYLOR: If the hon. member for Townsville South will assist me, I will be grateful. I should like to say to him that if his speeches contained one fraction of the

research I have put into this speech, his magnificent voice production, his delightful enunciation, and his terrific verbosity would be worth listening to.

If time permits I should also like to say something about Parliamentary representation as I have observed it over the past 15 years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with the desirability of constituting a Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works. As you know, sir, my special interest in public works, over many years, has centred on our irrigation projects, and frequently I have questioned whether some of them have been sufficiently investigated to satisfy Parliament before the Minister's legislation was submitted and approved. But a paragraph in the Monthly Summary of the National Bank of Australasia, dated 11 August, 1961, prompted me to again consider this question. That paragraph, in the Queensland notes, reads—

"State Cabinet has approved a £62 m. scheme for electricity development in Southern and Central Queensland which involves the construction of two major power stations."

Then on 24 May last, in "The Courier-Mail", I read of a £19,000,000 scheme for two major dams on the Border Rivers, in conjunction with the Government of New South Wales. In a few minutes I hope to show very clearly why, in this instance, a Public Works Committee could help to save a lot of money.

In addition to the Border Rivers scheme, here are some of the major projects introduced into this Parliament since I entered the House in 1947—all of which needed investigation by a Parliamentary Committee before being introduced in a Bill:

The ill-fated Blair Athol agreement, which was to win 3,000,000 tons of coal annually for an overseas market—but not one ton was ever shipped by the company.

The ill-fated Queensland-British Food Corporation.

The £29,000,000 Burdekin Dam scheme which, incidentally, was the subject of the last Bill submitted on the last day of the last session of the 31st Parliament. This £29,000,000 Burdekin scheme was, in the next Parliament, built up to a £90,000,000 scheme.

Then on 1 April, 1952, the £19,000,000 Mareeba-Dimbulah scheme was initiated, and although a Parliamentary Standing Committee would, without doubt, have concurred with the then Irrigation Commissioner that the major dam site be built on the Barron River at Tinaroo instead of at Nullinga on the Walsh River, as originally intended, there was room for further investigation before Parliament was asked to approve of the Bill. However, the highest praise is due

to the past and present Irrigation Commissioners, and the engineering and designing staff, and all the workmen, for completing this, the first major dam in Queensland for irrigation and power purposes, within the cost estimated ten years ago.

Then more recently we approved the £28,000,000 Mt. Isa railway line reconstruction, which is now in progress. Also, within the past few weeks we have seen announced in the newspaper a £24½ million water storage plan for the Upper Herbert River, including a 10.7-mile tunnel to divert water to the Upper Burdekin. This could be the first task of a Standing Committee on Public Works. Without doubt the engineering plan will stand up to any investigation, but what of the economics of the proposal? Can Parliament be sure that when water is made available, the land will immediately produce the crops envisaged? This, and a score of other questions, should be answered to the satisfaction of a Parliamentary Committee before the Executive brings the proposal before the House.

Before giving details of the proposed Committee and its responsibilities, I will refer to two of those irrigation jobs which total such colossal sums of money. Let it be understood that today I am as enthusiastic on the extension of irrigation projects as I was 10 or 12 years ago when I had so much to say on the subject. May I pay a tribute to the outstanding ability and knowledge of our Irrigation Commissioner, with whom I spent a week in the Tinaroo area last month. We are fortunate to have in our government service an officer so devoted to his duties.

Dealing first with the Dumaresq-Barwon Border Rivers scheme in conjunction with New South Wales, I quote from p. 815 of 1946 "Hansard," when the then Minister for Public Lands, at the initiation of the Bill, stated that the agreement provided for the construction of the Mingoola dam to cost approximately £1,000,000 and 12 weirs to cost £10,000 each. The New South Wales Government were to build the Mingoola Dam and Queensland would erect the weirs. For 15 years New South Wales could not find a suitable site for the dam, but Queensland went ahead with enthusiasm in building the weirs. The outstanding one is Bonshaw Weir which, instead of costing £10,000 as estimated by the Minister when he obtained the approval of Parliament for his Bill, had cost to 30 June, 1960, £271,006 7s. 4d. That is 27 times the estimated cost. Fortunately nothing was paid out on it in 1960-1961.

Another of these weirs, which was to cost £10,000 when the Minister brought the Bill to Parliament, had actually cost to June, 1961, £104,774 6s. 4d.

This irrigation project, as the report for 1960-1961 tells us, has cost £771,596 equally divided between Queensland and New South Wales. Now it is to be converted to a £17,000,000 scheme, but what of the economics of the proposal? What increased production has followed the expenditure of

£771,000? Would an investigating Parliamentary Committee recommend, after a review of the estimated increased production and wealth, that Parliament should approve Queensland's share of an estimated £17,000,000 expenditure?

Then what of the £90,000,000 Burdekin scheme. The engineering plan is magnificent. With the major dam at the 99-mile site, water could flow by gravity almost to Bowen. It could irrigate not only the alluvial soils along the river, but could also distribute water in the Barratta country. But can we afford to spend millions in distributing water before we know what the country will grow? Have our comparatively few agricultural scientists—who incidentally are doing a magnificent job in research wherever they are operating—yet established the most suitable legumes and grasses for pastures in that territory? Can they now say what crops are the most suitable for the Barrattas?

Mr. Aikens: You may be an expert in the passage of water, but you are not an expert in the development of the North.

Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I said I am making no criticism. I fear they have a long way to go and they need considerably more staff to help them.

Now let me say something of this proposed committee. Mr. W. J. Campbell, an Auditor-General of New South Wales, in his book "Australian State Public Finance" has referred to this question of a Standing Committee on Public Works. He said—

"By constituting a Standing Committee on Public Works, Parliament may exercise a close control over Loan expenditure, and as a result of investigation and report by the Committee, may have at its disposal detailed information enabling it to assess the merits of proposals brought down by the Executive. The Committee has statutory powers of inquiry. In considering and reporting upon any proposed work it is to have regard to the necessity or advisability of carrying out the work, the probable returns from it, and its present or prospective values. The committee is obliged to take such measures and procure such information as may enable it to inform or satisfy the Legislative Assembly, as to the expediency of carrying out the work."

I have quoted Mr. Campbell because the purpose of a Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works is so clearly set out by him. As you know, Mr. Speaker, such a committee operates in Victoria and South Australia. But the question now is what shall be the maximum estimated cost of any proposed work before coming under examination by this committee? When South Australia established their Public Works Committee in 1927, their Act set the figure at £30,000. Today it is £100,000. On present-day costs that amount of money would bring to the committee an unnecessary number of comparatively small buildings such as high schools and administrative

offices. I have no desire to bog down our annual public works programme by parliamentary investigation. It is the larger projects—and there will be many of them in the future—that I hope to see investigated by a Parliamentary Standing Committee before being presented to the House by the Executive in the form of a Bill. Therefore, after much deliberation, I recommend to this or the next Parliament that all proposed projects estimated to cost more than £500,000 be submitted to a Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works to be set up by the House.

I feel sure that our senior public servants would welcome such a committee. I feel sure, too, that, when Queensland sought financial aid from the Loan Council for a major project, it would be well received if it were made known that the proposal had been fully investigated by a Parliamentary Public Works Committee with statutory powers. Above all, when the appropriate Minister submitted to Parliament a Bill for approval of a project worth more than half a million pounds, hon. members would know it had the blessing of Parliament's own investigating committee.

Now let me refer to my desire to see established in this Parliament a Committee of Subordinate Legislation, similar to those in the South Australian and Victorian Parliaments. For the information of those hon. members who have entered the House since I proposed such a committee in 1955, these would be its duties: first, to consider all regulations, rules, by-laws, orders or proclamations which are required under any Act to be laid before Parliament and which are subject to disallowance by the House. Then the committee should be further required to consider:—

- (a) Whether the regulations are in accord with the general object of the Act;
- (b) Whether they unduly trespass on rights previously established by law;
- (c) Whether they unduly make rights dependent upon administrative, and not upon judicial, decisions; and
- (d) Whether they contain matter which, in the opinion of the Committee, should properly be dealt with in an Act of Parliament.

The Committee should be empowered to act and send for persons, papers and records, whether Parliament is in session or not.

My interest in the need for such a Parliamentary Committee followed a motion I moved some 12 years ago for the disallowance of a regulation laid on the Table by the then Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation. It required the first 10 tobacco farmers on the Burdekin to pay a water rate of £4 per acre-foot, when I had just come from Victoria where I had seen water similarly supplied from channels along the Murray, costing farmers only 10s. and 15s. per acre-foot.

Hon. members have seen, at the commencement of each session, Ministers lay on the table of the House, regulations and Orders in Council approved by the Executive during the recess, all of which are subject to disallowance by Parliament. On the first day of the 1961-1962 session, no fewer than 89 such regulations and Orders in Council were laid on the table. Over the session the total was 322. Hon. members know that the only way they have of reading the text of these regulations is to go to the table and ask the Clerk to let them see the particular one that may interest them. I wonder if, on that opening day last year, any member did this. Yet those 89 regulations and Orders in Council became law just as effectively as the original Act to which the regulations applied.

If the practice of earlier years is followed, this Parliament will rise in December, and, because of Her Majesty's visit, followed by the pending general election, there will be no sitting until the next Parliament assembles next August. In the meantime the Executive will meet every Thursday, and, at the first sitting of Parliament eight or nine months later, a supply of new regulations and orders will again be laid on the table. Over that long period between Parliaments this State will be administered by the Executive, and the diminishing authority of Parliament, and the increasing authority of the Executive, has troubled members of a great many Parliaments within the British Commonwealth.

Raised by the Speaker of the Tasmanian House of Assembly in 1955, at the Melbourne Area Conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, this subject was considered so important that at the Brisbane Conference in 1957 a special paper was submitted by the South Australian delegates, and I would recommend hon. members to read that report. Your own remarks, Mr. Speaker, as a Queensland delegate to that 1957 Conference, are a very straightforward statement on the importance of the subject. It was so important in the eyes of the Canadian delegates that at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference in Nairobi, Kenya, attended by the hon. member for Warrego, it was the first subject for discussion. In my speech in 1955 I quoted a statement in the House of Commons on 23 October, 1950, by the then Liberal Party Leader when he said—

"It was sad to see how little interest was being taken in the matter that concerned the Sovereignty of Parliament by members of all parties."

Back in October, 1939, our "Hansard" also records, on page 835, our present Leader of the Opposition as saying—

"Parliament is becoming more and more an acquiescing authority in the decisions of Cabinet."

He quoted the late Sir Isaac Isaacs when Chief Justice of Australia, as saying, *inter alia*—

“If Parliament becomes a mere sounding board for the Cabinet, the danger was that parliamentary government would fall into contempt.”

However, the comment on this subject which made the greatest impression on my mind was by Mr. F. G. Green, a retired Clerk of the House of Representatives, when he said at the Melbourne Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference—

“Sometimes I despair of the future because I can visualise Parliament losing its importance. We are getting nearer and nearer to the managerial State.”

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of this committee would avoid a “managerial State”. Parliament’s own members would investigate all regulations and orders, and Parliament would approve its own Committee’s decisions. Ever since the Revolution of 1688, the question of the omnipotence of a British Parliament has been settled. During the two world wars the powers of the Executive were necessarily expanded but in days of peace let us never forget that an informed Parliament is the ultimate authority in the land.

In South Australia the advent of that Parliament’s Committee of Subordinate Legislation had a salutary effect on authorities presenting subordinate legislation, and interested parties in disagreement with regulations, etc., were afforded opportunities of submitting their views to an independent body with an effective voice in Parliament.

When I visited Adelaide some 18 months ago, I spoke to senior parliamentary members of both parties. They all assured me that they would not be without both their Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and their Committee of Subordinate legislation. These committees act from the election of one Parliament till the election of the next, and I strongly urge either this Government or the one that follows to provide for these committees in this Queensland Parliament.

Since I have been mentioning the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, I should like to say a few words on the lack of interest in that Association by this Queensland branch. The only time the C.P.A. attracts attention is when a conference is to be held and representatives of this branch are chosen. In the case of the Australian area biennial conferences, when two representatives of each State Parliament attend, we follow the practice of having one delegate selected by the Government party and one by the Opposition. The Independents are always out of it. In the case of overseas conferences, which will in future be held annually, we have followed a practice, ever since the Premier of the day represented Queensland at Wellington, of treating the selection of our delegate as the

sole right of the Government party. When it comes to an overseas trip, Opposition members are also out in the cold with the Independents. This is wrong and should be corrected. Let it be remembered that in this branch of the C.P.A. we are all equal members with you, Mr. Speaker, as President. Let me again contrast our attitude with those of other States. They each have an active Executive Committee—we have not. I have here a copy of the constitution and rules of the South Australian branch. The practice of deciding branch representation at overseas conferences is the same in Western Australia as it is in South Australia. No. 24 of those rules reads—

“The selection of any delegate to represent this branch as one of a delegation to visit the country of any other branch or associated group, shall be recommended by the executive committee and made at a special general meeting of this branch called for the purpose: in the event of any other nomination being submitted, the selection to be made by ballot.”

In the interest of equal opportunities for equal members, I strongly urge this Queensland branch of the C.P.A. to come into line with the other more active Australian branches and adopt this very fair method of selecting delegates, particularly to the annual overseas conferences.

Mr. Speaker, when I announced on my 70th birthday my intention to retire at the expiration of this Parliament, I said that 70 was an age at which hon. members should retire, as it was in line with the compulsory retiring age of our judges and five years beyond that of public servants. One hon. member was quoted in “Truth” newspaper on the following Sunday as saying, “If Mr. Taylor decides he has been affected by senile decay then that is his business.” In view of this statement I feel it appropriate, and in the public interest, to say something on the question of desirable age limits for members of this House. Let me say at the outset that it would be completely undemocratic to legislate for a minimum entry age or maximum retiring age for Parliamentarians. That would be depriving the electors of their freedom of choice; it would be definitely prejudicial to the democratic principles for which we stand. When I was in Perth last year, my attention was drawn to the rule of one political party which prevented it endorsing a candidate over 65, and one sitting member who had passed that age would have to stand as an Independent if he nominated again at the next election.

But first let me refer to a minimum age for endorsement. I am satisfied that nobody should be endorsed for election to this House, to share in the serious responsibility of government, under the age of 30. Let me tell you a story of my personal experience. After I had returned from World War I, I became the first president of what is now known as the South-Eastern District, Returned Servicemen’s League. I

was then 27 and during that year, in March, 1919, Brisbane experienced that famous battle of Merivale Street, which followed a clash between returned soldiers and the Russian community celebrating their revolution. That story is interesting history. However, I gained some prominence because I was chairman and speaker on behalf of returned soldiers at weekly meetings held in the Stadium, until we succeeded in getting the Federal Government to deport 19 persons, and the Queensland Government to abolish the six places of free speech which it had provided at North Quay, the Domain, and other places. Subsequently the late Sir Edward Macartney, then Leader of the Opposition in this House, took an interest in me, and members of the Nationalist Party suggested that I become a candidate for this Parliament. I was naturally flattered. At that time I was still in uniform working as an assistant censor with some very wise and experienced gentlemen. They included two university professors, two newspaper editors, and two past headmasters—all old enough to be my father—and they promptly brought me down to earth. They said to me, "Is it true that you want to stand for Parliament?" When I answered "Yes," they said, "What do you know about Queensland?"

I realised that at 27, with nearly five years on full-time service in uniform, I had never been more than 100 miles north or 100 miles west of Brisbane, and I had to admit I knew very little of Queensland. Then these very wise gentlemen said to me, "Go out and learn something about the life and industry in the State before you think of becoming a member of its Parliament." That was sound advice, and I followed it. Twenty-eight years later I entered this Parliament after having gained acquaintance with all parts of the State. On that experience I say most emphatically that no young man or woman under 30 could possibly have the knowledge to justify a claim for competency to contribute constructively, and vote understandingly, on most of the legislation introduced for the development of Queensland. I will be reminded that in 1783, King George III appointed William Pitt (the younger) Prime Minister of England at the age of 24. Pitt, who died in his forties, was undoubtedly a great man. A son of the Earl of Chatham, he lived in an atmosphere of Parliament and he was a personal appointment of the King, and an outstanding exception to the rule that men in their twenties are too immature for Parliament.

When I speak of the upper age bracket closing at 70, I am repeatedly asked, "What about Sir Winston Churchill?" Undoubtedly he has been one of Britain's greatest statesmen, but I would remind my friends that in his greatest hour, which was also, as he described it, Britain's greatest hour, during the Battle of Britain, he was still under 70. But there are some exceptions of leadership by statesmen over 70. I was reminded of the "Grand Old Man" of British politics, as he

was known in his day. William Ewart Gladstone, who was still Prime Minister of England when he was 85. Then there is Dr. Adenauer of West Germany, who is still Prime Minister of his country at 83. But these great men are exceptions to the general rule. No doubt there are exceptions in many Parliaments.

I have here an article from a Sydney newspaper which asks, "Are we being governed by tired old men?" No doubt New South Wales has an exception, just as in this Parliament we have an outstanding exception—an outspoken hon. member, forthright and hard-hitting, who learned early in his parliamentary life that he who makes thrusts must expect strong thrusts in reply. So, Sir, when I suggest, not to governments, but to political parties, that they consider a policy of limiting endorsement of candidates for Parliament to ages between 30 and 70 years, I am trying to be consistent with our policy of retiring our judges at 70, and public servants at 65, so that the younger men in the service may hope to reach the top positions. Would any hon. member who disagrees with me rise in his place and move that a Bill be introduced to repeal the Supreme Court Act of 1921 so that our very efficient and learned judges would not be required to retire at 70? Would he take similar action with regard to our public servants?

I believe in this principle and am trying to be consistent. I trust I have thus shown, Mr. Speaker, that I am not affected by senile decay, nor, may I assure hon. members, am I affected by senile conceit.

Now, Sir, in the time I have left I would like to say something on parliamentary representation as I have seen it over the last 15 years.

It is indeed an honour to be the chosen representative to Parliament of the majority of some 10,000 to 12,000 electors. The position of a member is obviously one of trust and responsibility. Over the years I have seen that this trust and responsibility are divided between a member's attention to the requests of his electors, and his interest in, and contribution to, the debates in the House. If these responsibilities were at least equally divided by all members of Parliament, the electors would be well served, and the legislation and administration would be well considered.

(Time expired.)

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin) (4.3 p.m.): Much reference has been made to what has taken place and to promised development which is to take place in regard to certain enterprises. Among those mentioned was the development of the bauxite deposits at Weipa. On Wednesday and Thursday, 13 and 14 December last year, I had the privilege and pleasure of being a member of a small party of Queensland parliamentarians who visited Weipa as the guests of Consolidated Zinc Pty. Ltd., which is a subsidiary

of the Commonwealth Aluminium Corporation Pty. Ltd. The object of this visit was to inspect the bauxite deposits at Weipa and the development that has been undertaken in connection with the exploitation of those enormous deposits on the western shores of Cape York Peninsula and the most laudable humanitarian service that is being rendered to aborigines by a devoted band of missionaries at Weipa and Aurukun. Included in the party, which left Brisbane at 7.30 a.m. on Wednesday, 13 December, in a Gruman Gulf-stream two-engined turbo-prop jet plane and landed on the earthen runway at Weipa at approximately 12.30 p.m. the same day, were the Deputy Leader of the Country Party and Minister for Education and Migration, the Hon. J. C. A. Pizey, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. J. E. Duggan, the hon. member for Mulgrave, Mr. Armstrong, the hon. member for Nundah, Mr. W. E. Knox, the late Mr. George Clarke, the then Under Secretary of the Department of Mines, Mr. C. A. Byrne, a director of Consolidated Zinc Pty. Ltd., and myself.

Situated on the bank of the Embley River, which flows into Albatross Bay, is the small township of Weipa with an entirely male population, at the time that we visited it, of 59, all of whom were employed by Consolidated Zinc Pty. Ltd. It consists of a number of small cottages and a spacious dining room, recreation hall, laboratory and large storage sheds, all constructed mainly of corrugated aluminium because of the depredations of the termites in that area. The presence of myriads of mosquitoes, flies, and other annoying insects in this area has made it necessary for the company to have all buildings insect-proofed. The temperature during the first couple of hours in the afternoon was 98 degrees. The humidity was high and the absence of a breeze made conditions almost unbearable for those who had experienced the more congenial weather of places situated further south.

After having partaken of lunch at the company's dining room, the party, with Mr. Peter McLeod—who was a pilot in the R.A.A.F. during World War II, and is presently manager at Weipa of Consolidated Zinc Pty. Ltd.—at the wheel, were driven in a utility over a dirt road constructed by the company for approximately eight miles to the site on the river bank where 40,000 tons of bauxite had been loaded into ships and transported to Japan and to Bell Bay, in Tasmania. The excavation that had been made would not have a volume any greater than this Chamber and from it had been taken 40,000 tons of bauxite. From there the party boarded an attractive large launch and sailed down the Embley River towards its mouth, where a large suction drag dredge, the largest in use in the southern hemisphere, was engaged in dredging a channel to make it possible for large vessels to steam up the Embley River to the selected site on the bank where it has been proposed to construct the alumina plant.

I mention these details to let those who have not the knowledge know of the work that is being done at this isolated part of our State. From conversations I have had with people, I think it is generally considered that Weipa is just starting but from what we saw—and this can be borne out by the other members of the party—much has been done, and done at considerable expense. The launch that took us across the river drew into the side of the dredge and the members of the party scaled the ladders provided and boarded the dredge "W. D. Mersey". They spent three pleasant and interesting hours with the dredge crew, all the members of which were Dutch, observing the ship's machinery, studying the chart of the channel, and having explained to them the wonderful intricate mechanical operations performed by the dredge.

One of the main features of the "W. D. Mersey" is its manoeuvrability. It is propelled by twin screws, each driven by an 800 h.p. diesel engine, and a third 800 h.p. diesel engine provides the suction power for the flexible pipe-line trailing over the surface of the sea bed. Judicious use of the two propellers, in conjunction with the holding power of the suction pipe, permits the dredge to turn in a very confined space—it can almost pivot on its own stern—and enable it to move over a limited area without suspending dredging operations. The suction pipe operates like a gigantic vacuum-cleaner.

The hopper of the dredge has a capacity of 1,300 cubic yards and the best performance on the Embley River dredging was the filling of that hopper in 18 minutes. By working continuous shifts, as they were doing when we were there, of 11 hours and 13 hours for 5½ days each week, the plant is able to maintain a daily average of nine or 10 loads of material lifted, transported to the sea, and dumped about three or four miles out from the mouth of the river into Albatross Bay through the hydraulically-operated opening doors.

The channel to be dredged is of considerable dimensions. It is 7½ miles in length and 324 feet wide and is to be dredged to a depth of 27 feet. The average depth of water in the channel before the dredging operations were undertaken was 10 feet. The dredging, which is being carried out by the Westminster Dredging Company, is expected to continue for three years in all and to cost almost £2,000,000.

Sixty men are employed by the dredging company. We were told that the lowest-paid employee received £35 a week exclusive of tax, and the highest-paid employee £102 a week.

It is unfortunate that there is no rock of any size within the area of Weipa. Rock could be very useful for building the harbour. Surveys have revealed that there are no rocks within a distance of 300 miles from the proposed site of the alumina plant—no

rocks of any size that could be used in the construction of that harbour. It appears that, under existing conditions, dredging will have to be carried on continuously because silting is going on all the time.

After completion of the inspection of the dredge and dredging operations, the party was returned to the bank of the Embley River and driven a short distance to inspect the excavation where 40,000 tons of bauxite had been removed and shipped to Japan and to Bell Bay in Tasmania for treatment. The bauxite deposits in the Embley River area are 8 miles wide and 18 miles long and are estimated to contain 600,000,000 tons of bauxite of a high grade.

The bauxite, a pink, pebbly substance, appears as a comparatively shallow surface capping in depths of from 6 feet to 14 feet with very little over-burden so that extraction of the material should be a comparatively cheap operation. All over the surface can be seen these pink pebbles in millions with no covering on them at all, and when there is a covering it is so shallow that very little over-burden has to be removed to get at the deposits of bauxite.

Under the terms of the agreement between the State of Queensland and Commonwealth Aluminium Corporation Pty. Ltd., the company shall, as soon as it considers it practicable to do so after completion of the investigation and surveys referred to in clause 4 of the agreement, proceed to establish within the State, whether within the bauxite field or elsewhere, a plant for the production of alumina in commercial quantities. That is an agreement that has been drawn up by this Government and the company involved. If it decides to establish the said plant elsewhere within the State than on this bauxite field, the company shall inform the Minister of its reasons for that decision. The company has now informed the Minister that it intends to establish the alumina plant within the bauxite fields on the banks of the Embley River. Something might happen that would cause it to alter its opinion on the location of the alumina plant. The production of aluminium depends entirely on costs and, because of the part that they play in the production of this highly competitive commodity, the location of the plant will be where aluminium can be produced at the very cheapest rate. If the company finds, after surveys and investigation, that it can produce more economically in another part of the State, there is nothing to stop it altering the location.

Clause 18 of the agreement between the Government and the company prohibits the removal from Queensland—except to the aluminium smelter at Bell Bay in Tasmania, which is operated by the Australian Aluminium Production Commission; its total bauxite requirements would be approximately 50,000 tons a year—of any bauxite except with the consent of the Governor in Council first had and obtained.

This provision, in conjunction with Clause 7 of the agreement, ensures that the company shall erect a plant to reduce bauxite to alumina. Clauses 4 and 16 of the agreement in conjunction require the company to make periodical investigations of the economic possibilities of constructing and operating within the special bauxite mining lease, or elsewhere in the State, an aluminium smelter of a minimum capacity of 30,000 tons of aluminium per year, and to furnish to the Minister the results of all such investigations to assist him in determining whether such a large-scale enterprise is or is not economically possible.

That gives the Minister complete control over the company as to whether it should establish an aluminium smelter in Queensland, elsewhere in Australia or its territories, or in some locality outside Australia altogether. These investigations and surveys must be carried out periodically, and reports are to be furnished to the Minister of the results of those investigations and surveys. If the Minister is convinced that aluminium can be produced in Queensland at a price that would make it competitive in world markets, he has the power to force the company to do so.

Aluminium is produced by an electrolytic process, and an enormous quantity of electricity is used in it. I understand that the production of 30,000 tons of aluminium in a year would require as much electricity as that presently used in every city, town, and district in Queensland. The cost of this electricity plays such a major part in the cost of the finished article that it must be low enough to enable the aluminium to compete with that produced in other countries of the world.

If at any time after 20 years from the date of the agreement the Minister is satisfied that a large-scale enterprise for the conversion of alumina to aluminium is economically possible in the State or elsewhere in Australia or its territories, and so certifies to the company, it shall either commence to construct such large-scale enterprise within five years and complete it within 10 years of the date of the Minister's certificate, or surrender from its lease an area or areas containing one-third of the proved bauxite of economic grade. Nobody who is a patriot in this State wants to see our natural resources sent to other countries that will get the great benefit of processing. However, we must be realistic in our attitude to these matters. The first thing is to mine the bauxite, which is quite a simple matter; the next thing is to convert the bauxite to alumina, which is something that we could handle successfully in Queensland.

Mr. Evans: And that is where the big labour force is.

Mr. COBURN: Yes. The big benefit comes from the conversion of alumina to aluminium, and it is in this process that enormous quantities of electricity are required. Can we in Queensland satisfy ourselves and the company that it is possible to produce this electricity in quantities and at a price that will allow the company to compete successfully with other companies selling aluminium on world markets? That is the crux of the question.

Mr. Hanlon: Did they tell you that there is considerable doubt about it in New Zealand now?

Mr. COBURN: My information is—I have gone into this very deeply after going to Weipa and becoming interested because of what I saw—that, with thermal power stations, the cheapest we can hope to produce electricity is .5 pence a unit. With hydro-electric power in New Zealand, I understand they can produce it for half that figure—.25 pence. There is no certainty that we can produce electricity here and sell it at .5 pence a unit. We will need a very big improvement on anything that we have done up to the present time to be able to do that.

Mr. Evans: You would not make any profit.

Mr. COBURN: It would not be possible to make a profit, or even to produce it at that figure. I understand it has to be produced where the coal resources are, and that it has to be at a port because aluminium has to be at a port for sea transport.

Across the river from the Weipa settlement preparations for the provision of an extensive aerodrome with a bitumen surface, capable of accommodating the larger planes, were well advanced when we were there. The company are not resting on their laurels. They have done much that was evident to us while we were there. Heavy equipment has been brought to Weipa by sea, with the difficulties increasing according to the size of the ship. The company had, for instance, considerable difficulty in landing a heavy drilling rig with which a wild-cat hole for petroleum or gas was sunk to 3,243 feet. Although the well was unsuccessful in locating petroleum or gas, a good supply of artesian water was tapped. It cost £58,000 to get the rig in, and the total cost of boring the hole was about £140,000. At first it was thought that it would be necessary to pipe water a distance of approximately 40 miles, but now the company is satisfied, after having tapped this supply, that adequate artesian water will be available in the area, and water is particularly important in this production.

If we provide sufficient power in Australia to reduce the alumina to aluminium, enormous expenditure will be entailed. It takes 2 tons of bauxite to produce 1 ton of alumina, and 2 tons of alumina to produce 1 ton of aluminium. It will cost between £40,000,000 and £50,000,000 to provide an

alumina plant with township and harbour and other ancillaries. The Commissioner of Electricity Supply in Queensland, Mr. Neil Smith, is reported to have stated that if power were available it would cost at least £125,000,000 to build an aluminium smelter in Australia. To generate electric power from coal, the coal would have to be supplied at between 15s. and 25s. a ton on the coast. Having gone through the Auditor-General's reports, I find that last year at Collinsville the net cost of production of coal was £5 1s. 3½d. a ton, while at Ogmoo it was £4 16s. 8½d.

Mr. O'Donnell: You can get it at 30s. at Blair Athol.

Mr. COBURN: Yes, but that does not satisfy the requirements as stated by Mr. Neil Smith. He said you have not to get it at 30s. at Blair Athol, but you have to be able to deliver it to the coast at between 15s. and 25s. a ton, in order to be able to generate electricity thermally, so that it would be an economic proposition to produce aluminium.

The electricity required to convert alumina to 30,000 tons of aluminium annually is equal to all the electricity used in Queensland at the present time. That demonstrates the enormity of the task.

People say that Comalco should be forced to process alumina into aluminium in Queensland. Nobody more than you and I, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would like to see that done. Can anybody reasonably say to a company that is prepared to spend the money this company has spent to provide employment, that it must do something that is uneconomic?

Mr. Hanlon: If they are going to do that, they should be paying more royalty.

Mr. COBURN: They would simply say, "We will close down our operations altogether," and our bauxite and alumina would not be processed at all. We do not know what will happen in the production of other materials. Bauxite, which is valuable today, might be valueless 20 years hence. We do not know what other materials will take the place of those used today.

Our bauxite deposits at Weipa are enormous. They are almost beyond imagination. There is a total of 600,000,000 tons of bauxite there, and the most any company would use in a year would be 720,000 tons. That means that that deposit would last 833 years. Then at Alcan there are other deposits comparable with those at Weipa, so that, producing 180,000 tons of aluminium a year, we have enough bauxite in Australia to last us more than 1,600 years. Are we going to store it up and not use it, or are we going to force something onto the company which we know will be uneconomic?

It has been said that this company should be subsidised so as to make it possible for it to produce aluminium as cheaply as it can be produced in the countries where hydro-electric power is used. What does "subsidy"

mean in this connection? We have subsidised companies to let them get on their feet. In the struggling stages, when they required financial assistance, it was reasonable and wise to give them financial assistance until they got going under their own steam.

With this company, it is a matter of electricity. Unless it can get the electricity at about $\frac{1}{4}$ d. a unit at the most, it cannot produce profitably, so even if the cost of the unit was $\frac{1}{4}$ d. all the time, we would have to subsidise it for all time to the extent of $\frac{1}{4}$ d. a unit to enable it to continue production.

We do not know what will happen. Large-scale development is taking place at Kiangra and Moura, where the Peabody and Kaiser companies have come in with tremendous earth-moving machinery. I understand it has machinery which can move 115 cubic yards of earth in one operation. I don't know whether those machines can be used in places like Blair Athol and Callide, to get out the coal to be used in the generation of electricity cheaply enough to enable this company to produce aluminium in competition with aluminium-producing companies in other parts of the world.

These investigations and surveys must be carried out, and reports must be furnished to the Minister. The Minister would be remiss if he was convinced that aluminium could be produced in Queensland and allowed it to be produced elsewhere. Nobody in this State can say that the Minister could insist that the alumina should be converted into aluminium in Queensland under existing conditions.

Mr. Donald: Even if the company contracted to do so?

Mr. COBURN: I have not said anything about a contract. If the company can do it, it is the duty of the Minister to insist that it shall.

Mr. Donald: Well, what are you talking about?

Mr. COBURN: That is my contention. Can anyone else in Queensland show us how aluminium can be produced at a price that will enable it to be sold on world markets in competition with other companies selling it?

Mr. Evans: They have not departed one iota from their agreement.

Mr. COBURN: No.

Mr. Hanlon: They will be test-running a smelter at Geelong soon, and they started a long time after we did.

Mr. COBURN: No-one has yet come forward, so far as I know, to prove that this aluminium could be processed in Queensland at a price to sell in competition on the world market. Until they do we cannot insist upon the company doing something that would send it broke after the first year of operation.

Mr. Evans: You have told the House that until they get the channel they cannot do anything.

Mr. COBURN: That is so. The channel is like a closed door; it is only 10 feet deep and no large ship with any draught could get in. I understand that the company will establish this alumina plant and that the Minister will see that it carries out the terms of the agreement. We want a realistic attitude adopted to this and we must look at it in its proper perspective instead of having these catch-cries that we should force the company to produce aluminium in Queensland.

Mr. Adair: Do you know what they are getting a ton from Japan for the raw bauxite?

Mr. COBURN: I know they can sell bauxite anywhere.

Mr. Evans: They lost £80,000 on the shipment. They had a double load. It was a trial shipment.

Mr. COBURN: According to Mr. Neil Smith it would cost £125,000,000 to establish a smelter to produce 30,000 tons of aluminium. I understand the aim of Comalco is to produce 180,000 tons annually. What the cost of a smelter for that will be, and what quantity of electricity will be required for the electrolytic process of converting the alumina to aluminium would be easy to work out by simple arithmetic.

Mr. Wallace: During your visit were you made aware of different types of bauxite?

Mr. COBURN: I do not know much about the technical side of it but I know about the cost of the method by which it is converted from one form to another. I emphasise that we must get a correct idea of what this task involves.

Mr. Hanlon: Would you stop the Commonwealth from entering into it to get it started?

Mr. COBURN: I should say it would be a stupid arrangement for the Commonwealth Government to start subsidising the electricity supply unless they were prepared to continue with it all the time, because the cost of producing the electricity will not be reduced. If we could produce the electricity cheaply enough at the start, and we could continue to produce it cheaply enough, that would be all right, but subsidising to produce it cheaper would mean that we would want the subsidy interminably and I cannot see any sense in starting something which, if you stop afterwards, will also force the company to stop.

Mr. Hanlon: You subsidise butter and everything else.

Mr. COBURN: Yes, but we subsidise those only up to a point. If we were to start subsidising every unit of electricity

produced, which would be equal to the whole of the electricity used in Queensland today, to handle this 30,000 tons of aluminium, we would be faced with tremendous costs.

The area is remote and isolated and except for the employees of Comalco and the people on the missions it is uninhabited. The land is poor, even for cattle. Coastal timber appears to be useless, but some miles inland there are some small patches of better soil and some better timber that might serve useful purposes locally.

Mr. Adair: It is good cattle country.

Mr. COBURN: It is not at Weipa. If the hon. member compared the cattle at the Aurukun Mission with those in the Ayr district he would not be able to recognise them as cattle.

I think I have made out the case I wished to make out. I understand that once this project is in full swing, if they go on with their first decision to establish their alumina plant on the banks of the Embley River there will be a township at Weipa with a population of 5,000.

Let me come nearer home and talk about the Burdekin Dam scheme. It is well known both in the House and outside that I have always been an ardent advocate of the implementation of the Burdekin River Irrigation, Hydro-electric and Flood Mitigation Scheme. Ever since 1943 my voice has been raised in favour of the project. The 1951 report furnished to this Parliament by the Burdekin River Authority was probably the most favourable report on any project ever furnished to any Parliament. It said that this scheme was of such great national importance that the State could not afford not to go on with it. The authority gave all the results of surveys and investigations that had been carried out and they gave an estimate of the value of the produce that would come from the scheme. They said that, if the Commonwealth Government would not assist, the State should go on with its own resources although it might be much slower in bringing it to fruition.

All that was done was to build a coffer dam at the Leichhardt Gorge. This coffer dam has stored water, which is let down the river and poured into the channels to irrigate the crops of Dalberg, Millaroo, and Clare.

When I recently inquired of Ministers in the House why they did not proceed with the Burdekin Dam scheme when it had been so highly recommended by the Burdekin River Authority, which was composed of our highest-ranking public servants, they asked me what use there was in conserving millions and millions of gallons of water if you did not know how to use them on the land that was available for irrigating. They referred to the Oakey soils and the Barratta soils. These soils, it is realised, are in swampy areas and it is difficult to find a means of using them profitably. I asked

one of the members responsible for compiling part of that report why in 1951 he recommended the implementation of the scheme when he was not now prepared to embark on it. He said, "We hoped at that time that, by the time the dam was completed we would have had the solution to the profitable use of the Oakey and Barratta lands."

(Time expired.)

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (4.42 p.m.): I desire to preface my remarks by congratulating the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply on their able addresses.

I join with them in expressing loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and to her representatives, Sir Henry Abel Smith and Lady May. I am sure that the news of Sir Henry's appointment for a further three years will be received with very great approval by the people of Queensland. I feel sure that the deep interest Sir Henry has taken in the welfare of Queensland has been greatly appreciated by very many people in this State.

I am sure, too, that we will all be delighted to welcome Her Majesty to Queensland next year.

The year 1962 will go down in history as one of great anxiety in the marketing of our produce. That anxiety has, of course, been brought about largely by Britain's contemplated entry into the European Common Market. It is more than likely that Britain will be come a member. In discussing the problem—and it will be a tremendous one—we must appreciate Great Britain's point of view. It is not merely a question of what Great Britain wishes. It is my firm opinion that for sheer self-preservation she has no alternative. While there is a divergence of opinion throughout Queensland, and perhaps a very strong one, as to what the effect really will be, I think that perhaps it will not be nearly as serious as some people imagine. We can take consolation in the thought that a stronger Europe must mean a stronger world. In other words, if the economy of Europe is built up, as undoubtedly it will be, Australia, being chiefly a primary-producing country, must benefit from the greater demand that will come from that quarter for the goods we produce.

The period of transition is perhaps going to be difficult. We have been so accustomed to marketing what we produce in Australia, and the surplus, or what we could not market here, we have simply sold to Great Britain. For some unaccountable reason, that surplus was absorbed over the years, and we in Australia perhaps did not fully realise what that meant to us. After all, from the point of view of the primary producer, it is not only the portion sold on the local market that counts. A surplus, even though it may be small, sold at lower

prices on world markets, has such an influence that it drags down the price of the whole commodity produced. We have been in the happy position of being able to market our surpluses in Great Britain, even though at times prices were not perhaps to our satisfaction.

It is to be expected that this change will create some feeling and a good deal of difficulty. Our surplus commodities have to be marketed somewhere, and there are some commodities for which the future at the moment looks gloomy. I refer chiefly to fresh fruits and dried and canned fruits. At the moment we just cannot see markets for them. However, we are in the fortunate position in Australia that, if we cannot market our present products, we can change our methods and produce something that we can market.

We have also to rejoice in the fact that the food-producer is always in a strong position compared with the producer of secondary commodities, who depends on the sales of his products. We produce food, and the peoples of the world must buy food. I therefore say that our position might not turn out as badly as some people imagine.

These changes have been brought about even quite apart from the introduction of the European Common Market. Looking at what has happened over the last five years, one would never have imagined that trade with Asian countries and America would have developed to the extent that it has. I am sure hon. members will have noticed Press reports showing that last year Japan bought twice the value of our wool bought by Great Britain. I think the figures were £112,000,000 of purchases by Japan compared with £53,000,000 purchased by Great Britain. That applies to many other commodities as well. The sale of our beef to America has increased beyond all expectation. Whereas until a few years ago Britain took almost the whole of our surplus, in the year just closed America took three times the value of the beef taken by Great Britain.

We have had unexpected exports of coal to Japan. We have exported tremendous quantities of grain, in particular the wheat that we have sold to China, and this year we will be marketing the whole of our surplus sugar. We are fortunate in that these outside markets are developing at a faster rate than we perhaps expected.

We also have the trade relations—and friendly relations—that have sprung up between us and some Asian countries. They are so close to our shores that sooner or later we will be obliged to trade with them. Visits from representatives of these countries and the friendly relations that have grown up make us feel really happy with the position.

In my opinion, production and selling is not our real problem; it is our high cost of production. This is something that is on

the lips of all people in this State today. If it is not worrying parliamentarians, or perhaps those engaged in secondary industry, I can assure hon. members that it is affecting our primary producers very seriously. As a consequence, we have an army of unemployed. We are sometimes inclined to look at this problem quite indifferently and say, "It has come about due to no fault of ours. It is something that has just happened and we can do nothing about it." I do not agree with that viewpoint.

When I spoke in the debate on the Address in Reply 12 months ago, I said that by February and March this year we would have the greatest army of unemployed that we had seen since the days of the depression. That prophecy was correct, and, as far as I can see, nothing has been done to alleviate the position. The small amount of money that has been put into Government channels to provide additional Government work has been a palliative and has been of some assistance. But we have to do more than that. We have to get our industries onto such a footing that they will be able to provide more employment. What is really wrong with Queensland and Australia today is that our primary and secondary industries have lost their capacity to employ. A few million pounds put into circulation as a result of additional Government grants has relieved the position somewhat but has not cured it.

I want you to mark my words this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and see what happens in the early part of next year when seasonal employment in the sugar industry, the meat-works, and other works of that kind, comes to an end. When we are put on our mettle, we will not be able to absorb those people in employment.

I am not simple enough to believe that the introduction of mechanical means of production and manufacture has not contributed in some small way to a falling-off in employment. Nevertheless, unless something is done to reduce the high cost of production, the primary producer will be in a most difficult plight. In fact, he has never been in a more desperate situation since I have been in the business, and I have been in it all my life. While he is in that position, the primary producer cannot employ more labour.

One of the difficulties of this system of high costs—perhaps members of Cabinet and hon. members opposite have not stopped to think about this—is that in secondary industries all that a manufacturer has to do is add cost increases to his selling price. People tour the country selling machinery to farmers and graziers at very high prices. Primary producers are more or less obliged to buy the machinery because they cannot work their properties without it, and the additional cost of manufacturing and selling it is passed on to them. The farmer is not in a position to pass it on, so he really bears the brunt of it.

I wish that hon. members could see what is actually happening on the farms, even though they are conducted very efficiently. Nobody can charge the farmers or the graziers with inefficiency. They have to work very long hours to remain in business. It is very easy for the fellow outside to snipe at them—it is being done every day—and say that they are out of date and inefficient. Let him have a go himself! Recommendations that have been made by people who have no practical experience are often not worth listening to. If anyone who is critical of farmers and their efficiency wants proof of what I have said this afternoon, I invite him to have a look at their books and records and see how their business is carried on.

I am not going to ask you, Mr. Speaker, to take my word that the farmers are having a difficult time. I have here a report of the Council of Agriculture that was submitted to its annual meeting a few weeks ago. The Council of Agriculture is not anti-farmer and it is non-political. I understand that the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry, Mr. Madsen, is the President of the Council and that Mr. Harrison, the hon. member for Logan, is its chairman. This is the report—

"Farm Income Rises Least

"While farm incomes rose by only 4 per cent. in 12 years, company incomes increased by 188 per cent., and wages and salaries 198 per cent.

"Over the first six years farm income averaged £528 million a year, yet in the second half it fell to £450 million mainly because of lower returns.

"This occurred despite substantially increased levels of production for virtually all rural commodities.

"This was reported by the executive to the Council of Agriculture in Brisbane.

"The executive said that while the general Australian economy was moving at a relatively sluggish speed farmers had problems greater than other sectors.

"Commonwealth Government White Papers for the 12 years between 1949-1950 to 1960-1961 showed income rises of:

	Per cent.
Farm income	4
Company income	188
Private businesses, professions	112
Wages, salaries	198"

You see the hopeless position in which the farmer is placed. The executive said that farmers had tried to meet the situation by increasing output and adjusting production to take advantage of prices. It continues—

"World-wide production rises had tended to depress values further, creating further income problems for farmers.

"Queensland farmers asked in a council survey why their incomes were falling, gave the main reason as the margin between prices and costs.

" . . .

"Of outstanding bank balances in Queensland, 45 per cent. belonged to primary producers. The Australian average was 28 per cent."

If that is not plain evidence of the tough time the farmer is having under existing conditions, I would like to know what is.

What is the Council of Agriculture? It is a united body of primary producers representing sugar, dairy, wheat, eggs, etc. This is in the Council's own statement, and shows that the primary producers are having a difficult time. If you are in the business, you can see what your costs are. The sugarmen can smile. They are getting a reasonably good price and their production costs may not be so high, but the other branches of primary production are having a difficult time.

I should like to point to what I consider is the cause of it. Until we correct the wrongs done some years ago by the Richardson Report, we will not get over our difficulties. That was the commencement of the whole of our troubles. That report sent the whole economy haywire, and while costs are in the air, and primary producers have to take the equivalent of world prices for their goods, they will be in an impossible position.

I have been in the business for a long time, and while as primary producers we have never collected more money, our net proceeds have never been as low as they are today. Despite all those things, it appears that nothing is being done to remedy the position.

I have here another report. It appeared in "Country Life" the other day and dealt with transport. On reading this, and with the experience I have gained in the last eight or nine months after purchasing a property 200 miles from Brisbane, I have come to the conclusion that we who are farming within a stone's throw of Brisbane are not affected so badly. If you go farther from Brisbane and have to meet additional transport costs, I can assure you the effect is crippling. Your transport costs would take practically the whole of your profit. I was not surprised to read of the plight of farmers who are producing and have to meet the high impost placed on them by transport costs.

I found this article intensely interesting. It was taken from a speech made by Mr. D. S. MacMillan at the recent Beef Symposium during Exhibition Week. He said—

"Road Tax Hits Stockowner."

"It costs 2s. per mile less to move an equivalent load of livestock in the United States than it does in Queensland.

"Mr. Don MacMillan, livestock transport operator, Surat, made this point at the Brisbane Beef Symposium.

"He emphasised that Queensland taxes were 2s. a mile greater in Queensland than in America, where cattle brought a lot more than they did here.

"Wear and tear were cut to a minimum in the United States, with their excellent roads. Cost of plant and replacements was also much lower.

"Mr. MacMillan, a noted Australian rough-rider, operates a fleet of nine vehicles and recently made a study tour of the United States.

"A livestock transport in the United States doing 50,000 miles a year would pay £200 registration and road taxes, he said.

"A livestock transport in Queensland, if it travelled 50,000 miles in a year with no competition-to-rail tax, would pay £100 registration and £1,975 contribution to Road Maintenance Tax.

"If half that distance (25,000 miles) was travelled in direct competition with rail, a further £1,563 would be paid in competition-with-rail tax—£5,000 as against £200 on 50,000 miles."

There is a great deal more in the report but the only point I wish to emphasise is that these additional imposts, plus the transport charges, have been taken lightly by a number of people who have not experienced them. I am in partnership with my son and we pay in the vicinity of £800 a year in rates for the purpose of road construction, but before we can use the roads we have to pay a tax. Need hon. members wonder why the primary producers have been up in arms when that happens? It costs £3 9s. 6d. a head to land cattle at the abattoirs from Preston, which is 200 miles from here.

An Opposition Member: Why don't you use the railways?

Mr. MULLER: Why don't I use the railways? It costs £2 15s. after you load them on the trucks, and they are in the trucks two nights and a day. By the time they arrive at the market they are worth £1 to £2 less than if they are brought by road transport and arrive fresh at the market. All these charges make the primary producer's position almost impossible.

Another matter that is being bandied around the country at present is the opening up of the brigalow country. If ever there was a lot of hot air about any business, this it is. It is true that there are 16,000,000 to 17,000,000 acres of brigalow land. Some of it is very good, but I say honestly that a great deal of it could not be given away. When a number of lessees complained, I went out and inspected the properties and found that many of the complaints were more than justified. I would not take as a gift 5,000 or 10,000 acres of some of it because of the tremendous costs involved in development, although I admit that a great deal of it is beautiful country and is suitable for development.

Firstly, it is not a question of what a piece of land, or even a mineral deposit, is worth. Very often it is a question of what adds to or detracts from the economics of the proposal. It is proposed to clear this land in large areas. When I first heard about

this I rather liked the idea because I thought that the bigger the area the cheaper would be the cost. But initially we have to get the land. Nearly all that land is taken up under existing leases, and it is pretty difficult to take it away in many cases. Furthermore, we just cannot get 1,000,000 acres of brigalow land in one stand. We find that there is a patch here that is a beautiful bit of open country which is being used by the lessee. It is most difficult to take that land away and it can be taken only upon the payment of compensation. It is not as easy to acquire as some people try to lead us to believe. After holding office in the Lands portfolio for a few years I realise the problems of some of our settlers, particularly the younger men. If you go into these areas to pioneer the country you need a pretty substantial sum of money. Without a substantial bank account it cannot be handled. There is no return for some time. I have seen men draw blocks which were as good as winning the Golden Casket. In other cases, however, it has become a liability even for a man with £6,000, £7,000 or £10,000 capital.

Before this land can be developed it has to be cleared, and the cost is passed on to the settler. I am sure that hon. members are realistic enough to know that there are not too many young men today under 30 years of age who have from £10,000 to £15,000. If they have that amount of money they do not need any land; they are better off investing the money.

Hon. members will realise that this is a very difficult problem. I visited a number of new settlers, particularly in Central Queensland, where there was a rumpus only last Saturday. I met them at Capella, in the Peak Downs area, and on Orion Downs. The officers of the department selected these young men and it was really pathetic to see the number of them who had gone into this area. I am speaking particularly of Orion Downs, which is between Emerald and Springsure. It is a beautiful piece of country but its value has depreciated because of its situation. If it were in my district, within 150 miles of Brisbane, it would be very valuable country. These men went onto it with young wives and young families. They did not have a school at Orion Downs. They had roads of a kind. But their difficulty was to finance themselves on the property.

I could not help but remark on one case. I will not mention the name. I was so pleased with the development that had taken place that I said to the man concerned, "It is a credit to you." His father came to me a few days later and said he was very grateful for the encouragement I had given the son a few days earlier. He said, "Perhaps you would be interested to know how much money has gone into the place." He said, "I found the money. There are 4,500 acres of land and I put in £52,000. I should really spend another £10,000." That was one case out of 25. The other boys did not have a father or a rich uncle to help them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members should know the rule about reading newspapers in the House.

Mr. MULLER: The holder of the lease has to make a living out of it. I can assure you that many of these men are in an impossible position. They cannot finance the property and make a living at the same time. They are naturally thrilled and proud to be the owners of 4,000 or 5,000 acres. You might ask "Why don't they go into beef?" The reason I made that remark a little while ago about my own experience is that I was not loaded with a debt on which I had to pay interest. If they were to run beef in that area on those blocks they would not make their tucker. By the time they met all their expenses and bought store cattle, fed them, and got them off the place, I do not know what would happen. We had that position out near Emerald. At Arcturus Downs a man who leased a bit of country a few years ago had quite a crop of sorghum, but the cost of bags and getting it out left him just enough to walk off. He did not even bother to sell all the crop.

I charge the Commonwealth and State Governments to do something for the settlers after putting them on the land. It is not enough to open up the country and say, "Here now, Johnny, is a block of land. If you can clear it, it is all yours." He can do nothing with it unless he can sell what he produces. In Central Queensland what are the people to do with sorghum? I know Mr. W. J. Rundle. I worked with him for a couple of weeks a few years ago. He came up the hard way. He was an ex-serviceman from World War I. He came back and shot kangaroos to make a living. He was in the area just out of Emerald a few years. He has made a do of it. The other men are coming in and growing grain but they have not the trucks to get it away or the means of storing it. Surely it is someone's responsibility to build those sheds for storage. It is easy to say they should do it themselves. They cannot do it. They cannot meet their commitments now, without having to meet the cost of storage facilities. We talk about production and about opening lands and getting men out there. When we get men with the energy to do the job we leave them to starve. If you are going to open millions of acres of brigalow country, what are you going to do with it? What are you going to do with the young men when they get there? If they are put out in the Never Never country to live under those conditions they must fail.

Another important consideration today is the high rate of bank interest. Go along to the banks, and if they take you on at all they charge 7 per cent. A man drew a block of about 12,000 acres in the Rockhampton district. I knew him and I knew his father. They came from my district. In order to get a loan on those leases you must have ministerial approval. The banks would

not lend this man any money because they said he was a bad risk. One of the hire-purchase concerns offered to lend him £30,000 at 15 per cent. interest. He came to me as Minister for approval of the loan. His name was Alf. I said to him, "Alf, you can't do this." He said, "Let me have a go." I said, "I know you want £30,000 to stock the property. A property is no good to you unless you can stock it. But suppose stock values fell 30 per cent. overnight." And at that time it seemed they might. I said, "You would be ruined and the bank's equity in the thing would be nil."

Where are these men to get the money from? The correct approach is to provide £1,700,000 or £2,000,000, if you wish, to cut these blocks up into suitable areas, and lend the young men the money. Control them in some way. Do not give all they ask for, because in many instances they would then create their own burdens by asking for more than they could carry. Supervise their work. If they are prepared to spend £5,000, £6,000 or £7,000 on clearing, advance that money in proportion to their capacity to meet their debts.

I think that that is the practical way. If you go into developing this country by spending all this money and passing that cost onto the shoulders of the settlers, they will be crippled before they start. I have seen the potential of this country, but on some of those grazing blocks far removed from markets, and particularly with these wicked and cruel transport charges, the settler has not a dog's change of survival. I urge the Government to drop that transport tax as quickly as they can. If that is not done, God help our settlers.

There are many problems for primary producers. I know the sugar people might scarcely understand me this afternoon, but I have the greatest admiration for the organisation of that industry and the way in which they have controlled their business over the years. However, let us not forget that we cannot all do that. Their industry is a close preserve for the people in it; others have to stay out. Where there is open competition, nothing similar to the organisation of the sugar industry can be set up.

The dairying industry, too, is well organised. I know something about it because I gave many years, the best years of my life, working for it in both State and Commonwealth. That industry is faced at the moment with the problem of 9,000 tons of unsold butter. They entered into a contract with Great Britain, which Great Britain honoured, to take a percentage of their butter production. They have sold it in Eastern countries and elsewhere, but they still have about 9,000 tons unsold. It is just a crime to have primary producers produce a commodity and then have no-one to sell it to. I say that the Commonwealth Government should come into the picture

and take over those 9,000 tons, and pay the industry for it. They could pay a cheque into the Commonwealth association's bank account and it would be distributed equally and fairly over the whole of Australia. Every farmer would get his share down to the last shilling. Our primary producers cannot be sold a pup. We go along talking all this ballyhoo about development and getting these men on the land and, when we get them there, we dump them.

I have little time left, but I want to refer for a few moments to the marketing of meat in the Brisbane area, which I know has been such a controversial matter during the last few months. I am not critical of what has been done. The establishment of the abattoirs and the Queensland Meat Industry Board and the methods employed at that time were really excellent. However, my experience has taught me that if commodity boards disregard the interests of the consumer as well of the purchaser, they run into trouble very quickly. This has grown into a monopoly or cartel of those who operate in Brisbane. I know that when a cattleman sends stock to Cannon Hill sales he does not know whether he will get £5, £7, or £8 a hundred.

Press statements appearing from week to week stating what has been paid for cattle a hundred are just not true. I have been in it and I know it. When the Press was quoting £7 a hundred, the producer was getting £5 10s. or £5 15s. for choice quality beef. It is not passed on to the consumer. Prices are held right up in the air, and it is little wonder that there is often a protest from housewives. It was never intended that this should create a sanctuary for people who were exploiting the community in this way. If you watch the sales, you will find that it is simply, "One, two, three" and they are sold. They will not bid against each other. If there is a plentiful supply, they buy at any prices at all. Perhaps the beef people are responsible for it. I know that in days gone by they have not done much to help themselves. If they did what the sugar and dairying people have done, they might be able to protect themselves. When I was in Opposition, I supported organised marketing—do not forget that the Labour Party was in power when the legislation was introduced—and the first speech I made from the back bench opposite was made because I thought it was my duty, as a representative of primary producers, to express gratitude for the foresight of the Government of the day in establishing commodity boards. Over the years, however, I have taken the stand that if a commodity board is to be successful, it must not only sell the particular commodity but also look after the consumer. Unless that is done, the consumer is likely to drift into something else. For example, in the last five years the consumption of meat has fallen from an average of 128 lb. a head to 89 lb. a head.

(Time expired.)

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (5.22 p.m.): I am fully in accord with the action of the Leader of the Opposition in moving a motion of no confidence in the Government. As he pointed out, the Government have failed dismally in their efforts to solve the problem of unemployment. It is time they got down to the real crux of the matter and used their powers to help the unemployed in our community. They should cease making evasive moves from time to time to conceal the true unemployment position in the State.

I believe that the Opposition has every justification for moving this motion of censure. It is all very well for Government members to engage in empty talk about this serious problem, but it is poor consolation to the unfortunate electors who placed their confidence in Government members and voted them into office at the last election. It is our responsibility and our duty to criticise the Government vociferously in the hope that they will tackle the real problem. To my mind, they should give greater encouragement to developing secondary industries in Queensland, which would absorb many people who need work at present.

Is it the Government's intention to allow this trouble of mass unemployment to recur each year while they are in office? Every city and town along the Queensland coast, and every inland town, has its quota of unemployed because the Government have failed to shoulder their responsibility. The Government's attitude is one of complacency. It has placed Queensland in the unenviable position of having the highest percentage of unemployment of any Australian State. In many towns we find despondency, and many people have almost lost heart in trying to find work. Hundreds of thousands of men who want to work see no solution to their serious financial and economic problems. It is scandalous to think that hundreds of good men are looking for work at a time when vital developmental works are waiting to be carried out in Queensland. There is no limitation to the reproductive and useful work that could be carried out if the money were made available to meet this crisis, and in my opinion money should be allocated immediately for the purpose of eliminating the unemployment that now exists.

I wish to align myself with the sentiments of loyalty expressed by other hon. members to His Excellency the Governor and Her Majesty the Queen. Like other hon. members representing metropolitan electorates, I look forward to Her Majesty's visit to this State next year. However, there is one thing that I should like to mention. I have a feeling that a good deal of unnecessary expense could be incurred because of Her Majesty's short visit, and we have already seen in recent issues of our daily newspapers many exaggerated reports about unsightly things along the riverbank and the approaches to our city. I assure hon. members that during her short stay in this city Her Majesty

will not see half of these things that have been highlighted. To waste money cleaning up these places when it is needed urgently for work in the outer areas of Brisbane and in other towns and cities of Queensland would be criminal, because people are crying out for necessary amenities.

Having had an opportunity of perusing the speech read by His Excellency on behalf of the Government—I might say that I perused it several times—I came to the conclusion that it lacked substance in that it was devoid of hope for the future of this great State while this Government are in power. It failed to create any feeling of enthusiasm for the development of Queensland. No doubt His Excellency's speech prompted the Leader of the Opposition to move his no-confidence motion. It gave him plenty of material on which to submit such a motion.

I congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply motion on their contributions to the debate. As I went through the Opening Speech, I tried to work out a summary of the contribution I felt I should make this afternoon. I realised it was very difficult. At the same time, I feel we are all rather proud of our State, but I consider the Government are not doing all they should to promote secondary industries, which I consider to be of paramount importance.

The main development which has taken place concerns processing industries, or those branch industries that the southern firms found it economic to establish here because of the heavy cost of transporting manufactured products from the South.

These industries predominantly serve Queensland requirements, where the Government's aim should have been to encourage the establishment of industries which would supply not only the local needs but also engage in interstate competitive trade.

Some Australian States have made determined efforts to attract capital, and that policy has returned them rich dividends. It has also contributed to a healthier atmosphere between commercial interests and trade unions, which all goes towards creating greater industrial contentment in the community. It is high time that the Government stopped talking about Queensland's potential, and got down to the practical job of developing it with all the vigour and resources at their command.

It goes without saying that we all realise the tremendously important part that the availability of money plays in our economy, and the necessity to utilise our own financial resources for the benefit of the State. I urge the Government to give serious consideration to re-establishing the State Savings Bank. With the exception of New South Wales, which has its own Rural Bank, I think all the other mainland States are successfully operating State Savings Banks.

There are several good reasons why we should be enjoying the benefits of our own State Savings Bank, and I cannot think of one good reason we should not have such a valuable financial asset, which would assist greatly in the development of Queensland.

Mr. Evans: You want them all in Brisbane.

Mr. DEAN: I will tell the hon. gentleman where I want them. We want things such as public works schemes, housing projects, the operation of our hospitals and schools, maintenance of our Public Service, the efficient functioning of the railways, a system of roads, the provision of irrigation, and reforestation. It naturally depends on the supply of adequate finance, and they are the things we want in this State.

We now have a golden opportunity in this State. A study of Australia's overseas trade influences, as appearing in the 1960-1961 statistics, shows that Australia exported products to the value of £968,000,000, but as our export trade to the United Kingdom has been diminishing, and consequently our supply of goods to the European Economic Community countries has lessened to a great extent, we find that, of the £968,000,000, an amount of £231,000,000, or 23.9 per cent., went to Great Britain. By way of comparison, in 1951-1952, Great Britain took 30.8 per cent., and in 1938-1939 she took 48.9 per cent.

It is quite obvious that our trade with Great Britain is decreasing, and that with the other countries of the world it is increasing. At present, 80 per cent. of the class of commodities that is affected by the European Common Market goes to countries other than the United Kingdom.

The opportunities for Queensland are immense if the Government will only awaken themselves and create industries in Queensland's most advantageous cities and towns. Too long have we waited for this much-needed development which has, in the main, been entrusted to private enterprise. In other words, the business men and the private investors have let us down badly.

It is now time for the Government to take the lead by ascertaining, first of all, the requirements of the Asian markets, and then, with all haste, setting about to establish the necessary industries.

These great new commercial areas are beginning to open up for us in a large way. Interest is shown by countries like mainland China which, from an almost nil trading balance, has increased its trade with us to approximately £40,000,000. I believe that we can expect our market in China to expand greatly when that country's growing industrialisation lifts its people's standard of living and means of payment. Similar opportunities are to be found in Formosa, Hong Kong and Malaya, all of which

should indicate to the Queensland Government that the time for action is now, not in 50 years time.

The Government should exert themselves to the fullest extent and the sooner the better, whether or not Britain joins the European Common Market. It is a matter of grave concern when we are informed that Queensland is in very great danger of losing its position as the third largest manufacturing State in Australia, following New South Wales and Victoria. If hon. members are interested enough to read "The Courier-Mail" of 24 June, 1962, they will find that Queensland appears to be in the process of losing out to the concentrated industrial growth of South Australia, which has an area of 380,070 square miles and a population of 974,425, compared with Queensland's area of 667,000 square miles and population of 1,521,295.

By referring to this very serious trend, I am not trying to raise a false alarm. The facts speak for themselves. Furthermore, the Treasurer himself uttered a warning in June this year concerning Queensland's industrial lag. It was reported in "The Sunday Mail" of 24 June, 1962. He said that Queensland was dropping behind the average Australian industrial development.

The Premier himself made a statement which was reported to have appeared in an issue of a country newspaper, the June publication of "The Countryman", stating that the value of factory production in Queensland had risen from £143.9 million in 1957-1958 to £170.6 million in 1960-1961, but under scrutiny the Premier's statement did not reveal what South Australia had achieved in the same period of time. In South Australia, over the same period, the factory production for 1957-1958 was £132.2 million and by 1960-1961 it had increased to £170,000,000. In other words, the South Australian rise was approximately 28 per cent, while the Queensland increase was around 19 per cent. From a further examination it is found that in actual production figures Queensland is well behind New South Wales and Victoria and on present indications the position could, I regret to say, get worse.

To support my contention, I place in the records the following table showing the increases in manufacturing production in Australia's four main States between 1957-1958 and 1960-1961:—

State	1957-1958	1960-1961
	£M.	£M.
New South Wales	757.8	964.9
Victoria	566.4	700.5
Queensland	143.9	170.6
South Australia	133.2	170.0

In comparison, Queensland's increase of £26.7 million compared with those of £207.1 million in New South Wales and £134.1 million in Victoria, shows up our position in stark reality.

Again for record purposes, I submit the following comparisons of the number of people employed in manufacturing industries in the four main States:—

State	1957-1958	1960-1961
New South Wales	445,802	472,061
Victoria	357,143	387,430
Queensland	101,844	104,462
South Australia	92,472	99,955

All this information that I have placed before the House clearly indicates to all who are concerned with Queensland's development that the members of this Government are aware of the State's serious situation, but apparently they are taking no practical steps to rectify it. Talk and more talk seems to be the main theme of the Government spokesmen in the economic plight that Queensland finds itself in at the present time.

We are told that millions of pounds are to be spent on the construction of roads to assist in the expansion of the quality-beef industry throughout the State. I am not going to decry this important venture but in my humble opinion £22,000,000, which I am told is only an estimated cost for those roads, is too much money to be channelled into one avenue alone. Only a portion of that huge sum should be set aside for this extensive road system, and the balance used to establish secondary industry in the cities and towns throughout Queensland, especially north of Brisbane. The creation of such industry would, I am sure, be of great benefit in helping to place in suitable employment hundreds of juniors who are presently walking the streets of the cities and towns looking for work. Let us be realistic. If we should lose our present markets for beef through the development of the European Common Market, would it not be wise for the Government to have the State's economy safeguarded in some other industrial undertakings, especially secondary industry.

Another aspect of the State's development that has to my mind been sadly neglected by this Government is the practically untapped mineral wealth of Queensland. If we are to develop the State's mineral wealth for the benefit of the people, encouragement will have to be given to the introduction of improved survey methods and technical equipment. The countries of the world today are increasing their demand for all kinds of minerals, many of which are to be found in Queensland. Great possibilities await the people of Queensland from the use of their mineral wealth if the Government would only busy themselves in giving direct aid in such ways as providing improved railway facilities, power installations and housing projects in the particular areas of concentration of mineral wealth. I do not for a moment imply that the future development of Queensland's mineral fields should be financed by foreign capital. I should be dismayed to see a similar spectacle with the

mineral fields to what is happening at present with the State's great oilfields. In my opinion they have already been virtually given away to foreign companies, who will in time no doubt relegate any Australian interest in the oil deposits to a very minor role.

Mr. Hughes: Do you want to socialise them?

Mr. DEAN: I will tell the hon. member what I want to do with them and I will listen intently to what he has to say later to hear what ideas he has.

The cry for years now has been for a huge steel works for North Queensland similar to the Port Kembla development in New South Wales. Its establishment would be of profound economic significance to this State. Pig iron and steel, with their many forms and uses, are the indispensable elements upon which the structure of a modern economy is based. The establishment of Queensland's own steel industry, with the associated activities it would inevitably bring into being, would no doubt eventually help to make Australia a modern industrial nation. But again I caution that in the development of our iron and steel industries we must be long-sighted in the protection of our natural resources, and their development should be guarded by well-formed planning organisations.

Mr. Gilmore: You should be long-sighted and throw the Communists out of the unions.

Mr. DEAN: I am sure that the hon. member knows more about the Communists and their activities than I do. I have not had time to busy myself looking after other parties. I am fully occupied with looking after the people I represent.

By way of contrast, I should not like to see our main iron ore deposits completely handed over to private speculators to exploit, which, incidentally, I have been informed and led to believe, happened in Western Australia, with the support of that State's Government and also the present Commonwealth Liberal-Country Party Government, who made very little contribution, if any, to the development of that industry in Western Australia.

In Queensland the famous Mt. Morgan mine is one example of great significance of the State's mineral wealth. This mine has immense known ore deposits despite the fact that it has been worked for more than 60 years. A greater plan of expansion could be embarked upon at this mine, I am informed by people who claim to be qualified in mining technology, which would be of State-wide benefit if carried out. It is only 25 miles west of Rockhampton and has for some time been considered to be Queensland's principal gold and silver producer, yielding £3,000,000 a year. It is also another important source of copper.

In any assessment of the mineral wealth of Queensland, consideration must be given, of course, to the future of uranium as an element of major importance in the State's economic growth. Forecasts by the Australian Atomic Energy Commission in 1961 calculated that the demand for uranium for military purposes can be relied upon to remain steady at a level of 30,000 tons a year. World requirements for peaceful purposes were about 1,000 tons annually, forecasted to rise to 9,000 tons in this year, 20,000 tons by 1966, and 50,000 tons by 1970. The United States Commission believes that atomic-power requirements may even double the last-mentioned figure between 1970 and 1975. The increasing demand for industrial power purposes may reasonably be expected, on the basis that electricity needs in most advanced countries are doubling every 10 years.

Coupled with the urgent need to develop the State's mineral resources, another vital need in Queensland's development is an acceleration of our system of road construction, principally the main highways leading into and out of the cities and towns of this State. Using the 1961 figures relating to road improvement, we find that only 10,000 miles out of 120,000 miles have a bitumen surface, 2,500 miles being in the towns and 7,500 miles in country areas. Against that, 60,000 miles of roads have not been improved at all.

Mr. Evans: You were in power for 40-odd years.

Mr. DEAN: The hon. gentleman's party is in power now. I am concerned with the present and the future; I do not want to live in the past. Government members have accepted the responsibility of governing this State and have given an undertaking to the people, and it is their responsibility.

It has been stated that under the rate of development referred to it will be 50 years before half the roads in Queensland are bitumen-sealed, even if the rate of construction is increased to 1,000 miles a year.

Can we wonder why the accident rate in this State is so high when we see the feeble attempt made to deal with the two main causes—the unrestricted consumption of alcohol by the drinking-driver, and the unsatisfactory state of the roads which are inadequate to meet the requirements of the modern motor-vehicle? I feel that the construction of first-class roads and a much lower alcohol-content in liquor would go a long way towards reducing the high death rate on our roads, which in 1961 was 8.5 for every 10,000 people. We are informed that 23,818 men and women were killed or injured on Australian roads last year, and they were killed or injured principally in motor-vehicle accidents. The very sad aspect is that the main age group is between 17 and 30 years. Of that figure quoted, 883 deaths occurred. I do not think that that

great loss of our young people is anything to joke about. It is caused mainly by negligence, and by bad highways that lend themselves to very serious accidents.

Time gets away when one gets up to speak, but before my time expires I should like to say something of local interest. I feel duty bound to bring forward matters concerning my own electorate, and the debate on the Address in Reply is an opportune time to do so. There are three items of great importance to the Sandgate electorate to which I shall refer.

First, I wish to voice on behalf of the people of Sandgate their feelings of keen disappointment and a certain feeling of resentment at the absence of any prospect in the foreseeable future of the installation of a modern sewerage system. I make a special appeal to the Government on their behalf to give financial assistance to the Brisbane City Council to enable sewerage reticulation to be commenced in the very near future, thus doing away with the present antiquated system of sanitation.

Secondly, I again ask the Government to establish a clerk of petty sessions office in the Sandgate area. This amenity is greatly needed in the district. It would not only increase Sandgate's prestige but would also be a great time and money-saver to those wishing to use the services it provides.

Thirdly, because of the rapidly-developing prawn industry and the boating activities at this bayside resort, I again stress the urgent need for further improvements at Cabbage Tree Creek by way of extending the channel and creating a boat harbour at Shorncliffe. Although one often hears derisive comments when one speaks of one's own area, I point out that Sandgate is developing very quickly as a tourist attraction. Any week-end one can see hundreds of families enjoying themselves on the safe and peaceful foreshores extending from Shorncliffe to Flinders Parade, Brighton.

Mr. Hughes: They tell me the tide came in and had a look and went out again.

Mr. DEAN: Whether the tide is in or out, Sandgate is considered to be the premier seaside resort on the coast of Queensland. It is a natural playground, and the expenditure of a reasonable sum of money to provide the amenities necessary for the many families visiting Sandgate during the year is justified.

Once again I express my appreciation of the honour of representing the Sandgate electorate. From time to time I hear many comments and complaints about the shortcomings of the area, but they are largely due to the lack of money. The discovery of oil in commercial quantities could well bring in its train the money needed for the construction of the public buildings and amenities that we require. Recently people have expressed to me their satisfaction with the improvements made at the schools and at

the police station, but Sandgate lags far behind many of the other outer suburbs of Brisbane in the amenities that make life worth living for the average family.

Mr. Hughes: Do they still want to secede from the Greater Brisbane area?

Mr. DEAN: I assure the hon. member for Kurilpa that that is far from the thoughts of the citizens of Sandgate. They have no wish to secede from the Greater Brisbane area, to my knowledge. They are hopeful—and rightly so—that improvements will be made now that Labour controls the Brisbane City Council. I am sure that the Council will carry out its obligations to the Sandgate ward, because so far it has carried out the majority of the promises it made at the recent City Council election to other areas of Greater Brisbane.

Mr. Dewar: Nonsense!

Mr. DEAN: One would not hear that remark from a man with experience in local-authority government. I have been in this place when members of the Government, who have not had experience in local-authority work, have demonstrated their shortcomings and their lack of understanding of the everyday wants of the ordinary man and woman in the street. I am speaking now of those hon. members who have been unfortunate enough not to have been aldermen or council representatives in some local authority. I say that sincerely. I have had that experience, and, if it has made me nothing else, it has made me tolerant of my fellow man. If you can acquire one virtue in a lifetime I think you are fortunate.

Mr. DONALD (Ipswich East) (5.57 p.m.): I express my appreciation and pleasure, on behalf of the electors of Ipswich East, at the announcement that His Excellency is to continue in office for a further three years. I trust he will find those three years as pleasing to himself as the term he has already served.

In view of the many attempts by our political opponents to link the A.L.P. with the Communist Party, let me say very definitely that we of the A.L.P., in common with those who believe in the democratic way of life, are deeply concerned at the threat to democratic principles offered by the policies and techniques of totalitarian Communism.

Freedom of expression, inquiry, criticism of trade union organisation, all implicit in the socialist faith, are denied under the Communist system. Democratic Socialists therefore challenge the fallacies of Communist teaching and resist the spread of its influence.

But how best can a democratic community defend itself against Communism without abandoning the principles of democracy? How can democracy safeguard its institutions without resorting to repression?

To do so, I feel it is necessary for us to examine the nature of Communist threat to democracy, to discuss the advisability and effectiveness of dealing with Communism by legal suppression, and then to suggest a Socialist approach to the problem. Such an inquiry must begin with a brief examination of the nature of the threat, and the reason why Communism is a grave danger to democratic ways of life and to democracy in Australia.

There are two main reasons; first, Communist doctrines are anti-democratic; and second, Communists habitually use political methods and tactics which are inconsistent with the practice of democracy.

So far as doctrine is concerned, Communists now stand for a totalitarian organisation of society. Whenever a Communist Party comes to power it destroys all organised opposition. The form of government that Communists set up is the single-party dictatorship.

In fact, however, because of these views, the working class in the Communist state has less freedom than it has at present in Australia or in other capitalist democratic states. In these countries the working class possess a wide freedom of organisation and expression. Different views held by particular sections of the working class can be freely expressed and argued out. Within the trade unions, opposing factions and leaders may, and do, compete for power in a democratic way. Within the working-class movement as a whole, rival parties, including the Communist Party, compete for the support of the workers.

The position is very different where the single-party Communist dictatorship prevails. Workers have no choice but to accept the rule and leadership of the party. In the Soviet the trade unions, too, are under the control of the Communist Party and carry out, without open criticism or opposition, the policies of the party and the Government.

The sort of society that the Communists seek does not in fact provide self-government for the workers in the sense envisaged by Democratic Socialists. Under Communism, on the contrary, the working class is robbed of any real opportunity for self-government, and of any opportunity to hammer out questions of political and economic policy in their own independent organisations. They have no alternative but to follow the party line.

Democratic Socialists have always argued that Socialism will produce a more democratic society than is possible under Capitalism. In particular, Socialists claim that the substitution of public control of industry and economic life for private ownership of the means of production would give the rank and file of the community a larger share than they now have in the government of industry and in deciding the economic policies and destinies of the country. It would mean, therefore, a larger measure of democracy.

However, Socialism cannot produce a more democratic order if the public ownership of the means of production is achieved at the cost of those democratic liberties that the community already possesses. Socialism will mean a wider and a more effective democracy only if it preserves, builds upon and enlarges, the rights without which self-government is impossible in any form of society.

Freedom of thought, speech, inquiry, organisation, the right of the community to select its own government by choosing between competing policies and parties, the right to criticise and to reject a government or a particular leader—without these a community cannot be said to be self-governing. Democratic Socialists are therefore bound to struggle against Communism with all their might.

The A.L.P. believes that Communists are undemocratic, not only in their aims, the sort of society which they want to establish, but also in their methods. They, the Communists, do not believe that Socialism can be achieved by democratic, peaceful, parliamentary methods. They hold that Capitalism will have to be destroyed by revolutionary action, though Karl Marx himself expressed the opinion, almost a century ago, that in Britain or America the workers might be able to take power peacefully.

Mr. Hughes interjected.

Mr. DONALD: It is a pity that the people who interject did not give more consideration to their innane interjections when one is trying to reply to unfair criticism that has been levelled at our party by hon. members opposite.

No democrat denies that democracy must protect itself against those who attempt to use force or violence to overthrow democratic institutions. A democratic community cannot tolerate a conspiracy to subvert our political system; it must find some way of dealing with strikes, the real object of which is to assist a foreign power. No democrat denies that if the Communist Party or individual Communists are proved to be committing any of these offences, they should be punished.

But we must deal with specific actions, with the actual offence of using violence, of committing sabotage or espionage, or with planning and conspiring to do so. The law should not suppress an organisation simply because, in the opinion of the Government, it is likely to commit these offences.

To many people it seems reasonable to suppress Communist organisations and to impose restrictions on individual Communists merely because there is a danger that they may engage in some acts of violence or treachery. There are many who seem satisfied to argue: we know we cannot trust the Communists; we know that if they get the chance they will spy or use espionage; therefore let us put them out of the way of doing the harm before they get the chance.

This argument will not hold water. On purely practical grounds it can be questioned whether suppression of the Communist Party would in fact reduce the danger of violence or sabotage or espionage. If their party is declared illegal, and if it is banned, the Communists can no longer meet openly or advocate their views, but, driven underground, they can still maintain their contact with one another.

They will have no trouble bringing into their work new men unknown to the authorities as Communists. If they want to engage in sabotage or espionage, they can continue to do it or plan for it secretly. Even if they were a legal party they would plan such activities secretly. Thus the banning of the party would not appreciably affect or make more difficult the carrying on of just those activities which the banning is supposed to prevent.

This, however, is not the most serious point. It is a dangerous and drastic breach with democratic practice for governments to suppress organisations and impose restrictions on persons, not because of offences committed or known to be planned, but merely as a precautionary or preventive measure.

The favoured technique of the totalitarian states has been the preventive arrests of individuals and the precautionary destruction of political organisations because they are declared to be a danger to the State. This method is objectionable because it is incompatible with democracy, because it allows the Government to silence unwelcome views by using the grave charges of sedition and treason even though sedition and treason have not occurred or cannot be proved. It is an attack on political opinion while pretending to be an attack on some criminal activity or offence.

The root of the objection to banning political parties and organisations as a preventive or precautionary measure is this: if we adopt this measure we forbid, or at least impose severe restrictions on, the expression of a certain kind of political opinion for the sake of guarding against possible acts of violence, espionage or sabotage, even though by doing this we do not really reduce the risks of these undemocratic actions. In short, we violate the democratic right of freedom of speech and opposition. We introduce a measure that has all the characteristics of totalitarian states, to achieve a very dubious result.

No doctrine is so wild and unreasonable that the members of the community should not have the right to examine it, and make up their minds about it.

Democratic Socialists of course do not accept the Communist views that Socialism cannot come by peaceful, democratic change. They do not believe that revolution will produce a freer and better society for workers and others. Nor do we deny that

the Communist Party ought to be suppressed if it is discovered to be conspiring against the Government or the constitution of the country.

A democratic Government, like any other, must defend itself against conspiracy. The Australian Government, by the existing laws of the Commonwealth, already have wide powers to strike against conspiracy, sedition, treason and sabotage.

The views of many Conservatives that it is the Communists who create worker-employer antagonisms or engineer industrial unrest are fantastic and self-deluding. I use the word "Conservative" strictly politically to cover the opinion held by almost every hon. member opposite. If there is an exception I have not met him.

Admittedly, the Communists are extremely active and skilful in exploiting tensions, dissatisfaction or suspicion, but they have not created the industrial conditions out of which these things grow.

These tensions have been with us for some hundred years or more. These same tensions in the past gave rise to the trade-union movement, the Wesleyan Church and the Labour Party, indeed all those movements and individuals who have, during the last two centuries, been inspired by a vision of society in which injustice and poverty should no longer be allowed to exist.

In a large number of countries the method forced upon reformers has been that of revolution. But in the United Kingdom, the Scandinavian countries, and the British dominions, together with the United States of America, it has been possible to meet the demand for social reform by legislative measures, measures that have been designed to remove the cause of tension, to cut the ground from under the feet of the revolutionaries by removing their most powerful weapon, the quite genuine discontent of a considerable proportion of the population.

The Conservatives—and again I use the word to apply to members of the Government—tend to regard the economic and social problems from which arise discontent as minor frictions of the economy and generally to "minimise" their importance. In the presence of vocal and energetic advocacy of these discontents, the Conservatives tend to deal with the immediate inconvenience of the advocacy by trying to ban the advocate. Indeed, they go further and suggest that the discontents are themselves the results of the advocates.

This attitude must lead that party to one or two positions. They may become completely authoritarian and forcibly suppress all expression of discontent, or they may redirect them towards an external enemy or to an internal minority just as Hitler did. Otherwise they may make such concessions as they feel they can afford within the structure of the economy as they wish it to be, and hope that these concessions will be sufficient to remove the discontent.

The position of the Labour Party and the trade-union movement needs more careful consideration. In the first place they have themselves come into existence because they were the advocates of social and economic change, and because they, or a substantial majority of their members, are very conscious that major social discontent still exists. They also believe that relieving these discontents is more important than maintaining the existing social and economic structure.

Members and leaders of the Labour movement therefore cannot refuse to support the agitations arising from genuine social and industrial tensions just because the Communists are also supporting them. They may, and often do, feel great repugnance to the methods used by the Communists to air a grievance or force a change. They may feel that the grievance is being used as a means of attracting support for political manoeuvres that have little relation to the grievance itself. But they cannot agree that the grievance should not be raised at all, or that traditional industrial and democratic political steps to alleviate it should be abandoned. Their aim must be to ensure that the methods used are those accepted as legitimate in our democratic society.

This implies that they should be prepared to place themselves at the head of such agitations. It implies, further, that they should be able to show the sufferers that they are aware of the grievance, that they are able to secure a remedy for it within the democratic framework, and that they can secure this remedy reasonably quickly.

The fundamental fact about Communist penetration into trade-union leadership is that these individual Communists have shown themselves very efficient as trade-union leaders, and they have been able to get grievances aired and remedied. The only way they can be displaced, or even should be displaced, is by demonstration to the rank-and-file union membership that the election of non-Communist leaders and the adoption of more traditional policies will be equally effective in removing fundamental grievances. To secure this requires those trade-union members who are not Communists, and have the qualities needed for leadership, to exhibit the energy and efficiency of their Communist rivals. Interfering with the methods of trade-union elections will do little to help this. Interfering with the normal process of union agitation will make it increasingly difficult. Anything that quickens the solution of industrial disputes through normal channels will greatly assist.

Nevertheless, this is by no means the whole story. It is the irresponsibility of Communist trade-union leaders that has attracted most attention, much of it punitive. As I have said earlier, they do not mind if the fabric of the present system is rent by strike action. The day-to-day industrial dispute becomes an integral piece of tactics in the long-term Communist strategy.

Non-Communist trade-union leaders must always be aware that the day-to-day dispute is in itself only a symptom of the major disease of the economic and political system. The only real solution is the removal of the disease. But they should also be aware of the responsibility to keep the patient alive.

They reject the drastic revolutionary surgery of the Communist which, in their view, would mean the death of the patient. Nevertheless, they must make sure that the patient does steadily improve and that the circumstances encouraging the disease are progressively removed.

Abandoning the analogy, this means that the non-Communist trade-union leaders, while constantly maintaining advances in the status and power of the workers, must show an awareness of the longer-term strategy and have clearly in their minds, not only the type of socialist economy they finally desire but also the methods by which this can be achieved, without, in the process, losing that democratic system of political organisation which is equally vital.

All true democrats will readily agree that the support gained in any country by the Communist Party is a direct measure of the social tensions existing in that country. The only way to reduce the political danger such a party represents is to remove the causes of these social tensions, by either direct parliamentary legislation or by making sure that the traditional extra-parliamentary machinery is enabled to work smoothly and effectively.

Until this can be achieved, nothing will stop the eyes of the discontented turning to a country where, if not a better, at least a different, system operates. If democracy is to survive, or transform itself into Democratic Socialism, it must demonstrate that in the present and in the future it can deliver the goods. With this must go a deepening popular understanding of the meaning of democracy, and of the danger to democracy of trying to defend it by totalitarian methods.

That is the opinion of one who has been an active and financial member of the trade-union movement for over 50 years, who was at the age of 21 president of the Queensland branch of the Federated Furniture Trades Society, who has held many positions in the trade-union movement in an honorary capacity during those years, and who for some years before coming into this Chamber, was secretary of one of the most militant unions in Queensland. It is the opinion of one who has been an active member of the Australian Labour Party since he was attending State primary school.

I am in accord with the amendment moved so eloquently by the Leader of the Opposition and seconded so effectively by the hon. member for Barooka. In supporting the amendment, I ask the House and the public of Queensland, "What is the record of the present Government?" If hon. members were to echo the sentiments being expressed outside, they would answer without hesitation,

"It is one of failure, mismanagement, broken promises, and inefficiency." In a very few words that sums up the record of the Government.

Let us consider for a moment the employment position. Hon. members on this side of the Chamber who have spoken in the debate have shown by statistics just how badly the Government have controlled employment in Queensland. I wish to pay a tribute now to the hon. member for Fassifern, who put his views on the employment position in no uncertain terms. He indicated very clearly to the Government that they have fallen down on the job and created a pool of unemployed when they should have men at work. How often have we been lectured by people who are opposed to the trade-union movement and opposed to the working classes and told that we should work harder? They have told us that we should not strike against social or economic ills, that we should work and work, because only by working harder can we improve our standard of living and improve the prosperity of the country. How hollow are their opinions when today tens of thousands of people are anxious and willing to work and others refuse to give them a hand to find creative employment! It is natural for anyone to work. It is as natural as night following day. We are here to re-create not only ourselves but also the commodities that are necessary to keep us alive and to enable us to enjoy ourselves and make progress.

I am not going to weary the House by going over what other hon. members have said about unemployment. I am not going to quote statistics, nor am I going to quote the opinions of any working-class journal or any A.L.P. journal. I quote from a "Telegraph" article, which says—

"The upward trend in the latest employment figures must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the rate of recovery needs a further boost.

"The national unemployment total for that month decreased by 788 to 93,128, due to a substantial seasonal fall of 3,079 in Queensland; all other States except South Australia showed increases.

"And even with this local seasonal improvement Queensland's unemployment figure stands at the level of 2.7 per cent. of the State's work force—the worst in the national job picture.

"Within the next few months a testing time will come as work slackens in Queensland's seasonal industries.

"If the rising trend in jobs is to be maintained private industry will need more encouragement and confidence."

If private industry is not confident now, who is to blame? Is it the workers who are seeking in vain to obtain positions? They do not want to be on the dole. They seek independence. They want to live as human beings should live. They are denied this

opportunity because the present Government and their friends and supporters in private enterprise are not in a position to give jobs to the workers, or are refraining from doing so. The quotation from the "Telegraph" to which I have referred is sufficient to justify the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Bad and all as it may be for the breadwinner to be out of work—he may be knowledgeable enough to know that he can expect it in his particular job—to refuse employment to young boys and girls who have sacrificed their leisure to get a good education and whose parents have sacrificed a great deal financially to see that they got a secondary education is cruel, and it stands to the lasting disgrace of the present administration that hundreds of boys and girls should be denied the right to work, the right to get a job and learn how to work. We have been told again and again that we have to get skilled tradesmen from abroad because we have not enough of them in Queensland and Australia. Queensland enjoys the doubtful reputation of having the highest percentage of unemployment in the Commonwealth and the largest percentage of youths out of work. These people are anxious to learn and become skilled in one trade or another. They are anxious to become proficient in any industry in which they can secure work or in which they can become indentured. The parties opposite who are in control—we know it is a political accident—are not lifting a finger to help these young people. What do we find? Again I will not quote from any working-class journal, but from "The Queensland Times", one of the oldest papers in the State. This is what it says on this very question—

"Nothing can be more important than directing the youth of the country into channels of gainful employment. Our future cannot be secure unless present foundations remain firm, and they cannot be if we are to have a growing army of jobless school-leavers.

"Our claims to have an advanced civilisation will have rather an empty sound if we are unable to cope with the flow of graduates from the classroom to the workroom. This is a serious aspect of the results of economic instability, and nobody can be pleased about the situation as it is at present if they are really sincere in their desire for progress.

"It is difficult enough for young people who have been able to fit into the work force, however, to prepare for the time when they hope to have their own homes and families; but those who are thrown on the industrial scrap-heap must feel badly let down. It might be all to the good if some of them are able to return to school to further their education, but not all can do this, especially if it involves added expense for families already hit by the economic disruption.

"Only if we can assure our own young people of useful positions in the community can we convince others that this is a country worth coming to. The ranks of the unemployed are thinning no doubt; but the pace will have to quicken before happy days for all are here again."

There is a condemnation of the present Government, and a pretty severe one. It is perhaps more effective than I could make it, because people might think I am biased. You cannot say that "The Queensland Times" is biased. The Government member who giggled, thereby demonstrating an empty mind, should not ignore the plight of children with a secondary education, some with Senior passes, and some with Junior passes, who are unable to find work. He can only express his merriment by a senseless giggle. It is no wonder this Government are such a failure. Do not forget the promise they made at the last election that there would be more jobs.

We will go to another mouthpiece of the Government, the "Telegraph", and again they are condemned by their own people. It reads—

"Nearly three months after the beginning of the school year in Queensland thousands of them still are looking unsuccessfully for jobs. Thousands more have gone back to school to continue their education because they have been unable to find a place in industry."

The Government said that industry would bubble over at such a tempo that we would not have sufficient workers to take the jobs available. It continues—

"The financial hardship that is caused by this situation is only one aspect of the problem; boys and girls of this age are rarely the family breadwinners. More important is the demoralising and frustrating experience of being unwanted when they are eager to become part of the working community."

I doubt if any hon. members opposite have had the experience of looking in vain for a job. I do not think they have had the experience of looking in vain for employment for members of their families. If they had had that experience, they might be more sympathetic, might be more practical in governing the country, and would see that the idle people are put back to work. They cry about the idle machines when there is a dispute, but the disputes occur only when the workers are fighting for economic and social justice. They do not stop work for fun.

Let us observe the building industry, and if there is one industry that is the key to the economic conditions existing in the country, it is the building industry. In spite of the glowing terms in which the Treasurer spoke of the building industry when introducing his Appropriation Bill, what do we find? Again I am not asking hon. members to accept something from the Building Workers' Union, or anyone employed in it. I shall

quote again from a daily newspaper, in which Mr. K. J. Morris, President of the Queensland Master Builders' Association, is reported as follows—

"He said builders were looking for work, and some had insufficient to keep a skeleton staff employed."

Is that the record of a Government who have the interests of the State at heart, who want to see a flourishing, prosperous State with a contented population? It is the record of a Government who snap their fingers at the discomfort of the working class. Mr. Morris continued—

"Builders are anxious to employ and train more apprentices, but are unable to do so because of the huge amount of work being carried out by the Government and the small amount handed to builders."

This is the Master Builders' Association, the people who say, "Let us have private enterprise, and let it be unrestricted. We do not want Socialism." Are they wanting a big handout from the Government to keep employees in work? No. That is not the motive. They want the Government to give them work so that they can exploit the workers and the people of Queensland.

What did the Minister for Public Works and Local Government say? He said that on one job that cost the State £91,000 he had been able to save £21,000 by having it done by day-labour. I do not need any further proof. That is sufficient for me, coming from the Minister for Public Works and Local Government.

Mr. K. D. Morris continues—

"The building industry has suffered in the past 12 months its greatest set-back since the 1930 depression, and unfortunately many builders have lost their life savings in an endeavour to keep their businesses running."

When hon. members on this side of the House complained about what Mr. K. D. Morris has complained about, and said that the position in Queensland has not been worse since the great depression of 1929-1932, I can recall without difficulty that hon. members on the Government side said, "You are exploiting the unemployed. You are thriving on them." If anyone has thrived on the unemployed, it is the exploiters opposite. It has not been hon. members on this side or the trade unions, who are trying to do all they can to help them.

I turn now from the building industry to the metal trades industry to see what the Commonwealth Employment Service Director for Queensland, Mr. A. Gibson, had to say. We have seen headlines in the Press about vacancies in the metal trades industry. At the moment we are not condemning the Governments of other States, but, with every justification, we are condemning the unsatisfactory management of this State by the present Government. Hon. members opposite

may be very interested to hear what Mr. Gibson is reported to have said. We find this—

"Of the four main Australian States, Queensland was the only one in which registered unemployed metal trades workers outnumbered vacancies, the Commonwealth Employment Service Director for Queensland (Mr. A. Gibson) said today."

The Press report continues—

"Mr. Gibson today said official figures revealed that at the end of last July there were 399 persons registered for work in the skilled metal and electrical trades as against 171 vacancies."

Then we find—

"At the end of June the respective figures in Queensland were: 463 registrations and 181 vacancies. May: 531 and 169. April: 704 and 135."

But the figures in other States at the end of July show just what I have stated. I ask hon. members to listen to what the secretary of the metal trades group of unions in Brisbane had to say. He said that employment prospects for skilled boilermakers were worse now than for the last 12 months. He said that the position in the metal trades in Queensland was that employers were starved for contracts. Many were operating on half-staff and immediate prospects were very dim.

I should like to deal with the railways in great detail. Let me say firstly that on every occasion when the present Premier was Leader of the Opposition and had an opportunity to talk about the Queensland railways, he castigated the then Labour Government for not adding to the 6,000-odd miles of railway line in Queensland. He said that we were showing a lack of foresight and not showing sufficient strength in developing the country by building more railway lines. When he became the Leader of the Government, what did he do? Did he add one mile to the 6,000 miles? On the contrary, not only did he close lines but he removed them to such an extent that he has caused inconvenience in many settlements. The Government stand condemned for refusing to carry out the plans envisaged by previous Labour Governments, and particularly previous Transport Ministers.

I come now to the electrification of the railways. The report that has been compiled by people from a foreign country whose economy is based on oil tells us, whose economy is based on coal, that we should not keep the coal mines working and should neglect an industry that has played a very prominent part in the development of the State, and that we should import the energy to drive our locomotives. In my opinion, electrification is the solution to our suburban transport problems. We have only to go to Melbourne or Sydney to see what has been achieved by electrification. I point to other work started by the previous Labour Governments, such as the railway workshops at Redbank and Banyo. All these

things were considered necessary by practical men; not only heads of departments, but people who knew transport and were anxious to develop the country. I can remember visits of inspection to the Ipswich Railway Workshops when Mr. Walsh was Minister for Transport. I can remember his being greatly impressed by what he saw there and his remarking on the cramped and unsafe conditions that existed at the time and that were likely to become accentuated. He said, "We will have to do something to relieve them. We will have to purchase land somewhere to erect new workshops." That policy was embarked upon. People had to leave homes in which they had lived for many years so that the workshops could be built at Redbank.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) (7.51 p.m.): In rising to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, I think it is incumbent on me, and it is also a pleasure, to pay respects to the electors of Norman and to His Excellency Sir Henry Abel Smith and his good wife, Lady May. I feel, too, that in a formal manner I should congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and perhaps I could thank the Premier for moving this morning that the provisions of Standing Order No. 17 be not applied to this debate so that hon. members would have greater scope to speak on the motion. Apparently Government hon. members are waiting for the Opposition to make their contributions to the debate before they take it on themselves to rise and deliver policy speeches in an endeavour to bolster up their very shaky positions in their own electorates.

Nowhere in the speech delivered by His Excellency, which was of course prepared by the Government, was there any major constructive proposal to eliminate the serious state of unemployment which unfortunately exists in Queensland today. Mention was made of full employment, but this coalition anti-worker Government is bankrupt of ideas. Bold plans are needed to promote secondary industries so that our natural wealth can benefit and develop the State, so greatly desired by every man and woman in Queensland and indeed in Australia. Every married couple with a family and commitments wants the security of future that full employment brings and there is only one way to get it. But the members of this Government are failing dismally. They are not making any bold plans for full employment. So I think I should warn them. They have been warned already, particularly on 9 December when the issue of insecurity and lack of full employment brought about the downfall of the Federal Government. It is well known that the Australian Labour Party received the greater proportion of votes and therefore a mandate from the people. Only for the gerrymandering of seats by this Government, we of the

Australian Labour Party would now be in control of the Treasury benches and Queensland—and for that matter Australia—would be emerging from the stagnation that the country has known under this Government. An upsurge of prosperity and confidence would be evident from Coolangatta to Cape York, and elsewhere throughout the State. What is worrying me as well as other responsible members of the Australian Labour Party, who of course are legion—and I am sure it is worrying thousands of Australians, too—is that the members of this Government appear to be thinking with only one idea, that is, to export completely the natural mineral wealth of the State. We have heard Mr. Menzies and many others speak of its great potential. "Potential" may be a good word and it has its place, but unfortunately nothing is being done to develop our potential.

What is worrying me is that most of the vast wealth of Queensland is not being developed. I feel that this Government, supported by the Federal Government, should be doing something to promote industries that would manufacture products that we are constantly importing. In my opinion, no country can continue to prosper and maintain an equitable trade balance or full employment by our present methods. Why do we not all get together and do something constructive to develop and populate the towns and cities? There is no doubt that, by developing secondary industries, we can develop the North. It is from there that we are unfortunately losing population to the cities and the southern States.

So far as I am concerned, our primary industries have for too long carried Australia. With the possibility of Britain's entering the European Common Market, great thought should be given immediately to secondary industries. To support my point of view, Professor R. H. Greenwood, Professor of Geography at the University of Queensland, spoke at the first general session of the Australian Institute of Management conference on this same theme of positive action for the development of Queensland, and some of the basic points of his address included the making of fuller use of existing industries towards lowering costs and increasing production. He is reported as saying that the most effective magnet to draw people to Queensland would be lower prices. Many commodities produced in Queensland were yielding by-products, but were incompletely used. There were many industrial uses for sugar; large amounts of leather were wasted; Queensland's salt works could form the basis of chemical production. Professor Greenwood went on to advocate the adoption of a policy of intensification and integration, greater development for the area centred on Rockhampton; and further improvements to various cities and country areas. I do not want to take up time by quoting Professor Greenwood fully, but I point out that

a professor at the University also realises that we should do something to develop secondary industries in this State.

I now refer briefly to Britain's proposed entry into the European Common Market. It is amazing to me that, for as long as I can remember, there has been a belief by many people that Australia has been exploited by Britain, yet there is a panic when it seems that we may lose our preferences in the sale of primary products if Britain joins the Market Six. Australia must continue to look for trade relations with other countries, which is one of the things that we of the Australian Labour Party have been urging the Federal Government to do. We should look closely for trade opportunities not only for our great primary industries but for some of our secondary industries as well, because the longer we put these things off the worse our situation may become in a short time. We all know that procrastination is the thief of time, and consequently I feel that the sooner we do something to straighten these matters out the better it will be for Queensland and Australia.

We heard the hon. member for Wavell deride the Australian Labour Party when we were the Government. Unfortunately he is not in the Chamber now, but I should like to remind him of some aspects of his Government's bungling during its last 12 months of office. They cared nothing about providing full employment; rather did they follow the pattern of the coalition parties in Canberra in their eagerness to supply to the employers, and cause to exist in this State, a pool of unemployed, as it is popularly called.

I am going to analyse some of the misdeeds of this Government that have taken place in recent months. Without a shadow of a doubt, the Government can be declared bankrupt. They are certain morally bankrupt, as witnessed by the introduction of the off-course totalisator. I am sure that no-one envisaged that the Treasurer, in his greed for finance, would allow this to happen. In fact, he stated openly that he hoped to rake in £1,000,000 annually from the people with this scheme.

Then there was the introduction of so-called liquor-reform and its subsequent payments to the Government, plus the havoc to family life it could possibly bring in its wake; the curtailment of much-needed subsidies to local authorities which has made them almost hopelessly insolvent, forcing them once again to hit the home-owner and family-man with increased rates; the lack of opportunities provided for people in country areas, forcing them to migrate to the cities and other States; the high ratio of men, women and children on unemployment relief; the thousands of children who left school last year still seeking work; and the lack of planning for future school-leavers. We are faced from morning to night by rules and regulations. Motorists are taxed in every

way that the Ministers can think of—park-areas, increased third-party insurance premiums, higher registration fees, special charges on insurance, and more fines than any other country would dare impose on its motorists, and so on. The State Transport Act, which created the biggest furore of any legislation ever brought down in this Assembly, was introduced by the Feuhrer of Lockyer, the instigator of outside investigational bodies such as the firm of Ford, Bacon and Davis. I should like to deal more fully with their report later, if I have time.

I can assure the Government that the people of Queensland will not forget the State Transport Act in a hurry, or the complete stupidity of it, either. Hon. members on this side of the House endeavoured to direct the Minister's attention to the injustices of the legislation, but he was too pigheaded to acknowledge the advice. The people concerned were happy with Labour's Act. At least it was never challenged in court. The Act introduced by this Government was challenged. In ignoring us, the Minister for Transport and the Government were forced to call a special session of Parliament on 6 June to validate the Act, and the Minister knows as well as I do that the validated Act, too, will be challenged in the courts. I venture to suggest that the challenge will succeed.

The greatest laugh of all in this matter, of course, was when the hon. member for Tablelands, Mr. Gilmore, said at a meeting at Ravenshoe, as reported in "The Courier-Mail"—

"A lot of people think the Transport Minister is a big bad wolf, but he has the welfare of everyone at heart. He has bent over backwards to help every primary producer."

I suppose that is why he helped to crucify Mr. Alfred Jonsson, who endeavoured to supply the people in Cairns, Townsville and the surrounding areas with fresh fruit and vegetables. The truth is that people in country areas are only waiting for the day when the Minister for Transport is defeated in an election. During my visit to the North and other parts of the State recently, I found a feeling of antipathy towards the Government.

We heard the hon. member for Wavell rave about Communism. When there is in existence in Queensland legislation enacted by the Government that enables the transport constabulary to raid homes and offices without a warrant, one can be forgiven for thinking that Fascism is the rule of law. Further, under this Transport Act people can be compelled to give evidence without the benefit of legal assistance.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BROMLEY: If hon. members opposite call that justice I do not. Furthermore, although the Government may have had legal advice from the hon. member for Windsor, we find that when people are

compelled to give evidence without the benefit of legal assistance and appeal to a court of law against an arbitrary decision of a public servant, they are completely denied justice. I believe that matter should also be investigated.

Let us look further at this Fascist-type of legislation, the brain-child of this Government—traffic laws under which people have little alternative to pleading guilty and paying up for any breaches, however small, because of the trouble and expense of defending themselves in court.

This coalition Government hoodwinked the people by preaching a doctrine that they were parties with principles, and so I ask hon. members: What principles have they when they have thrown the State wide open, encouraging the people to gamble by the installation of betting shops, a measure they fought bitterly in the years when they were in political obscurity?

Mr. Houghton: Didn't they gamble before?

Mr. BROMLEY: They gambled before, but within their means. Perhaps they had money in those days, because under the Labour Government full employment was not only the fashion, but it was the belief of the Australian Labour Party, a belief it still holds, and a belief they are continually endeavouring to do something about.

Whenever we mention unemployment—and we are seriously concerned with doing something about it—all we get from Government members is laughter. They are not concerned with the average man and woman, the working people of today, because the majority of them, that is, the Government members, have plenty of property or businesses, and what property they have not got they are endeavouring to sell to overseas interests. They are not interested in what is happening to the people of Queensland today.

I was speaking about parkatareas, and this particular method of extracting money from the residents of Brisbane. In relation to parkatareas, a special reporter of "The Sunday Mail", Bob Macmillan, states—

"The State Government's parkatarea system has had a test period of more than three months and shown one main fault;

"A big portion of inner Brisbane parking space now lies idle every business day.

"In some streets up to 50 per cent. of parking space is a 'no-man's land' where short-term parkers search for two-hour free areas rather than pay 2s. to park for even a few minutes.

"It is obvious from even a casual drive round the Government prescribed 'central traffic area' that the 6,000 laid-out park-area spaces are far in advance of Brisbane's present development."

I mention also that the Treasurer, in his hunger for money, and in his endeavour to get a rake-off of £1,000,000 annually from

the people, was not considering where the money came from, as long as he got it. He was not interested in the people on small incomes, in the family man who, after all, has a right to enjoy himself, and has a right, if he wishes, to have a bet.

Mr. Low: You are pretending to be a real lily-white.

Mr. BROMLEY: I do not pretend to be a real lily-white. I believe in enjoying myself, and I believe in everybody else enjoying himself, but the hon. member for Windsor would prefer everybody else to be unemployed, to be on the dole, so that they could not enjoy themselves.

As a matter of fact, in reply to some of these inane interjections by the hon. member for Windsor, I would like to quote some of the things he has said in his court cases. You would laugh if you read them. I will keep them up my sleeve for another time, so I advise the hon. member to be careful in future.

I quote next from the magazine section of Sunday "Truth" of 3 December, 1961, under the heading "Wow! . . . Double-Talk on Booze & Betting". It reads—

"Last week in State Parliament, the Treasurer and Minister in charge of Racing, Mr. T. A. Hiley, brought down his long awaited Off-Course Betting Bill."

The article goes on to say what the Bill aims to do—to legalise S.P. betting shops, and to legalise S.P. bookmakers in the country. There is no mention, if I can remember, in that Act of the fact that T.A.B. shops are not to be set up in close proximity to hotels. The "Truth" article continued—

"But Mr. Hiley forgot that way back in 1954 when Labour introduced a Bill to allow local option polls for legalised betting—he himself was one of the proposal's most caustic critics."

An Opposition Member: He was wearing a white carnation then.

Mr. BROMLEY: As the hon. member says, white for purity.

These are some of the things Mr. Hiley said when in Opposition—

"I suppose when the working people of this State are crucified by the betting shops, the members of Cabinet will, like Pontius Pilate, wash their hands."

He continued—

"I have not the slightest doubt that one of the results of this Bill will be that more young people will be lured away from the glorious Australian tradition of participation in sport in order to attend betting shops."

An Opposition Member: Who said these things?

Mr. BROMLEY: The present Treasurer, who introduced the Bill and who, in conjunction with other hon. members opposite,

was critical of a Labour Government when they introduced an amendment to the liquor laws. He said—

"What the Government is doing is blasphemous."

That was the pure Mr. Hiley who wore a white carnation. That is what he said when we of the A.L.P. intended to introduce legislation to conduct local option polls, and a referendum on whether the people wanted S.P. shops or betting in the city or country areas.

The article continues—

"The Minister for Justice is yet another Minister who must blush over his 1954 contributions."

Mr. Pizzey: You read that.

Mr. BROMLEY: Yes, but it did not stop the Government from introducing the infamous Bills that they have introduced recently. The article continues—

"He said then that there should not be laws operating within certain geographical boundaries or certain restricted areas. Yet in introducing his recent Liquor Bill, he adopted the very opposite principle—allowing Sunday drinking only 40 miles from Brisbane Post Office."

The article continues—

"But the man who did remember these 1954 speeches was the Queensland Opposition Leader, Jack Duggan."

My Leader dealt with Government members when he spoke on that legislation earlier in the year, and I am sure some Government members must be blushing with shame. The members of the Government who have not read this will see this advertisement, "A Message to every Christian-thinking citizen." Some of the voters were Mr. Chalk and Mr. Fletcher.

An Opposition Member: They are decrepit.

Mr. BROMLEY: Certainly they are decrepit, but I will not engage in personalities here. It is our duty to awaken the people of Queensland and make them alive to the responsibility of members of Parliament and especially to the responsibilities of the present Government. If they feel any responsibility, they are certainly not alive to it. If they were they would be doing something to improve the conditions and living standards of the people of Queensland.

I speak briefly now of the hungry Government with no principles, the Government that claim to have principles. The only principle that this Government have or know is the one that is spelt "p-r-i-n-c-i-p-a-l"—cash. They are a money-hungry Government; they are hungry for more power and more money, from any source. But unfortunately it all comes from the people. This is the Government who will go before the people very shortly and say, "Judge us on our record." The people will do just that.

I am indebted to John Higgins, journalist, who, in an article in the Sunday "Truth", quoted Ludwig Lewisohn as follows:—

"Democracy, which began by liberating man politically, has developed a dangerous tendency to enslave him through the tyranny of majorities and the deadly power of their opinions."

The members of this coalition Government have opinions that they think are invincible, but the power of public opinion at the next State elections will prove that they are not invincible; the power of public opinion will be proved the greater.

Let me deal first with the Minister for Labour and Industry who, unfortunately, much to our sorrow, is a very sick man. He controls traffic. He will not change his opinion about the necessity to increase mobile patrol officers to reduce the accident rate among motorists. In the Brisbane "Telegraph" of 26 April, 1962, reference was made to the reaction of the great majority of motorists to the presence of uniformed police officers on patrol. I am not speaking about those that the Minister for Justice spoke of this morning who attended a certain ball recently and unfortunately did not see liquor being carried onto the premises.

Mr. Pizzey: You must have been there yourself.

Mr. BROMLEY: As a matter of fact I was not present—not at that particular ball, anyway. On 26 April last this statement appeared in the Brisbane "Telegraph"—

"Traffic police, after an intensive Easter survey, are urging official acceptance of the 'show-the-flag' method of traffic control."

That is what I have been hammering at ever since I have been a member of Parliament. When I say "show the flag" I mean show the uniform of the police. It is well known that most motorists upon seeing uniformed police immediately check on their driving and ask themselves, "Am I doing the right thing? Am I obeying all traffic regulations?" When they do not see a policeman in uniform they are perhaps inclined to do the wrong thing and that is when accidents unfortunately happen.

The Minister for Health and Home Affairs refused to change his opinion and to agree that an open inquiry into the Westbrook farm home for boys was desirable. He was proved wrong. He refused to acknowledge the claims of responsible persons that the minutes of hospital board meetings should be complete and open to the public.

The Minister for Justice, Mr. Munro, completely repudiated the opinions of the public and the members of the Bar Association when he stuck to his opinion that an open inquiry into the handling of what is now known as the Plomp case was unnecessary.

None of the members of the Government will change his opinion. The Minister for Transport, Mr. Chalk, refused to alter his opinion on the decision to call in an overseas firm of consultants, Messrs. Ford, Bacon and Davis, to investigate the Queensland Railways when we of the Australian Labour Party advised him that there were more competent men in Queensland and elsewhere in Australia to investigate the department and to help him to straighten out the bungled administration of the portfolio. As a matter of fact, I think we have one within the ranks of the Australian Labour Party, in Alderman Roy Harvey. He is doing a mighty job in straightening out the transport muddle that has resulted from the mal-administration of the previous Conservative Brisbane City Council.

In view of all the publicity that the proposal for changing question time procedure in State Parliament is receiving, I think it is incumbent on me to bring to the notice of the House and to have recorded in "Hansard" the fact that many people are writing to the Press expressing concern at the possibility of having Standing Orders altered.

I am going to quote once again from the "Telegraph" under a heading, "A Basic Right". It goes on to say—

"The ugly seeds of political censorship lie not far below the surface of a remarkable suggestion . . ."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the hon. member is merely quoting from a newspaper. If it is his own opinion, he is reflecting on the Chair because I was responsible for the recommendation to the Standing Orders Committee regarding a variation of Standing Orders, not the Government.

Mr. BROMLEY: I was not reflecting on you, Mr. Speaker, but I feel, as is well known, that freedom of speech should not be curtailed, nor should it—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Can the hon. member state one case where freedom of speech has ever been curtailed in this House? I want it to be clearly understood that the Government had nothing to do with the recommendation to the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. BROMLEY: I was not reflecting on you, Sir, as Speaker of this House, nor on any past or future Speaker. I did feel that because this opinion was expressed in a paper that we and the public of Queensland and Australia read every day, I would be quite within my rights in quoting it. I do feel that, for the benefit of posterity and perhaps for future members of Parliament, I would be quite in order in quoting from this newspaper, and I do not reflect on you, Sir, at all, nor on the Chair or Parliament itself. If you have no objection,

Mr. Speaker, in the limited time that I have available I shall quote from this paper. It says—

"The ugly seeds of political censorship lie not far below the surface of a remarkable suggestion that would muzzle the freedom of members of Parliament and curtail the liberty of the Press.

"The Speaker of the Queensland Legislative Assembly, Mr. Nicholson, is concerned because some Parliamentarians give notice of questions that reflect on certain people such as Ministers of the Crown, and because newspapers inform the public of them.

"To rectify this practice of democratic government, Mr. Nicholson proposes to call Parliaments Standing Orders Committee to consider the matter.

"Any move to maintain proper decorum in Parliament will have full public support, but the people will have no part of any manipulation that would allow the Speaker to decide what the electorate should, or should not, be told.

"Mr. Nicholson is 'disturbed' because questions can be published before he or his clerks have had a chance to 'edit' them. Apparently he does not see how strange it is in a democracy that the people's elected representatives should be allowed to ask only those questions that receive Government approval.

"If he is to try to suppress publication of these matters then logically he also must close Parliament House to all visitors until the business of the day is rehearsed to his satisfaction.

"What an extraordinary concept of Parliamentary democracy!

"As the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Duggan, pointed out yesterday, the most effective safeguard against the irresponsible questioner is the fact that he is brought into public contempt unless he can substantiate his accusations.

"There is only one answer the Standing Orders Committee can give to the Speaker's dangerous proposal: Don't interfere with a Parliamentary system that will flourish only while it is free of any pressure to mislead or conceal."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member has had time to complete his comments, as his time has expired.

(Time expired.)

Mr. O'DONNELL (Barcoo) (8.32 p.m.): I rise to support the amendment so ably moved by my Leader, and the points he so forcibly put before the House this morning.

On behalf of the electorate of Barcoo, I should like again to affirm our loyalty to Her Gracious Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, and to congratulate her Vice-regal representative, Colonel Sir Henry Abel Smith, on his reappointment for a further three years.

I might add that the Vice-regal family has become very well-known in my electorate. If every electorate in Queensland had received the number of visits that mine has, those electorates would have come to appreciate the good qualities of Sir Henry and Lady May.

We are faced today with many important problems, and, so far as I can see, only the Australian Labour Party has any real concern for those sections of the community that are at a disadvantage due to the crises that have arisen in certain industries.

The Leader of the Opposition referred this morning to Blair Athol, as also did the hon. member for Burdekin. I should like to enlarge briefly on the situation that exists there. No doubt it is generally realised, but I repeat it because it is worth repeating, that at least 200,000,000 tons of the best-quality steam-raising and power-generating coal is deposited there. From time to time the people of Blair Athol and the surrounding district have been given hopes of great development in the area only to have their hopes dashed. The infamous Ford, Bacon and Davis Report on the Queensland Railways is being circulated and discussed everywhere, but there is very little realisation of the effect that it will have on the declining centre of Blair Athol. Today Blair Athol gets more than 60 per cent. of its income from railway orders. What will be the effect on Blair Athol of dieselisation?

Mr. Smith: But you would not suggest that blacksmith's shops should be kept open?

Mr. O'DONNELL: I am not suggesting anything to the hon. member, but I should like him to allow me to continue with my theme and mind his own business, as I do when he is speaking.

The hon. member for Burdekin referred to bauxite deposits at Weipa and the activities of Comalco. It may interest the House to know that Comalco has an interest in Blair Athol, in that it took a five-year option over the two Blair Athol leases in 1958. Unfortunately, Comalco has not made any statement about what it intends to do, which, of course, is disappointing.

A review of the situation shows that there are two active companies in Blair Athol. The Blair Athol Coal and Timber Company produced 130,304 tons of coal and employed 58 men in 1957. In 1962 it is producing 72,000 tons of coal and employing only 32 men. The retail cost of coal in the centre—coal costs are important—was 28s. 9d. a ton in 1954, and the Blair Athol Coal and Timber Company was able to sell on the field at that price and make a profit. In 1962 the price is only 30s. a ton. There have been two retrenchment periods. In 1958-1959 the number of fitters and mechanics had to be reduced and in 1962, and not so very long ago, the railway orders were reduced from 950 tons a week to 300 tons because of the lack of business in the railways. The other firm, Blair Athol Open-Cut Collieries,

employed 47 men in 1957 and produced 105,185 tons of coal. In 1962 it employs only 19 men, producing 62,958 tons of coal. So in five years we have a reduction from 235,000 to 130,000 tons and a reduction in men employed from 107 to 51.

There is only one apparent solution to this—the establishment of a powerhouse. I know it has been discussed time after time, but it must be reiterated because Blair Athol will cease to exist unless a powerhouse eventually is established there. Such a powerhouse would feed into the Capricornia grid system and boost power. We know that cheap power will develop and encourage industry; but one of the unfortunate facts facing us today is that industry is not sufficiently decentralised to give a powerhouse of this type the business that it should receive in order to function as at economic unit. However—and this is poor consolation to the people of that centre—a couple of years ago the Premier visited there while I was head teacher at Capella, and, after admiring this wonderful coal seam, said it was a pity this outstanding natural resource was not nearer Brisbane.

Mr. Low: How can you keep in touch with the people when you are living in Queen Street?

Mr. O'DONNELL: I point out to the interjector that I have made eight tours of my electorate in the last 12 months, and that would be considerably more than the hon. member has made in three years.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Dewar): Order!

Mr. O'DONNELL: The people of Central Queensland are considerably disturbed. We know that £23,000,000 will be spent on Callide and the heartburning fact is that the power from Callide will be reticulated to Emerald and points west. In other words, this power will go through an area that could have been served by a powerhouse established at Blair Athol.

Some people seem to think that the difficulties of the situation at Blair Athol could not be overcome. I know its location is a difficult one, but surely in these modern days, when there is a lack of water in an area, it can be piped in. It would be costly, but to supply water to Callide cost £3,000,000. That is a large sum. It is just as feasible to say we could send electricity from Blair Athol east to the coast, as to send it west from Callide. The water brought into the area would not only have supplied the powerhouse. It would also have supplied the Clermont district, and I think that district could do with a much better water supply than it will receive from the Sandy Creek project.

Earlier I referred to the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report. That is a document that various people have referred to in either complimentary or other terms. I suggest

that this report was brought in by the Minister for Transport to whitewash what he intended to put into operation anyway, because he could then say, "The report suggests what I am implementing. It advises the Government to do this." I will not dwell on that subject, apart from reminding the House that it has thrown into the minds of the railway employees of this State the greatest state of uncertainty that has ever existed. They have no conception of what is going to happen. They have no conception of what will result from the reorganisation this report suggests. If it is implemented many of them will have to sell the homes they own and move to other centres.

In spite of this modern dieselisation scheme, I think it would be far more welcome to the people in the Emerald district if they got three extra steam locomotives and bulk wagons to shift the grain. That is a source of great news at present. We want more assistance for those farmers. The farmers on Peak Downs are contributing to the revenue of the Railway Department. If they are to continue they will have to get something more than the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report, which cost £115,000. That money could have built three grain storage installations along the Springsure line where they are needed, and they would have been of far more benefit to the people of Central Queensland than recommendations to whitewash the actions of the Minister. I should like to add that there should be some inquiry about what is going on when the Grain Sorghum Board deny it is at fault, and the Railway Department, too, denies that it is at fault. The only people to come out in the open and really co-operate are the members of the Gladstone Harbour Board. That board is doing its duty. I think the Government should look into it. After all, it is a Country Party Government representing the interests of the country people and in that district we have 350-odd farmers. When the Government have money to give away to foreign experts, I suggest to them that they should spend that money in the country and try to do something for the people who are attempting to put the country on the production line. The Government should do something that will bring to this land of ours some promise, and not criticism.

I know that the bulk-storage installations are built through the Wheat Board, but if money is there to be given away it could be given to the right people who could do the right thing with it. If the hon. member who has interjected wants to know what these farmers think he has only to read the last three resolutions that were adopted at a mass meeting of growers at Emerald. As reported in "The Sunday Mail" of 26 August, 1962, they were—

"To investigate fully the supply of storage construction material to growers on a credit basis, similar to bag finance.

"To declare Rockhampton a wheat port for future coastal storage.

"That the railways be asked to make available a responsible officer to work with the wheat and sorghum boards in truck movements."

A Government Member: A good Country Party representative for Barcoo would be the right representative.

Mr. O'DONNELL: The hon. gentleman should not worry about that. I am not doing too badly.

Mr. Sullivan: A great deal of money was wasted on the British Food Corporation.

Mr. O'DONNELL: That interjection is right up my alley because of these people who wish to bring in big company money to finance development. The Minister for Public Lands opposed this idea but protagonists for overseas company finance had expressed the opinion that the British Food Corporation had shown just how this land could be developed.

I should now like to refer to the development of the brigalow country. I approve of this scheme because I believe that development must continue. I know that people will say there is a great risk that the markets will not be there but we must ever press on with some degree of optimism. I know there are dubious points but I believe that development must come to that area. There are some points of criticism that I wish to bring before the House. The Government have not taken hon. members into their confidence on the brigalow development scheme. We know there has been a Commonwealth grant of £1,750,000. There was a short Press notice this morning, or yesterday morning, which said that Mr. Muir, the Land Commissioner—not the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, taking the House into his confidence—would reveal in *Theodore* the details of the brigalow development scheme. That is hardly what is expected from the Government of the State. This development is important and we should have time to discuss the matter and criticise it, if necessary. We know there are many difficulties. How much will be spent on resumption, what will happen when they are resuming this country, how people are to be compensated, and into what blocks is this land to be surveyed, and so on are all questions of interest. But not a mention has been made in this House except that the Commonwealth Government have allocated £1,750,000. Had the Australian Labour Party been returned to power in the Federal sphere they would have spent, north of the 26th parallel, £60,000,000 for three years. They would have got it to develop Northern Australia. There would have been free grants for access roads and storage facilities.

Mr. Evans: They didn't get it when they were in. They were in for years and did not get any.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I am talking about the Labour Government that should be running Australia today, not about the Government elected through Killen and his Communist friends.

Mr. Evans: I am talking about the Labour Government, because they are controlled by Communists.

Mr. O'DONNELL: They are not controlled by Communists. If we went back into the hon. gentleman's history we would find him hanging round the Labour movement at one time.

I stress the importance of the point that we should be taken into full confidence on this brigalow development scheme so that we can co-operate in the development of the country.

Reference has been made to the European Common Market and in the circumstances I must repeat what I said in my maiden speech last year that wheat, meat and other commodity boards must step up activity to sell in all countries. The brigalow development will mean nothing without those markets. I refer to the development that is going on in the eastern Barcoo. I remind hon. members that all this brigalow development will be in the Country Party electorate of Mackenzie just as the Callide powerhouse will be in another Country Party electorate. It is not going into a Labour electorate. But we who are developing our own areas are particularly interested in marketing our products overseas.

In my area a wonderful experiment is being carried out by the graziers and the farmers and they are putting their best into the country. As I have said repeatedly, the country is exploding, bursting at the seams. Fresh reports of its productivity, of the sorghum harvest and the projected wheat harvest, will astound people who once looked upon that country as just pure grazing country not particularly suited to sheep because of the spear grass and so on. Now we are right on the ball. We are moving ahead.

Mr. Gilmore: Queensland has never had it better.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Not when it has the right people working—and they are working in that area; they are not letting Queensland down as others I could mention are. It is important for our markets overseas that our State and Federal Governments combine, and, if necessary, the Commonwealth Government must make credit facilities available for the expansion of markets.

I am concerned particularly about the wool industry. What will happen if this Common Market bloc comes in to bid at our wool auction as a unit instead of coming in as separate bidding countries? The wool industry is most important. Already prices are too low and lack of competition at the auction sales would mean further reductions. We must always remember that it has always been A.L.P. policy that the concept of living areas will be jeopardised if we reduce, or are forced to reduce, on the markets of the world, the return that our country needs for the people who pioneered the development

of the land and who are on those living areas in order to make a competitive living—not a good living but a competitive one.

Mr. Evans: You have just about got out of your depth, I think.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I have not got out of my depth but I know that a living area is not based on acreage; it is based on what the land will support and yield.

Mr. Evans: You were talking about markets.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Yes, I am talking about markets.

Mr. Evans: How are you going to control world markets?

Mr. O'DONNELL: It is not a question of controlling them; it is an endeavour to go after them to help ourselves.

Mr. Evans: Haven't we gone after them?

Mr. O'DONNELL: We have not had very good results so far.

Now I should like to refer to certain aspects of the Government's education policy that are affecting rural areas. In 1964 we are to have introduced a new primary syllabus which will mean that the existing 8th Grade will become Form I. in the Junior curriculum. However, I am not so concerned with education in the large centres. I know that there will be overcrowding and a shortage of teachers, but those about whom I am concerned are in centres like Jericho, Alpha, Capella, Marlborough, Omore, Tambo, Isisford, Muttaborra, and so on. I should like to know how those children are going to fare because there will be no high school tops for them. How is the Education Department—and I have great admiration for its officers—going to cope with this problem? I can assure hon. members that those officers are extremely good people, and I can find no-one able to contradict that.

Those children are faced with two alternatives. They have to remain at their school or move away to be educated in larger centres. The second course may be all right if the parents of the children can afford it, but how are the children whose parents cannot afford it to be given the opportunity that they deserve? Whilst I know it is rather early, I think that the Government should make a statement on this matter so that the parents of these children may know of the future that awaits them.

Mr. Low: They usually find out by writing a letter to the Minister.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I am sorry, but that will not get one anywhere. I think that the Government should be considerate and make an early statement on this matter so that there will be a clear understanding of what is to be the result of the change-over. I am not against the abolition of the State Scholarship; I am merely in favour of everybody

getting a fair go, and I do not think that the children in the isolated areas will get it unless the Government are prepared to come right out in the open and state how they will assist them.

Mr. Sullivan: As a school teacher, do you not agree that children in country areas are receiving much better treatment under this Government than under the Labour Government?

Mr. O'DONNELL: No. The growth of secondary education has come about because the numbers of children have increased and so given the opportunity for this expansion. Let me remind this House that as far back as 1941 the Labour Government had arranged to centralise all the one-teacher schools in the Crow's Nest area.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. O'DONNELL: It is all very well to talk about centralisation; all we know is that the Treasurer is centralising all the loose change in this State out of the pockets of punters and drinkers. In the Kingaroy district there was also a scheme for the centralisation of schools by the elimination of one-teacher schools, with the setting-up of a secondary department in the area. That was planned for years, and this Government cannot claim a great deal of credit for it. These progressive ideas have been laid down for many years. You cannot tell me that they do not have it in New South Wales, just because there is a Labour Government there.

Mr. Low: We have schools to teach them in, not trees to teach them under.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I am surprised at a gentleman like the hon. member for Cooroora making a statement like that.

Mr. Low: It is true.

Mr. O'DONNELL: It is totally untrue. Consideration should be given also to establishing Senior tops by a reduction in the minimum of 10 required today. I know of an instance in Barcaldine in which unfortunately the tenth student will be leaving the district after the Junior examination because of the transfer of his father, which means that their argument for a Senior top next year will go by the board. Why did I mention Barcaldine particularly? Because it has a problem in the sense that it is a residential town and cannot assimilate into employment the children who are school-leavers at the Junior level. They have either to leave the district to seek employment or to go to a school outside the area that has a Senior top. As I say, it is a residential area. The people concerned are usually employees on wages, and not very high wages. We know that it costs over £300 a year to keep a child at school away from home, and a Scholarship allowance is quite inadequate for this purpose.

Mr. Low interjected.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I do not want to listen to the hon. member's interjection. I am bringing these points before the House because they are problems facing the people in the Barcoo electorate. I should be pleased if the hon. member would worry about the problems of his own electorate.

Mr. Low: In 1963—

Mr. O'DONNELL: I do not wish to find out anything about 1963. I point out to the hon. member that the Australian Labour Party has a responsibility to the underprivileged people in this State. While I am representing the Barcoo electorate I shall discharge that responsibility, whether it pleases or displeases the hon. member.

Mr. Low: Once a year!

Mr. O'DONNELL: I will not tolerate any further interjections designed to put me off. I know of no political party in Australia that has had more regard for the underprivileged people in the community than the Australian Labour Party. That is quite easy to understand, because it is composed of people who were reared in the traditions of the Australian Labour Party and who, unlike some hon. members opposite who were reared in them, have not deserted them. Those traditions are based on the freedom of the individual and the responsibility of the individual, and the Australian Labour Party is strongly democratic and will continue to be democratic. We know that everyone has a right to personal property; but we also believe that that property must be socially conditioned because it is only in the interests of social justice that a person can exist in a true democracy. We do not want people to deny us those privileges, whoever they may be, whether they are monopolistic capitalists who want to have the sole right to production, or whether they are Communists who want conditioning of property and nothing else. We want a balanced democracy, and we can achieve this only through the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. Ewan: You are narrow-minded.

Mr. O'DONNELL: That is not being narrow-minded. Do not forget that our party has never deviated from the policy laid down by our fathers. They believed that social justice was required in their day, and we, who have inherited the best from them, believe that social justice is something for which we will have to fight as long as human beings exist because there will always be reactionaries who will decry whatever they can. We believe that the business man should be charitable and do whatever good he can for his employees and try to create more employment. We also believe that big corporations should give the workers who make their dividends possible a share not only in management but also in the dividends that go to people who do very little work. We do not deny anybody social justice, and hon.

members opposite cannot say that we have ever done so. They have put up hoardings saying, "Socialism versus a Free Society." To my mind that is ridiculous. I have taken part in country elections for years, and I believe that country people are far more sane than the people down here who would use such a slogan.

Mr. Sullivan: In other words, you admire country folk?

Mr. O'DONNELL: I have a great admiration for people in the country, and I believe that if we fail to develop the country everything else will fall down about our ears. We can thank our lucky stars—

Mr. Sullivan: That you got rid of a Labour Government.

Mr. O'DONNELL: The Australian Labour Party originated in the country, do not forget that, and it has a longer history than any other political party in this Chamber. In 1963 it will return to office and carry on where it unfortunately had to leave off in 1957.

Mr. KNOX (Nundah) (9.9 p.m.): In this debate I feel that I should first congratulate the mover of the original motion, the hon. member for Flinders, on the way in which he presented to the House a very exact record of some of the achievements of this Government, and some of the features of Government policy with which he has been associated in his own electorate. I should also like to congratulate you, Sir, as hon. member for Wavell, in so ably seconding the motion moved by your colleague.

I should like to take the opportunity of congratulating the new Leader of the Liberal Party, the Minister for Justice, and the Treasurer, who is now Deputy Leader. They have served the Liberal Party interests in a distinguished way for many years. They have been extremely conscientious members in this House both before and since becoming Ministers. Their service to the State is second to none.

I regret very much that Mr. Morris has found it necessary to retire from the leadership, and particularly the circumstances that made it necessary. He has worked extremely hard as a Minister, as Leader of our party and as Deputy Premier of the State. We who have been associated with him, both in Government, and in the case of some of us, in Opposition, know of his unbounded energy and enthusiasm and his capacity for hard work. In losing him we have lost a Leader of great ability. However, we are glad to note that it will be possible for him to continue as Minister for Labour and Industry, and to continue the excellent work he started when he became the holder of that portfolio, which enabled him to bring to Queensland many of the new industries which we now have.

Perhaps today, more than ever before, we on this side of the House were disappointed by the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. In a pre-election year, we would have expected, if the Leader of the Opposition desired to place before the people of Queensland any weaknesses that he may have found in the Government's policy, that he would have presented them in a strong and forceful manner, and would have made his speech effective. It was surprising to see and hear the Leader of the Opposition prefer to ramble about on all sorts of matters which are not of great importance to the people of Queensland, and engage in a political attack upon certain people on this side of the House. He wasted a great deal of his time on matters that could hardly be considered to be of great importance.

Mr. Graham: You would be a good judge.

Mr. KNOX: I might not be the best judge. Perhaps the best judges of these things would be the members of his own party who deserted him when he moved his amendment. Only nine members of his party were in the House when he made what might be considered an important speech.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. KNOX: The hon. member for South Brisbane was very obviously absent when his Leader was speaking. He should be the last to comment on it, because his Leader was one of those who tried to save him in his endorsement. There were only nine members of his own party in the House who listened to what was believed to be an important speech. Only three members of his own front bench deigned to listen to it. I do not claim to be a judge of the quality of his speech, or the importance of it. I ask hon. members to judge it by the representation of his own party at the time he made his speech.

In moving the amendment he felt he would be in a position to wield a big stick at the Government that may carry a threat today, and for some days to come. But it was surprising to see how little support he got from that side of the House.

Honourable members opposite who have spoken today have wasted their time on matters of parochial importance rather than in dealing with the general problems of the government of this State. If the people of Queensland are looking for an alternative Government—and I do not suggest for one moment that they are—they will be interested to know of the constructive thinking of the Opposition leaders and if they look at the speeches made today they will find nothing on which they can hope to pin any possible constructive ideas from that side of the House.

The first attack on the Government by the Leader of the Opposition was that we have failed to take practical and efficacious steps to remedy the disproportionately high percentage of unemployment. The Leader of the Opposition could hope to get a better time for launching an attack of this type because, in effect, at this time of the year unemployment is always at a fairly low level. That has been characteristic of Queensland's economy. The seasonal nature of our employment has been a feature of Queensland for nearly a century. Colleagues of the Leader of the Opposition in the Federal House believe that a level of unemployment of 2 per cent. is quite in order. That is the opinion of some members of the Socialist party in the Federal House.

It is rather strange to hear the Leader of the Opposition complaining about unemployment when we know that whenever new figures are published of increases in unemployment, the people with the biggest smiles on their faces in this House are those sitting on the Socialist benches. It has been the policy of this Government to provide a climate whereby people will have an opportunity to find jobs in a vast and expanding State. This climate has been provided with a great deal of effort and sacrifice and under somewhat difficult circumstances. Nevertheless, in this year, with all the difficulties we have been confronted with, our record for providing employment for the people of Queensland has been second to none. The increase in Queensland's population from December 1957 to December 1961 was from 1,400,000 to 1,500,000. That is an increase of just over 100,000 people in a matter of just over four years.

Mr. Newton: You have only found that out since the census was taken.

Mr. KNOX: Nevertheless, those are the facts, and I think the hon. member must be prepared to recognise them. It is interesting to see exactly what the employment position has been in the past few months. The figures I am about to give hon. members are a summary of the trend from the beginning of this year to the end of July. In Australia, as the result of special efforts made by the Federal Government to increase employment, the average fall in the number of those registered for employment was 31.4 per cent. In Victoria the drop was 18.9 per cent.; in New South Wales, with a Socialist Government, there was a drop of 26 per cent.; in Western Australia there was a drop in that seven-month period of 26.3 per cent. In Tasmania, again under a Socialist Government, the drop in registrations was 29.6 per cent. In South Australia the drop in registrations was 34.4 per cent., and in Queensland, in seven months, the reduction in the number registered for unemployment was 53.3 per cent.

A similar position exists with those receiving unemployment benefits. They are the people who are most in need. They are usually the most desperate in this tragic problem. The Australian average drop for those receiving unemployment benefits was just under 20 per cent. In Victoria it rose by 2.5 per cent. In New South Wales it dropped by 11.5 per cent.; in Western Australia it dropped by 11.5 per cent. In Tasmania, under a Socialist Government, it rose by 50.7 per cent. In South Australia it dropped by 17.6 per cent., and in Queensland, in seven months, from January to July of this year the rate of fall in the number receiving unemployment benefits was 57.8 per cent. That is the greatest reduction in the record of this State in more than 30 years. Indeed it was because the Premier was able to present the story of Queensland's development and need that he has been able to foster policies that, with the aid of the Commonwealth Government, have increased employment in the State, and it ill behoves the Leader of the Opposition to complain that we have done nothing about the problem. Our record in this is particularly good and far exceeds the record of any other State Government. The reduction is shown as a percentage but it is also represented by the total figure of registrations—from 30,000 in January to just over 14,000 in July, and it will drop further in the next two months.

Mr. Hanlon: What about after that?

Mr. KNOX: It is quite true—and hon. members recognise it, and members of the Opposition know it full well just as the majority of the community know it—that normally in the period November-December-January in Queensland there is an increase in unemployment. That has been so for nearly 100 years. It is a normal feature of the State's economy because the sugar season ends and the meat season ends and the seasonal workers normally find themselves without weekly work. That is nothing unusual.

Mr. Ewan: Doesn't the Industrial Commission take that into consideration when it fixes the wages?

Mr. KNOX: For seasonal work, yes.

We should look also at the more positive side of this. Consider that in the month of June in the last year that Labour was in office there were about 9,000 people unemployed, while at the moment there are just over 14,000 registered. We believe we can still improve on the existing figures. In the next couple of months we will certainly do so. Indeed, in June, 1957, there were 378.4 thousand people employed in Queensland apart from those in rural industries and domestic service. In June, 1962, five years later, there were 390.5 thousand people in

employment in Queensland under the same definition. That represented an increase of 12.1 thousand in that very short space of time.

Employment in factories increased, in spite of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. It increased only slightly but it increased. He said it had decreased.

Employment in building and construction increased in that period in spite of the claim by the Leader of the Opposition that it was declining.

The total employment in Queensland in January, 1962, was 375.1 thousand. In June of this year it was 390.5 thousand, an increase of 15.4 thousand in six months. This is the highest increase since before the war in that same period of time.

Mr. Davies: 15,000 in six months!

Mr. KNOX: Nearly 15,500 people found employment in Queensland in six months.

Mr. Mann: How many still unemployed?

Mr. KNOX: We do not say there are no unemployed. What we are saying, contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition claims, is that we are trying to find the jobs; we are providing the climate wherein the jobs are being provided, and, in the figures I have given, we have proof that our policies have been successful. In the first six months of Labour's last year of office in Queensland, they could find employment for only 8,500 people. We have nearly doubled that figure in the same period.

Mr. Newton: But you were given a special allocation to do it.

Mr. KNOX: Yes, we have received a special allocation to do it, thanks very largely to the advocacy of people like the Premier and the then Deputy Premier, Mr. Morris. They were able to present our case and tell our story and to convince the other States of our need so that we gained the support of the other States as well as that of the Federal Government. It is to the credit of the Leaders of this Government that they have been able to convince others that we need the help and that we have been able to use it sensibly and wisely. As for the future of young Queenslanders, which has also been mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, I remind hon. members that this problem of the increase in the work force of young people is not a Queensland problem alone. Every State and every nation of the free world is faced with the same problem. Hon. members who read the overseas Press will agree that in recent weeks there has been similar concern in Ireland, England, Germany, France, the United States, and Canada. All have exactly the same problem because of the increased birth rate just after the war, with these young people now coming into the labour force.

Mr. Hanlon: Every country has increased numbers at its high schools, but the hon. member does not use that argument there.

Mr. KNOX: That is not necessarily so at all. We have provided in this State lots of opportunities for young Queenslanders, which were previously denied by the socialistic Governments before us. It appears to me that members of the Opposition are frightened lest we convince the people of Queensland that we are genuinely interested in the welfare of the young people of the State. The more that we do for them, the more their parents will recognise what we are doing, and the stronger is our chance of winning the next State election and future elections.

By and large, the problem facing us is a temporary one, which will last four or five years. After it is overcome, as it will be, it will not occur again for quite a number of years. Members of the Opposition may well be worried about our success in providing a healthy future for young Queenslanders. We have been able to provide opportunities for higher education that were previously denied to them, and the claims of the Leader of the Opposition that all of these things were their thoughts and their plans, that all the sites were their sites, are quite incorrect. In my electorate two schools have been built in the last few years on sites that had to be found by this Government. Plans had to be prepared by this Government and the money had to be found by them for the provision of these facilities. We owe nothing to any previous Government in this policy.

It is a great pity that the previous Government failed to recognise this problem about to face us and provide for the future. If the Labour Party had remained in office I believe that we in Queensland would have been in the same position that they are in in New South Wales under a Labour Government. Schools there are overcrowded and children have to go to special schools; they cannot go to schools of their choice. Facilities are inadequate, the schools are specially zoned, and they are having all the trouble in the world because they did not provide far enough in advance. We are a long way ahead of New South Wales because of the thinking of the leaders of our Government on education.

The Leader of the Opposition surprised me greatly when he said that he supported the claim by an employers' representative, Mr. James, in regard to increasing employment opportunities for juniors. I note that support with interest because the Trades Hall unions have bitterly opposed claims by Mr. James with regard to the employment of juniors. They have said quite publicly—and here I am merely repeating what I have

read in the Press as having been said by Trades Hall leaders—that the employment of more juniors must mean a decline in the employment of seniors.

Mr. Mann: You have not any plans for the employment of juniors.

Mr. KNOX: The hon. member for Brisbane who has just interjected, and who seems to be so concerned with employment now, was a member of the Government on 19 March, 1957—I am sure he will remember the day quite well—when one of his Ministers rose to his feet and said—

“... in addition to the 400 building workers about to be dismissed, since 1 July last it has been necessary, owing to shortage of funds, to effect the following reductions in the number of Crown employees:—

Forestry	416
Irrigation	508
Public Works	300
Railways	500”

That is a quotation, appearing at page 1,519 of Volume 216 of “Hansard”, from a speech by a Minister of the Labour Government, of which the hon. member for Brisbane was a very ardent supporter.

Mr. Mann: Your Government sacked more than that from the railways alone. What are you talking about?

Mr. KNOX: Did the hon. member for Brisbane raise his voice in protest that day to stop those men being sacked? There is no record in “Hansard” showing that the hon. member protested against the sacking of nearly 2,000 men. He was silent.

The last point that the Leader of the Opposition made in support of his motion of no confidence was a sort of kite-flying in regard to the Ford, Bacon and Davis report. He promised that all sorts of terrible things would happen if it was implemented. I remind the Leader of the Opposition of a statement made by a very close friend of his—I gather that he is a very close friend, because they worked together to save the political life of the hon. member for South Brisbane—Mr. Frank Nolan. Mr. Nolan's view of the Ford, Bacon and Davis report was that it had many features that could be implemented to the advantage of the railways. He said he hoped that the Minister would not make any sackings as a result of it, and he also hoped that many of its features could be implemented because he thought that they might make the future of the railways more secure.

The Leader of the Opposition is not prepared to take anything that is a little bit grey or a little bit tinted. He wants everything in black and white. He is against the Ford, Bacon and Davis report entirely, and

he has conjured up all sorts of horrible pictures of the future if it is implemented. But there are some reasonable people in the railways, people who are a little closer to the railways than the Leader of the Opposition is now, who can see nothing but good coming to the railways as a result of the report. The Minister for Transport has made it quite clear that the Government will not indulge in wholesale sackings in the Railway Department and have not followed a policy of sacking railway employees as did the former Government. The Leader of the Opposition was a party to the sacking of railway employees at that time. I am sure that members of the Opposition will agree that although there has been a decline in the number of employees in the Railway Department that has not been as a result of sackings.

Mr. Hanlon: If you do not hire them you do not have to fire them, that is obvious.

Mr. KNOX: Misrepresentation of these facts by hon. members opposite is not to their credit. The Leader of the Opposition need not fear what might happen as a result of the implementation of the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report, because quite a number of the recommendations in it have already been implemented by the Government, being, as they are, an intelligent Government, a Government willing to accept new ideas that are going to make the railways run more economically.

Mr. Duggan: What about the Pinkenba line?

Mr. KNOX: The result has been an increase in patronage in quite a few lines in the Brisbane area, particularly on the Pinkenba line to which the Leader of the Opposition refers. I should like to assure him that there has been an increase in patronage on that line. It has become a little better financially than it was when he was Minister for Transport.

Mr. Duggan: You squealed publicly about the recommendations in the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report.

Mr. KNOX: We do not believe that the railways are to be treated as a toy, as the socialists treated them. We believe that they should provide a service and that, while providing that service, they should not be a burden on the people. Over the years the railways have drawn away very important funds that could have been used in other directions. This has been well known to the people of Queensland and many people have asked me, "Why are not the railways run more efficiently, more economically?" We have been able to provide many of the

answers that have been sought, and many people now realise that we are achieving results where former Governments failed.

Perhaps the next point which the Leader of the Opposition made in his no-confidence motion was that he believed that many of the functions of the Government were being performed by private and semi-private bodies. Is that something to be necessarily ashamed of? When this Government went into office they made it perfectly clear that they would seek the co-operation of industry, the co-operation of the trade unions, and the co-operation of the employers' organisations in providing a policy for development. Many of the things the Government have done in this respect have been to their credit, and many trade-union leaders enjoyed the confidence of our Ministers in some of the steps that have been taken.

It was this Government, through the Minister for Labour and Industry, that re-instituted the Health, Welfare and Safety Board. That was part of Labour's legislation for many years, but they allowed the board to become defunct because they found too many political cross-currents interfering with its workings. We have been able to reinstitute that board, on which there are representatives of the trade unions, the Government, and industry. Its members make recommendations to the Cabinet on matters of health, welfare, and safety in industry, and those recommendations become regulations under the Factories and Shops Act. That is another way this Government have been successful in seeking the co-operation of private bodies and private individuals to do a job for Queensland. We have been prepared to take quite a bit of advice from many private and semi-private bodies, to which the Leader of the Opposition referred. After all, if we are to be successful as a Government, we must have the co-operation of those people.

The Leader of the Opposition referred also to some of the teams that have promoted Queensland industry. I sense a note of jealousy in those remarks, because when he was Deputy Premier he was never able to encourage to this State the industries that our Deputy Premier, together with the team of people he took with him when he went overseas, was able to encourage. As a direct result of those approaches, apart from many other things, an oil refinery is now being built in Brisbane. That is a direct result of the efforts made by Mr. Morris on that occasion.

The beginnings and cultivation of industrial estates came as a result of those visits. Literally hundreds of inquiries came from overseas as follow-ups of the visits and contacts made in the countries this team

visited. It ill-behoves the Leader of the Opposition to belittle the efforts of the Minister, or the private individuals who were prepared to give their time and services for this State. They have been retained, and some of the people in that team are now overseas following up some of the contacts originally made.

The committee for the industrial development of this State, I believe, is called "The Active Eight", and consists of many business men who have been prepared to give their time to assist this State. They, too, have been successful in their venture.

I also remind the Leader of the Opposition that he made some remarks about nothing being produced as a result of the Minister's efforts. He referred to the Queensland Pocket Year Book for 1962, and made some generalised statement that there was a decrease in the number of factories in this State, not an increase as we have been claiming. I thought as a matter of interest I would check the record to see what the facts were. I find, contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition said, that there has been an increase in the number of factories in this State. The Leader of the Opposition evidently did not check his figures and relied upon other people, who apparently did not check them. He will find them on pages 72 and 73 of the little book to which he referred, and he will find that a record number of factories had been established in this State as at the end of the financial year, 1960-1961, which is the latest figure in this book. The Leader of the Opposition should check his facts before making attacks on the Government.

He went on to say that we had failed to establish large-scale secondary industries. I do not know why the Leader of the Opposition is so interested in large-scale secondary industries. Surely there are many small manufacturers who should be encouraged to this State. In fact, they have been encouraged by this Government. The Leader of the Opposition, when he was Deputy Premier, associated himself only with monopolies, whether transport monopolies, or oil monopolies, or people of that calibre, and he cannot see any further than monopolies and large-scale industries. In our policy we have encouraged the small man, as well as the large man, to establish himself in this State. It is only necessary to remind the Leader of the Opposition that the facts speak for themselves in this matter, as they do in the case of unemployment.

In retail sales alone, in the last four years there has been an increase from £301.7 million a year to £380.3 million, an increase in four years of £78.6 million. To give

some idea of the prosperity of the State, in four years motor-vehicle registrations have increased from 365,000 to 435,000, an increase of 70,000. The number of private companies registered and incorporated in Queensland in 1956-1957 was 547. In 1959-1960 it was 1,513. The total number of private companies registered and incorporated in Queensland in the five years from 1957 to 1962 was 5,500, an average of 1,100 a year. That is twice the figure that Labour was able to produce during its last year of office. I do not need to say any more about our steps in encouraging industry.

As to the attacks on the cost of living, let me remind hon. members opposite that those attacks are long out of date. Meat prices this year have dropped by up to 9d. a lb. in Brisbane, and lamb and mutton today can be bought as cheaply as they have ever been bought in the last five years. Hon. members opposite know that perfectly well. Let us have no more talk from hon. members opposite about increased prices, because the facts are as the housewife knows them. She sees what is happening.

I should like to give some idea of the prosperity of the people of Queensland. If hon. members were to look at the savings bank balances at the end of the financial year for 1956-1957 they would see that they were the equivalent of £102.3 per head. At the end of May, 1962, five years later, the average savings bank deposit per head was £129, an increase of £27, or almost 26 per cent., in the average savings of Queenslanders, in spite of credit restrictions and economic difficulties.

The Leader of the Opposition in his tour around Queensland became known as "Duggan the Knocker." At any time when he thought the Press were not present he knocked the Government, but he was embarrassed when some of his remarks that were reported in the Press were so easily contradicted. The Socialist mess his Government left for Queensland has taken some time to clear up, but in the five years that we have been the Government we have been successful in re-aligning the ship of State so that it is now headed in the right direction. The opportunities for Queenslanders to participate in the growing development of this State are increasing monthly, and the Leader of the Opposition is bitterly jealous of our success.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Mann, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.