

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 11 SEPTEMBER 1962

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 11 SEPTEMBER, 1962

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

QUESTIONS

DISMISSAL OF FORESTRY EMPLOYEES, GYMPIE DISTRICT

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

“(1) Is it true that twenty-one men were discharged by the Forestry Department in the Mary Valley on Friday, August 31, 1962, a further six were put off at Widgee and a further six at Toolara?”

“(2) Is it also true that twelve of the first twenty-one are to be re-engaged almost immediately and, if so, why was the original decision reversed so quickly?”

“(3) Does he not think that with the present high percentage rate of unemployment and the Government's plan to restore confidence in the private sector of the community any large-scale discharge of personnel is only aggravating the employment situation?”

“(4) Will he give the House any indication as to when it is anticipated that the Forestry gangs in the Gympie district will be brought back to full strength?”

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

“(1 to 4) As part of the Government's effort to relieve seasonal unemployment in the early part of this year, additional funds were made available to the Department of Forestry which was thus able to increase its wages staffing from 1,718 in January to a peak of 2,196 in May—a nett increase of 478 men. Of these, over 50 were engaged in the Gympie Forestry District which includes the Mary Valley. It was intended to continue these extra men in employment until the end of June only, but, in an endeavour to avoid the necessity for large-scale dismissal the large work force was carried forward into the new financial year in the hope that many of the extra men would gradually be absorbed into other avenues of employment. However, the level of funds available forced a reduction of staff at the end of August. The Government is anxious to maintain employment at as high a level as possible, and a reconsideration of the position allowed the withdrawal of notice in a number of cases. The extra employment provided early in 1962 was additional to the Department's normal staffing, and the number employed presently is far in excess of that level. However, as forestry work provides a very satisfactory ratio of employment to funds expended, the Government, in its constant review of the unemployment question, is endeavouring to retain employment to the fullest extent on Forestry works within the limits of finance available.”

PETRIE RAILWAY SERVICE

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister for Transport—

“In view of the statement by him that cancelled suburban rail services would be restored if hardship to a group of people were proved, and in view of the fact that I have been petitioned by eighty-one residents of Zillmere and other areas serviced by the Petrie line, will he re-consider his decision and restore the 2.55 p.m. train from Central Station, because the removal of this particular service has meant that school children have been forced to remain at railway stations for an hour in some cases and it has caused a great deal of inconvenience to shoppers and shift workers?”

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

“This matter has already been raised with me by the Honourable Members for Aspley, Wavell, Nundah and Nudgee, and whilst I have some knowledge of inconvenience caused to a number of school children from Virginia, unfortunately the business offering is not sufficient to warrant the expense of providing an extra service.”

LEVEL CROSSING BOOM GATES AT ALBERT STREET, WOOLLOONGABBA

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister for Transport—

“Has his attention been drawn to the recent collision between a train and a truck at the level crossing in Albert Street, Woolloongabba, on August 27, 1962, and, if so, will he make arrangements to have the booms operating at all periods during which trains are using this section of the line as, otherwise, a motorist could be lulled into a sense of false security?”

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

“The booms at Albert Street, Woolloongabba, are manually operated and when the signalman is off duty they are left in the raised position. ‘Stop’ signs with cats' eyes are provided about 10 feet from the track on each side of the lines. However, following the recent unfortunate occurrence the matter of some additional protection at this crossing is being investigated.”

FOUR-LANE HIGHWAY OVER TOOWOOMBA RANGE

Mr. ANDERSON (Toowoomba East) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

“(1) Has the survey in connection with the four-lane highway over the range leading to Toowoomba been completed?”

"(2) Will it follow the route of the existing highway from Essex Evans to Toowoomba or will it be re-located? If so, where will the route be?"

"(3) Will the work be commenced in this financial year?"

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

"(1) No."

"(2) These questions cannot be answered until the survey is completed and results analysed."

"(3) Yes."

VOYAGES IN UNSEAWORTHY CRAFT

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) asked the Premier—

"(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article and photograph in 'The Courier-Mail' of Thursday, September 6, reporting that a man named Horn is about to embark on a Pacific cruise in a ramshackle, home-made, galvanised iron contraption?"

"(2) Is he aware that a man named Arthur Wilson left Cairns in July last in a raft built of oil drums in a similar irresponsible escapade, but later abandoned the queer craft along the coast?"

"(3) In view of the fact that large sums of public money are spent and valuable lives are endangered and sometimes lost while later searching for these people, when they are reported lost or overdue at some point, will he have the matter fully investigated with the view to establishing (a) the bona fides of the people concerned, (b) whether these 'voyages' are actuated by a cheap desire for publicity and (c) that they lodge a substantial bond against the cost of any search and damages for loss of life in such search?"

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

"(1 and 2) Yes."

"(3) As a precaution against unseaworthy craft proceeding on voyages for which they are not adequately equipped, suitable Regulations were promulgated under the Queensland Marine Act on Thursday, September 6, 1962. The whole thought behind this action was that without seeking to impose any total Governmental control on all such movements, which would be most undesirable, there is sometimes that odd occasion where the State should have power to intervene both to protect citizens from what looks to be sheer folly and to avoid the resultant burden on the State and its citizens of hazardous search parties and high costs. The case which brought this forcibly under the Government's notice was the Carpenter expedition out of Cooktown, in which instance my colleague the Treasurer thought it proper to intervene and found there was no legal power to do so. The

Regulations now promulgated will provide an effective answer to this type of problem. For the information of the Honourable Member, I am advised that a detention order was served on the owner of the craft 'Herr Horn' on Saturday last, this being the first order under the amended Boat and Punt Regulations. The notice drew the attention of the owner to the fact that the vessel was considered unseaworthy for the waters in which it was to be used."

SMALL-BOAT HARBOUR, TOWNSVILLE

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough), for **Mr. TUCKER** (Townsville North), asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"Has any further progress been made with reference to the provision of a small-boat harbour for Townsville?"

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

"The proposal has reached a stage of acceptance, and commencement merely awaits the outcome of negotiations with the Townsville City Council concerning building of a rock wall and the widening of Palmer Street with the dredged spoil."

LEVEL CROSSING BOOM GATES AT BOUNDARY ROAD, COOPER'S PLAINS

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

"Has any progress been made in negotiations between himself, the Minister for Main Roads and the New South Wales Railway Department for the replacing of wooden gates with boom gates at the Kyogle railway crossing in Boundary Road, Cooper's Plains to eliminate the present traffic hazard which has been the scene of numerous accidents recently?"

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

"At the present time information is being awaited from New South Wales Railways before further consideration can be given to the matter."

COMALCO AGREEMENT, WEIPA

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

"(1) Has Comalco, the company which has the bauxite lease at Weipa, carried out all terms of the agreement itemised in the franchise, particularly with regard to money expended annually?"

"(2) What is the total expenditure Comalco has been committed to in the agreement?"

"(3) What is the total amount of the expenditure by Comalco since the granting of the franchise?"

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

“(1) Yes. The Company has more than carried out all the terms of the Agreement, and particularly with regard to moneys expended annually.”

“(2) Total moneys to be expended by the Company, in the terms of the Agreement, to the end of 1962, £725,000.”

“(3) Total expenditure by Comalco since the granting of the franchise, £3,850,000. I would point out for the information of Honourable Members that the expenditure to date is more than the total obligation imposed in the terms of the Agreement to the end of the tenth year (that is 1967). I think it timely to mention that statements which have been made in the House that Comalco was not complying with financial commitments in accordance with the franchise—which, incidentally, was approved unanimously in Parliament—are utterly irresponsible. It is regrettable that so many members are adopting the role of knockers.”

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE IN MACKAY ELECTORATE, 1963

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough), for **Mr. GRAHAM** (Mackay), asked the Premier—

“As there will be a large registration of unemployed in Mackay at the termination of the present sugar season, will he indicate what amount of public funds could be reasonably expected to be spent in the Mackay Electorate during 1963 in the following Departments:—(a) Main Roads, (b) Railways, and (c) Public Works?”

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

“I do not know on what basis the Honourable Member anticipates there will be a large registration of unemployed in Mackay at the termination of the present sugar season. However, I can assure him that the position in Mackay, as well as any other centre that may be affected, will be closely watched with a view to ensuring, as far as humanly possible, that those persons who desire to work are given the opportunity of so doing.”

HOUSING COMMISSION ACTIVITIES IN MACKAY ELECTORATE

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough), for **Mr. GRAHAM** (Mackay), asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

“(1) How many Electorates other than the Mackay Electorate showed a Nil Expenditure in Housing Commission activities during the year 1961-1962?”

“(2) Why was discrimination shown insofar as the Mackay Electorate was concerned in the allocation of Housing Commission funds for the year 1961-1962?”

“(3) Is there any likelihood of the Mackay Electorate being included in any allocation of Housing Commission funds during the coming year and, if not, why not?”

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

“(1) Dissection of expenditure or of any information affecting the activities of the Queensland Housing Commission has never been made under the heading of electorates, consequently the information sought by the Honourable Member is not available.”

“(2 and 3) No discrimination was shown. In Mackay, excluding Workers' Dwellings, the Commission has erected 71 houses and has 23 vacant allotments on the north side of the Pioneer River and has erected 106 houses and has no vacant sites on the south side of the river. Of these houses 92 are rental. At August 31 last, the Clerk of Petty Sessions held only one application of 80 points priority from an applicant to whom a house would not be allotted as it is considered he would not be a satisfactory tenant, and ten applications of 40 points priority. From this information it will be seen that the rental housing needs at Mackay have been met and it would be inadvisable to provide for houses in the Mackay Electorate during 1962-1963.”

SHIPMENT OF SILICA SANDS FROM WHITSUNDAY ISLAND TO JAPAN

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough), for **Mr. GRAHAM** (Mackay), asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

“(1) With further regard to his letter to me of August 30 on the matter of the arrangements for the removal of Silica Sands from the beach frontages on Whitsunday Island, can he give the House any further particulars with regard to the arrangements that have been agreed to by the Bowen Mineral Company Ltd., and the Japanese interests?”

“(2) Will he give an assurance to the House that, whatever arrangements exist with regard to this agreement, the beach frontages on this particular island will not be sacrificed so that some particular person or persons can make capital out of these natural assets?”

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

“(1) No further information is available. The proposals are apparently a business arrangement between the Bowen Mineral Company Ltd. and Japanese interests.”

“(2) The leases in question are below high water mark and the conditions imposed on same are such as to ensure there shall be no damage to the beaches.”

WATER SUPPLY, MARY CREEK AREA

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South), for **Mr. ADAIR** (Cook), asked the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation—

“Owing to the fact that tobacco grown in the Mary River area topped last year’s sales in Queensland for tobacco production figures and also return per acre, and as the future development of this area is restricted owing to the limited supply of water available, what measures have been taken by the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission for a permanent supply of water for this area?”

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

“The Irrigation and Water Supply Commission has not to date made any investigation of water conservation works on Mary Creek, locally known as Mary River. The position is the same as was indicated in my reply to a question by the Honourable Member in November last, when I informed him that thirteen licenses to divert water from Mary Creek were in force, each license being limited to an area of 10 acres. It is understood that almost twice the authorised area was irrigated last year. Normally the stream is capable of meeting irrigation requirements, but investigation of water conservation works will be made as soon as practicable. Meanwhile to meet future dry periods it is suggested that farmers consider provision of off-stream storage on their farms.”

DRIVER-TRAINING COURSE IN
SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

“In view of the increasing number of road accidents and the desire of all responsible people to see this accident rate decrease, will he have included in the proposed new educational curricula a course of driver training and traffic knowledge, generally, in secondary schools?”

Hon. H. RICHTER (Somerset—Minister for Public Works and Local Government), for **Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY** (Isis), replied—

“The Department is willing to co-operate in any scheme of driver training in secondary schools provided that the courses are held outside normal school hours or during vacations.”

PILOT STATION AT MOFFATT BEACH,
CALOUNDRA

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

“What is the Government’s purpose behind the proposed establishment of a shore-based pilot station at Moffatt Beach, Caloundra?”

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

“The purpose is twofold. Not only is it our wish to provide for the people of the near north coast a stable small-craft haven for which there has been a pressing need for many years, but it is our intention to use this haven to our maximum advantage and provide from it an efficient and more economic pilot service based on shore with staff living in the comfort of their homes and families rather than in the isolation of offshore floating quarters. Might I add that the construction of such a work would provide employment for a substantial labour force with a high local content.”

DISMISSAL OF FORESTRY EMPLOYEES,
MARYBOROUGH AREA

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) asked the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry—

“(1) Have men been dismissed from the Maryborough Forestry area since July 1, 1962? If so, when and how many from each centre in this area?”

“(2) Is it intended to dismiss men in the Maryborough area in the near future? If so, when, how many and from which centres in the area?”

“(3) How many men are employed at the Maryborough Tuan Forestry area at present?”

“(4) How many acres were planted at Tuan centre this year?”

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

“(1) Yes, as follows:—State Forest Reserve 915 (Tuan), three on September 3, 1962; State Forest Reserve 8 (Aramara), two on September 3, 1962.”

“(2) Yes. Notice of dismissal effective from September 7, 1962, has been given as follows:—State Forest Reserve 864 (Childers), three; State Forest Reserve 57 (Tiara), one; State Forest Reserve 676 (Woocoo), two; State Forest Reserve 958 (Bauple), three; Fraser Island, four. These dismissals were necessary to reduce to normal staffing following an increase in staff earlier in the year with the object of reducing seasonal unemployment.”

“(3) Forty-six.”

“(4) 478 acres.”

FISH BOARD PURCHASE OF REDCLIFFE ICE
WORKS

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

“On what date was the contract for the purchase of the Redcliffe Ice Works by the Fish Board from Gomersall Brothers signed, on what basis was the valuation of £19,000 for the purchase of these out-of-date ice works arrived at and by whom was the valuation made?”

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

"The assertion in the question that the ice works are 'out-of-date' is nonsense. The Redcliffe Ice Works is right up-to-date and fitted with modern equipment for the manufacture and expeditious handling of ice. It has an eight point automatic ice mould filler with electric hoist. It has two heavily insulated and heavily coiled ice tanks with a total holding capacity of 520 moulds. The two compressors of 50-ton capacity are capable of handling the heaviest loads under the most unfavourable weather conditions. The plant is complete with all electrical equipment including ice crusher, saws and an ice delivery truck. The building, which measures 80 feet by 50 feet or 40 squares, contains the ice-making plant and five insulated cold rooms. The land included in the sale covers four 20-perches highly elevated allotments with frontage to two streets and the area is fully sewered. Included in the sale were two modern brick frontage shops with cantilever awnings and a butcher's cold room, which were erected two and a-half years ago, at a cost of £4,750. The contract of purchase was signed on June 28, 1962. The Board satisfied itself of the value of the assets by inspection by its own officials."

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under the Co-operative Housing Societies Acts, 1958 to 1961.

Orders in Council under the Racing and Betting Acts, 1954 to 1961.

Orders in Council under the Treasury Funds Investment Acts, 1958 to 1960.

Regulation under the Fisheries Acts, 1957 to 1959.

Proclamation under the Agricultural Requirements Control and Conservation Act of 1939.

Order in Council under the State Transport Act of 1960.

QUEENSLAND MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—
Treasurer and Minister for Housing): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill to amend the Queensland Marine Act of 1958, in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

FISHERIES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—
Treasurer and Minister for Housing): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill to amend the Fisheries Acts, 1957 to 1959, in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

COMMONWEALTH AND STATE (GLADSTONE COAL LOADING WORKS) AGREEMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—
Treasurer and Minister for Housing): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill with respect to an agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the State of Queensland in relation to coal loading facilities at Gladstone, and for purposes incidental thereto."

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 6 September (see p. 326) on Mr. Lonergan's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, on which Mr. Duggan had moved the following amendment—

"Add to the question the following words—

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

(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."

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) (11.24 a.m.): I rise to support the amendment moved by my Leader and so ably supported by the hon. member for Barcoo, among others. I believe that the amendment, moved in the closing stage of this Parliament, is of particular interest to the people of Queensland. Since it was moved we have heard various Government members not only attacking the Australian Labour Party but also indulging in character assassination of people not in the Chamber. We have also noticed that the former Deputy Premier, Mr. Morris, had to come here from his sick bed in an attempt to excuse the failings of the Liberal Party and to prop up their policy on unemployment. It is well-known in Queensland that he was deposed from the position of Deputy Leader of the Government on account of his failings and of his utterances from time to time, and we now have new blood in that office in the person of the Minister for Justice, Mr. Munro.

The Minister for Labour and Industry is indisposed but is still hanging onto his portfolio, and had to come into this House to help prop up this Government and overcome some of the things said by other members of his party.

Then we had the speech of the hon. member for Redcliffe, who walked the tight-rope on three occasions, fell from grace in the Country Party, fell out with the Liberal Party, and was finally taken back by the Country Party as one of their beloved members. The hon. member for Bowen then came into the debate and spoke about the wonderful conditions in Bowen, and how he could solve the whole unemployment problem in Queensland by sending all without work, the whole 14,000, to Bowen. "We can take the lot," he said. What a ridiculous statement that was!

There have been certain statements in the Press concerning the hon. member for Greenslopes. I should like to say that never at any time has any member of the Australian Labour Party attacked him. I will say, however, that when he gets up to speak he usually has a chip on his shoulder and likes to criticise members of the Australian Labour Party, especially those who are officials in the trade-union movement. He does that every time he rises in this Chamber.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I rise to a point of order. I know that the hon. member for Greenslopes cannot do this, but I draw the attention of the Chair to the fact that it is quite useless for the hon. member now speaking to say that members of the Opposition did not cast aspersions on the war record of the hon. member for Greenslopes. The hon. member for South Brisbane was one of them and the hon. member for Salisbury was another.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will draw attention to any irregularity in the speech of the hon. member.

Mr. THACKERAY: We do not mind fair criticism, and I believe that every hon. member has the right to criticise. Government members certainly attack the Australian Labour Party whole-heartedly, and last week such an attack was made on the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, who is a very prominent man in the party. I challenge any member of the Cabinet to be as forthright and as open as was the Lord Mayor in declaring his financial position to the people of Queensland. I should like to see the Minister for Transport rise and declare his assets.

Mr. Hughes: Do you say that the Lord Mayor is a good Labour man?

Mr. THACKERAY: I say that he is an excellent Labour man; he always has been and always will be. I notice that "The Morning Bulletin" in Rockhampton was right behind the Government. The editor received an O.B.E. from the Queen, no doubt on the recommendation of this Government, and presumably felt that he must do something to prop them up. He said in his editorial—

"The Moonie oil strikes and interest in the State's coal and mineral resources by strong outside financial interests all conspired to give Queensland more money than perhaps she quite knows what to do with."

I should like to know where some of that money is.

The editorial goes on to say in another paragraph—

"Two other grounds for the no-confidence motion—the tragedy of thousands of young Queenslanders whose future has been jeopardised by the refusal of their right to work' and 'the failure of the Government to promote large-scale secondary industries' are so much poppycock."

This is what Mr. Westacott, the editor of "The Morning Bulletin", said is all poppycock. I will show later whether or not it is poppycock.

The Government think that everything is rosy and that they will win the next election. They should read the report in last Saturday's "Courier-Mail" of the result of the latest Gallup poll, which shows a swing to the A.L.P. in Queensland. In February of this year 52 per cent. of the people of Queensland said that they would vote for

the A.L.P., and that figure is the same today. On the other hand, the Country Party and the Liberal Party have lost 4 per cent. of their supporters in that period because of the various taxes they have imposed—the liquor tax, the betting tax, increases in stamp duties, stock return fees, and increases in the valuation of land.

Another question that is exercising the minds of the people of this State is, what is the position of the former Premier, Mr. V. C. Gair? Is he a liaison officer in the Department of Labour and Industry or is he the full-time organiser or agent for the Q.L.P., being subsidised by the Government? I should like to know how a man in his position can openly say to the Government, "Well, you bring in preferential voting and we will give you a helping hand," while he is still employed in the Department of Labour and Industry. As I and other hon. members know, it is very difficult to find him in his office. When one does find him there, he has a clean desk because he has no work to do. What industries has he brought to Queensland? What have the Government to show for the salary of £2,500 that they pay him?

There is a very pertinent article in "Sunday Truth" of 26 July, 1962, about the jaunt of Cabinet to Quilpie. The Queensland Cabinet could well be referred to as "Hagen's Circus" because of this latest visit. Members of Cabinet went there to prop up a member of one of the Government parties who is losing his popularity and who will be defeated by the A.L.P. candidate in the coming election. Cabinet embarked on this costly jaunt merely to try to keep the seat safe for that hon. member. The new Leader of the Liberal Party went out there in his corduroy trousers and his big hat, and he is well-named "Maverick of the West". The Premier told the people what a wonderful "Twister" the Minister for Education and Migration was, and Mr. Pizzey did so many dives and twists that no-one knew which way he was going. I want to place it on record that in my opinion these jaunts have become a farce.

The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, in answering a question this morning, gave us some information about Weipa and the fact that, up to date, Comalco had fulfilled the terms of its contract. Let us look at it. The company has approximately 4,000 square miles. For the first five years, from 1958 to 1962, it has to pay £2 a square mile. I am open to correction on these figures, but I understand that it is £4 a square mile for the next 10 years, and then it rises to £15 to £20 a square mile. It works out at 3d. an acre for the first five years, then rises to 5½d. and 7½d. an acre, and the Government have the right to take back a certain number of acres if the company does not abide by the terms of the contract. The main point is that the people of Queensland are receiving only 6d. a ton royalty. The Minister is reported

in Volume 232 of "Hansard" at page 2306 as saying that 600,000 tons of bauxite valued at £1,500,000 will be exported to Japan in the three-year period from 1963. The royalty payable to the Government on that is only £15,000. If that is worked out on the basis of the article to which I have referred the bauxite is being exported for a return of 2½d. a ton. That is the return on the value of bauxite exported.

Mr. Evans: That is exactly in accordance with what is in the Act, which was passed by your Government.

Mr. THACKERAY: I believe we are giving it away; it is far too cheap.

Mr. Evans: We have not altered your Act.

Mr. THACKERAY: The people of Moura are very worried about many aspects of the operations of Peabody-Thiess who, it has been stated on the radio, will be given an extension of their franchise for a period of, I think, 40 years. I have visited Moura recently and I know that many of the people there are greatly disturbed at the position, because the Government have not told them the exact position on resumptions.

In addition, Peabody-Thiess are not meeting the conditions laid down in our industrial Acts, particularly in relation to scaffolding. Recently the miners of the town and members of other unions met Peabody-Thiess by way of deputation. The Building Workers' Industrial Union organiser is out there now and the organisations are not at all happy at the conditions operating. I believe these people should meet their obligations under Queensland Acts.

Figures showing the incidence of unemployment have been quoted by members on this side of the House. The latest figures available to us show that the number of registered unemployed in Queensland is 14,195. The Minister for Labour and Industry came into the House the other day with his own set of statistics to prove that the proportion of unemployed was less than 1 per cent. We are unable to obtain those figures and we should like to see his record. The only figures available to us are those supplied by the Commonwealth Statistician's department. Even now there are 374 unemployed at Rockhampton.

Much has been said by members of the Government over the last two or three years about factory employment in Queensland. The Government are always blowing their trumpet about the number of new factories coming to Queensland and claim they have done a wonderful job. Their theme is that men are being absorbed into factory employment and that there is nothing to worry about.

I should like to quote from the journal of the Bureau of Census and Statistics, No. 25, page 3, which sets out the statistics on shops and factories in Queensland for 1960-1961. This bulletin has just been released and it shows that there has been a fall in the number of male employees, in the wood-working section of 586; in the food and drink section of 605, and in the furniture and bedding section of 150. The article discloses the number employed in factories in Queensland in June, 1961, and other information as follows;—

"In June, 1961, factories in Queensland employed 17,217 workers under 21 years of age, of whom 10,954 were males and 6,263 were females. This was a decrease of nearly 5 per cent. in total juvenile employment compared with June, 1960. There were 641 fewer males under 21 and 198 fewer females under 21."

Further over, the figures disclose a drop in males and females employed in factories in Queensland from 102,483 in 1959-1960 to 99,322 in the year 1960-1961, a drop of 3,161 or 3 per cent. The figures show that the number of youths employed in factories in Queensland dropped by more than 5 per cent., in spite of the fact that the Government are always boasting about the great job they are doing for youths. Taking textiles and textile goods, not including dress materials, the drop in the employment of boys and girls was 17 per cent. In the skins and leather section there was a 14 per cent. reduction, and in the saw-milling and joinery section a drop of 22 per cent. The Government cannot say that they have helped in the employment of youths in factories in Queensland. The latest figures prove what is happening in that direction.

The Government have always talked a great deal about decentralisation and how they believe in it. The statistics show that in the southern portion of Queensland 73 people in 1,000 are employed in factories. In the northern portion of the State 62 in 1,000 are employed in factories, whereas in Central Queensland the figure drops to 49. That proves conclusively that decentralisation has not taken place in Central Queensland.

The following figures show the number of apprentices indentured and serving time in the Rockhampton district in the last six years:—

1957	628
1958	603
1959	593
1960	590
1961	572
1962	534

In six years under a Tory Government the number has dropped by 94. That is how Rockhampton has advanced under this Government. There has been an increase of eight in the number of factories, but the overall increase in the number of workers is only 159.

The Premier has made many statements about what he was going to do. In "The Courier-Mail" of 3 December, 1959, we read—

"British Move on £9 Million Fertiliser Plant in Central Q."

That is the last we heard of that one. On another occasion we read—

"'Millions for C.Q. Venture'—Nicklin.

"The Premier (Mr. Nicklin) said last night he hoped before the end of the month to announce an investment 'worth some millions in Central Queensland. He said it would be connected with fertilisers, and based on Mt. Morgan pyrites."

That was the last we heard of that one.

The Federal Australian Labour Party have said quite openly that when they are returned to office they will invest over £60,000,000 in the north of Australia. We in Central Queensland will reap some benefit from that. At the moment the Commonwealth Government have forgotten all about the North. In Central Queensland we could support many industries. As far as we are concerned the answer to the problems of Central Queensland is large secondary industries.

I am quite happy about the brigalow scheme; it will mean that about 120 people will go on the land. It must have an effect on Rockhampton's industries and in other fields of commerce. But in my opinion it is only of secondary importance compared with what is required. In Central Queensland we have a need for such industries as a steel works, aluminium plant, chemical and fertiliser works, and flour and cotton mills. We believe that the area can support them. In the Fitzroy watershed alone there is a run-off of over 5,500,000-acre feet each year. Sydney's water consumption amounts to 101,000,000 gallons a day. The run-off from the Fitzroy River in one year would supply Sydney for 40-odd years. We believe that those industries should be started.

Mr. Sheil, the Manager of the Mt. Morgan mine has openly stated that there are 100,000,000 tons of limestone of startling purity at The Caves, with many more big deposits elsewhere. Limestone is a basic element in the manufacture of cement, which is used in the construction of weirs, roads, and bridges, and is an essential commodity in the steel and chemical industries. Mr. Sheil informs us, too, that large quantities of soda ash are available. It is composed of limestone and salt, and could be used to produce alumina from bauxite. There are large deposits of salt at Bajool, and this industry has been developed in the last three or four years. At Mt. Morgan there are 7,000,000 tons of pyrites, which can be made into sulphuric acid and fertilisers. Carbide is a major factor in the manufacture of plastics from lime, coal, and coke, and it is found in large quantities, of great purity,

only in Central Queensland. Port Alma and Gladstone are natural ports and there is a railway system of approximately 400 miles connecting them with the Central Queensland hinterland. The State Government must impress upon the Federal Government the urgent necessity for the appointment of a Federal commission to examine the possibilities of developing these industries in Central Queensland. If we had a commission similar to the Snowy Mountains Authority we would progress in leaps and bounds and would not lag as we are at present.

I now refer to the Rockhampton City Council and a few matters of local interest to Rockhampton. In the Budget brought down by the town clerk of Rockhampton on 27 July, 1962, there appears a point of particular interest that I should like to raise. The town clerk said—

"The amount of carryover loans are a matter of concern, as in the year 1961-1962 the total Loan expenditure amounted to £440,000, and the carryover was £404,292."

I want to know what sort of loans they are. Are they loans from the Treasury Department or debenture loans, and why have they been carried over? A fortnight ago a man was sacked from employment in the Rockhampton City Council because of shortage of loan works. His name was Tony Mather and he was the campaign director for Mr. C. White, the endorsed A.L.P. candidate for Rockhampton South. I believe he was sacked on political grounds, and for no other reason. How could the Council substantiate the allegation of shortage of loan works when there is a carryover of £404,000? The people of Rockhampton should know about it.

Mr. PILBEAM: I rise to a point of order. I think I should explain that the man claimed victimisation and an approach was made to the court, which ruled that there was no victimisation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The hon. member for Rockhampton North.

Mr. THACKERAY: There was an industrial conference and Mr. Applin recommended that he be re-employed when loan money was available. What is this amount of £404,292 doing there? Why hasn't it been used? This sacking was only a political trick. They wanted to get rid of Mr. Mather from the city council. He has an excellent background. He has the qualifications of an overseer but is working as a ganger. If there was a shortage of loan money, why should he be sacked and no-one else? No-one can say anything against him because he is an excellent worker.

On 7 June last I asked a question in the House about the price of petrol in Rockhampton and also about reductions in rail freight from Gladstone to Rockhampton.

Previously the rate was 100s. 6d. a ton inclusive of handling and shunting charges from Gladstone to Rockhampton. The Railway Department reduced the charge on petrol to 50s. 6d. a ton, showing a reduction of 50s. a ton. It is estimated that there are 300 gallons of fuel to the ton so the reduction in freight represented 2d. a gallon. The people of Rockhampton were given 1½d. a gallon. In reply to a series of questions I asked the Minister for Justice, I was told that Mr. Fullagar was still making inquiries. I have a very high regard for Mr. Fullagar but I do not think he is being allowed to pursue those inquiries. I believe he is being told to lay off and that the people of Rockhampton are not being given the extra ½d. a gallon to which they are entitled. Instead of being passed onto the consumer it is going to the oil companies. The Minister for Justice should tell us at once why the ½d. a gallon has not been given to the people of Rockhampton.

I should like to say a few words about the Rockhampton price of bottled beer, particularly Fourex, and canned beer. A few months ago "Sunday Truth" had to prod Mr. Kelly out of his slumber on the exorbitant prices of spirits in the West, and I should like to prod him once more to go up to Central Queensland and have a look at the racket operating with the breweries and the wholesale distributors there. It is not the hotel proprietors who are "copping" the rake-off; it is one of these other two. There is a great deal of dissension in Rockhampton among hotel proprietors about the price being charged up there. It is no good the breweries telling us that freight is responsible, because a concession is given by the Railway Department for the carriage of beer from Brisbane to Rockhampton. Most of the merchants buy in 12-ton lots and the rate is 120s. a ton from Brisbane. At 60 cartons of beer to the ton the freight works out at approximately 2d. a bottle. The price of Fourex in Rockhampton is 4s. 9d. a bottle as against 3s. 4½d. in Brisbane. The profit on Fourex beer allowed the publican is approximately 22 per cent. The same rates apply to canned beer except that there are 90 cartons to the ton and the freight from Brisbane to Rockhampton works out at ½d. a can. This is how the racket has operated in Rockhampton. Southern beer, V.B. canned, is sold to the hotel proprietors of Rockhampton at the same price as Fourex cans in Brisbane. Although the cans have to travel an extra 1,000 miles from the South, the wholesale distributors in Rockhampton have the game tied up so tightly that they say, "It is all the one price." You pay the same price for Fourex in Rockhampton as you pay for southern canned beer. I suggest that Mr. Kelly rise from his seat in Brisbane and go up there to investigate the prices resulting from the monopoly operating with the breweries and the wholesale distributors, because the people of Rockhampton are sick and tired of being fleeced by the merchants.

I should now like to say something about the cemetery trust in Rockhampton. The members of this trust are very upset at the moment over the Government's failure to do something about providing land for a new cemetery. This has been going on since at least December of last year. At present there is sufficient land available for no longer than another nine months. Representations have been made to the Department of Health and Home Affairs, the Department of Public Lands, and the Department of Education, but nothing has been done to provide more land.

The city council realises the position. It has done very good work there in providing machinery to mow the grass at the cemetery, but I can say without any doubt that the cemetery in Rockhampton is the worst in Queensland. People could break their ankles getting into it. Women going to funerals have to negotiate grass and broken bottles, and other obstacles.

The trust is in no position to carry out the work. I doubt whether it has sufficient money to meet long-service leave payments and the cost of accumulated leave. What it requires is a block of land, and representations have been made to the Minister for an area of land situated in the University block site, portion 65. It is owned by the Department of Education, but so far we have been unable to get any of it from them. It is situated at the Yepoon turn-off, and contains approximately 100 acres.

The Rockhampton Cemetery Trust plans to make this a model cemetery, with no headstones. The whole of the grounds will be mown, and it will be laid out similarly to some of the cemeteries in the South. The trust also requires a loan of approximately £5,000 to begin work on fencing, offices, and machinery. It is now up to the Government to do something about it. This has now been going on for over nine months and the trust is sick and tired of it. The sooner the Minister gets a move on, the better it will be for the people of Rockhampton.

Another thing to which I wish to refer is the water supply at Keppel Sands. When I was member for Keppel we made representations, with the members of the Livingstone Shire Council, for a water supply to that seaside town. Situated about 25 miles from Rockhampton, it is one of the beauty spots of the district. There are approximately 120 homes there, owned mostly by Rockhampton people.

This water supply was approved and gazetted in September, 1959. It was estimated to cost £2,700, with a subsidy of approximately £540. The cost at present is £2,727 6s. 5d. I should like to know if the Director of Local Government approved of it. Did the men in the office of the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission approve of it? Did they ever investigate it? Have they looked at the

reticulation? The water supply is drawn from a well approximately 2 miles from Keppel Sands. It served over 8,000 American soldiers during the war years. They had a 6-inch main from the well down to Keppel Sands, and to where they had their landing barges. It is no good saying that there is not sufficient water there; there is. The failure lies in the original approval of the plan, under which the water supply system was to be powered by a 3-h.p. electric motor driving a pump with a 2½-inch bore and a 5-inch stroke, sucking the water up through a 1½-inch pipe and discharging it through a 1½-inch pipe into a 2-inch main. The main is rusted inside, and the water is going through it to Keppel Sands. Homes are connected to the main before it gets to the two 10,000-gallon tanks, which are supposed to provide reticulation to the beach-front. I think it comes down in about 1½-inch and 1½-inch pipes to supply half-inch outlets to the homes. There is no water in the pipe and no water in the tank, and no water will ever reach the beach-front because of the number of people who are tapping the 2-inch main before it reaches the tanks. The Livingstone Shire Council has made headlines of the fact that a person who is prepared to employ a licensed plumber can get his home connected to the water supply. Many people have spent £50 or £60 to get water to their homes but none has come through the main. The scheme is a complete failure. At least a 6-inch pipe is needed for delivery from the well, the tanks should be increased to 100,000 gallons' capacity, and more tanks should be provided at the other end of the bluff to be filled at night when there is less demand on the water. No-one is satisfied with the present scheme, and it is up to the Director of Local Government to go up there and see what can be done about it. He should inquire why it was ever approved, because £2,700 of the rate-payers' money has been completely wasted.

Dealing briefly with housing, in the last financial year Rockhampton was hit harder than any other part of Queensland in home building approvals. In that period only 198 homes were built in Rockhampton, whereas 352 were built in Toowoomba, 572 in Ipswich, and 463 in Townsville. If there were more secondary industries in Central Queensland, building would increase. However, we have not the secondary industries that we need, and the figures for housing give a very good guide to the prosperity of Rockhampton. The business people in Rockhampton say that the city is flat at present.

As my time is running out, I shall leave my comments on the Ford, Bacon and Davis report till the Budget debate. I content myself with saying that the £120,000 spent on the report was completely wasted. The Minister for Transport should have set up a consultative committee.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HEWITT (Mackenzie) (12.9 p.m.): I should like to take this opportunity of once again congratulating His Excellency the Governor and Lady May on the way in which they have made their time available to travel to many of the outlying areas of the State, thus getting to know the problems of the people living there. Through His Excellency, I also reaffirm my loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen.

We have heard much in the debate on the amendment about things that this Government have not done. I for one should like to say that I am whole-heartedly behind the Government because I believe that, over the last five years, they have carried out much excellent work and contributed a good deal to the development of the State.

The other day in this House an attack was made on me by the hon. member for Warrego on the brigalow-development scheme that is to be undertaken within the Dawson, Mackenzie, and Isis Rivers catchment areas. As one who is fully conversant with those areas and the problems associated with them, naturally I feel that I am able to speak with some authority. For the hon. member for Warrego to come here and make accusations such as he did—more or less stating that I had some privilege that was denied to other hon. members—is a lot of eyewash. Had he been energetic enough and keen enough, he could have found out the same things as I did in relation to how the £1,750,000 was to be spent. The information was available to everyone. We all knew that £1,750,000 was to be spent for this development during the current financial year. As most hon. members know, most of it is being spent within the bounds of the Mackenzie electorate. I am proud of that fact and make no apology whatever on his accusations about my calling a public meeting at Theodore after a discussion with the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation and the Chief Lands Commissioner, Mr. Eric Muir.

We discussed the whole problem and decided that the people who were living within that area were entitled to know what was likely to happen. Therefore, this public meeting was called. What is more, it was attended by approximately 300 people, virtually all the land-holders within the bounds of the No. 1 area to be developed, and many of those in the No. 2 area.

Mention was made of a photostat of the Rockhampton "Morning Bulletin", which circulates in the Central Queensland district. I shall read what the leading article has to say about that meeting. It says—

"The Brigalow Meeting"

"What was called 'the brigalow meeting' at Theodore on Saturday was a most important one to many people, for several reasons.

"To begin with, it should have nipped in the bud symptoms of dissatisfaction amongst land-holders which appeared to

be taking root, judging by certain Press correspondence, which rather more than hinted at preferential treatment for some and injustice to others.

"Secondly, it made public a lot more than was hitherto known about this national scheme to develop to its maximum economic productivity a vast area of country by the clearing of scrub, the establishment of improved pasture, provision of further water points, additional subdivisional fencing, and ultimately the cultivation of fodder crops.

"In his address to the 200-odd farmers and settlers who attended the meeting, the Chief Lands Commissioner (Mr. Muir) can be said to have cleared the air considerably. He gave in clearly understandable terms details about certain things which are agitating the landowners in the brigalow belt—details relating to the areas affected, tenure and the question of compensation for land already cleared and coming within the area involved.

"There is a general idea that the brigalow belt is a vast area of unalienated Crown land which has only to be cleared, grassed and offered for selection and the district's cattle population is on the way to being doubled. The fact is that much of it is held under lease by a number of settlers who are alarmed at the thought that they may be deprived of it under less than equitable terms.

"Mr. Muir gave an assurance that the incorporation of existing leases in the scheme would be conducted by negotiation with the holders. He had to answer some delicate questions regarding future tenure and compensation payable where clearing had already been done or was in progress, but he implied that these things would come out all right if there was trust in the bona fides of the Government. He urged the fullest co-operation by lessees with the Land Commission. 'If you will co-operate with us we will co-operate with you,' he said.

"If the answers to questions and general statement did not clear away all doubts they went some distance along that path. They were strengthened by Mr. Hewitt, M.L.A., who is clearly on the side of the settlers. The Lands Department, he was sure, was out to help them. Moreover, he hinted that the new Land Act to be introduced this session would contain good news for them.

"In view of this it would seem that the settlers can afford to take things at face value. Many of them will probably find themselves better off than they would have been without any disturbance to the occupancy of their holdings. That, of course, will remain for time and experience to unfold.

"For those who are not directly affected but see in the brigalow scheme something of great importance to the Central Division, there is a lot to be gratified over. Not the least is the Chief Commissioner's anticipation of the scheme being sufficiently advanced for new settlement to commence within a year. It would be a tragedy if any serious obstacle were placed in its way at the outset.

"The Commonwealth and State Governments have embarked on an enterprise from which much good is expected to accrue for the Central Division, for the State and the Commonwealth. One goal alone is worth striving for—the big increase of the region's cattle-carrying capacity from 124,000 head to 340,000 head.

"It is not a half-baked idea with a lot left to chance.

"The most expert men in the employ of Commonwealth and State have visited the area, made a thorough investigation and pronounced: 'No better area in the State lends itself so much to economic development.'

"The brigalow scheme, if it does all that is expected of it, could not only be a great thing in its own right, but might set the pattern of all future development schemes in the northern part of Australia, the nation's most pressing need now and for some time to come"

That is the article that the hon. member for Warrego held up, suggesting that there was something sinister about it. I take a lot of satisfaction out of the fact that I went along to that meeting. We were able to clear the air. One land-holder who asked two or three questions had approximately 60,000 acres of land. Most probably under the scheme he will finish up with no more than 10,000 acres. He was asked by someone, "Are you in favour of or against this scheme?" He said, "I am whole-heartedly behind the scheme. I think it is a very good thing." That was the spirit of the meeting right through. There was no trouble whatever. If we are knockers of this sort of thing where will we finish up? It is something that we need. It has great potential. Reference is made in that article to the fact that I was on the side of the original settlers. I am proud of that fact. They are the men who pioneered the way. They were the ones who did a job when things were difficult. The roads were bad. In those days doctors were perhaps many miles away. It was not a matter of merely a trip of hours, but perhaps days, in a buggy or some other means of transport not even as convenient as a buggy. They are entitled to some consideration, and I am certain that the Minister and the department in their wisdom are fully conscious of that and will give them just a little extra because they pioneered the area. I make no apologies for what I have done.

The hon. member for Warrego also criticised the system of land-balloting in this State. I assure him that there has been very little change in land ballots. In other words, the old Labour system has been followed, but my view is that there should be a change. This, I feel certain, will be brought about when the Bill consolidating the Land Acts is brought down. In a minute or two I will substantiate that statement. The hon. member referred to Angellala Downs and Bonus Downs and said how different were the ballots for those properties compared with ballots in the days of the Labour Government. How silly can the remarks of the hon. member be! I shall point out what happened with Angellala Downs. For Lot No. 1, portion 8, parish of Mountview, with an area of 21,737 acres and an annual rental of 6d. an acre, there was a survey fee of £335 15s., the provisional value of the improvements was £6,492, and applicants needed cash, readily-convertible assets or stock to a value of not less than £8,000, a matter of £1,500 more than the value of improvements.

For Bonus Downs, Lot No. 1, portion 9, parish of Dunkeld, with an area of 24,191 acres, the provisional value of improvements was £7,490 and applicants needed £9,000. For Lot 2, portion 5, parish of Tullundunna, the value of improvements was £17,585 and applicants needed £19,000. For Lot No. 3, portion 10, parish of Dunkeld, with an area of 23,977 acres, valued at £7,070, applicants required £9,000. Those were the conditions applicants had to comply with to enter those ballots. I can recall a ballot in my own area in 1956 for portions 8 to 10, parish of Barfield, County of Ferguson, and portions 15, 17 and 18, parish of Tarramda, County of Dawson, Shire of Banana. An applicant had to comply with these conditions—

"That he is in a position to pay the provisional valuation of improvements within the period allowed and in addition, is possessed of cash, readily-convertible assets or stock of a sufficient value to enable him to establish a reasonable equity in the portions applied for."

Where is the difference? There is virtually no difference at all. It is a lot of nonsense to say there is.

The hon. member said that Angellala Downs and Bonus Downs were resumed for closer settlement. They were not resumed at all. They were expired leases that became available to the Crown.

Let me cite another instance or two. I can well recall the Auburn ballots. Before I thought of entering Parliament there were two boys named Hamilton who would have made excellent settlers under any conditions if they had been allowed to go to ballot, but they were ruled out by the Government of the day as ineligible. Under this Government one of those lads has since drawn a block in the Taroom district and he is a very successful tenant of the Crown.

I do not know where the hon. member for Warrego is heading when he makes statements so far off the beam. In one breath Labour talk of closer settlement and of what they did in their day while, in the very next breath, they say something quite different.

Let us look back and take the case of a certain area not far away, where closer settlement has taken place. Under Labour one person held approximately 500,000 acres of country. I can give anyone the name of the properties and tell him where it is. Not only that, we had the spectacle of a property controlled by the Queensland Government, under the Queensland-British Food Corporation scheme, with an area of 364 square miles, situated on the main Bruce Highway about halfway between Rockhampton and Mackay. It contained thousands of acres of top-class scrub land and numerous permanent water facilities. Mind you, the Labour Government owned the property—and what did they do when they sold it? They sold it stock and all, and I can tell hon. members here and now that it had approximately 11,000 head of cattle on it plus substantial improvements. The value of improvements and stock would almost have made what the property brought. They received £155,000 for it and they sold it lock, stock, and barrel. Moreover, they gave a brand-new lease to try to attract competition, and written into the terms of that lease was a provision that there would be no resumption rights during the first 15 years of its term. If hon. members opposite want to suggest that we as a Government fail to do justice in our land policy, let them say whether there is any justice in that. Let them first take a look at what happened in those days.

Furthermore, we hear talk of sub-standard areas and so on under this Government. I have had a few cases in my area that did not come about during our time but, thanks to the present Minister, we have been able to fix up one area. They were very sub-standard. Although they are not really as good as we hoped they would become, the Minister and the department did as good a job as possible. We still have on our plate another area that we are trying hard to do something about. I feel certain that it will receive the favourable attention it deserves.

Although I have had to criticise the hon. member for Warrego, I am very pleased at least that the hon. member for Barcoo and the hon. member for Rockhampton North did not try to knock the brigalow development scheme in the same way as their colleague did, because it is something in which they should be co-operating. If they want to further the development of Queensland they should all be playing their part.

Leaving land matters, I should like now to refer to some things that have made a great difference in my area. I mention first the field of education. Through the efforts of this Government, great improvements have

taken place. At Mundubbera a new high-top will be ready for the start of the 1963 school year. That has been needed for a long time. We also have a high-top at Theodore, with all buildings and equipment brought up to a very high standard. We have our problems at Monto, where at present they have both Junior and Senior courses and there is a certain amount of overcrowding. I trust that the Minister will look into this matter and see that by the beginning of the 1964 school year this centre has a separate high school to meet the needs of the area.

Dingo is only a small place, but on Saturday I had the privilege of opening the new school that has been erected there to replace the old one that served for some 70 years. We all know the development that has taken place in the Moura-Kianga area because of the coal deposits there. This has provided much more employment, and we now have increased accommodation for the children. This Government have seen that that has been provided. The same applies to the small town of Kalpowar. The Department of Education has tried to ensure that all schools in the area receive just and fair treatment.

Of course, the change in the education system means that there will be a need for additional high-tops at the beginning of the 1964 school year, and I ask the Minister to examine the problems facing the areas within my electorate. The school at Baralaba serves a large farming and grazing area, and also draws from nearby smaller schools. Then there is the Duaringa-Bluff-Dingo area, situated within the boundaries of the Duaringa shire. Already the Duaringa Shire Council is arranging a meeting with the Regional Director of Education to discuss with him the need for the erection at one of these centres of a high-top.

Another thing for which the Government can take much credit is school transport. If we look at this system of transport throughout the State, we soon realise how much it has meant to all areas, particularly the closer-settled ones where high-school tops are being provided. When settlers went on the land in days gone by, they had their battles for the first four or five years, just as they have today, with poor old Mum trying to fit in an hour or two each day teaching the children before milking the cows or doing some other tasks.

The Government have gone out of their way to establish school-transport services in all these areas. I can call to mind three in my own electorate. There is one in the Gibber-Gunyah area; there is another in the area known as the Wallaby Group. It is a fairly long service, too. The Minister for Education and Migration himself inspected it and, having seen the conditions under which these people were striving to make ends meet, established the service. I might mention that this is another area in which a Labour Government cut up land into blocks that did not give adequate living areas.

This Government have at least tried to do what they can for these people. The Department of Education provided them with a school-transport service, and the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity made sure that an all-weather road was built on which the transport service could run. The children are now getting the schooling to which they are entitled. The other service is in the Cottenham area.

Mr. Sullivan: The change of government meant a lot to people living in isolated areas.

Mr. HEWITT: That is true. The improvement has to be seen to be understood. If one visits the people and talks to them, they are loud in their praises of what the Government have done for them.

A Government Member: It is a pity the school-children did not have a vote.

Mr. HEWITT: Yes, that is true, too.

From time to time we hear criticism of our hospital system, particularly certain aspects of it. The Government, through the Minister for Health and Home Affairs and his departmental officers, have given advantages to country districts that they were denied for many years. Dealing with my own electorate, we have the new Theodore Hospital, a hospital that Labour refused to give us for many years.

Mr. Sullivan: It is something that will remain a monument to this Government.

Mr. HEWITT: That is so. It is something for which the people are very grateful. It has been used virtually to its full capacity since it was opened, and a small maternity section will probably be needed soon for the people of the area. The hospital is fully staffed, and we have had no major staffing problems up to date.

Turning now to the railways, the Minister for Transport has been subjected to a great deal of criticism for his administration of the railways. In all fairness, I think it should be said that he has held the portfolio during the most difficult time in the State's history. No person who is fair-minded will deny that.

Mr. Sullivan: He says he has not been criticised by the railway workers themselves, that they think he is doing a good job.

An Opposition Member: You are joking!

Mr. HEWITT: I say to the member of the Opposition who said, "You are joking" in reply to the interjection of the hon. member for Condamine that although many railway-men are critical of the Government, many others in my electorate are very grateful to the Government. I became a member of this Assembly when parties now occupying the Government benches were in Opposition, and at the small mining township of Baralaba a number of men employed by the Railway Department had been living in tents for years. There has been a complete change.

All those men are today comfortably housed in prefabricated homes and, what is more, many of them are high in their praise of my efforts to assist them. They also express their gratitude to the Minister for the job he has done to give them something that was denied to them previously. Hon. members can rest assured that living in a tent is not a very comfortable experience. I lived in one for part of my life, anyway; It was when I was in North Africa with the R.A.A.F. not that I wanted to, but I had no alternative.

Mr. Sullivan: Under a Labour Government, too.

Mr. HEWITT: Nevertheless, it is not a very comfortable experience. I did not live in tents for as long as these men did. In addition, many of them have been provided with refrigerators, which were impossible to obtain before. Electricity has also been supplied to their residences. It was almost impossible to get electricity in a railway house during the regime of Labour, but today, wherever it is available, the Minister for Transport has provided it for railway-men.

No matter what is said about us, or what criticism is levelled at us, I assure our critics that they themselves must have been much more fortunate than some of their mates who suffered under the difficult conditions I have mentioned. These men have had a very good spin under this Government and they can rest assured that, when we are returned at the next election, such treatment will continue. We may be able to increase the amenities they are already receiving.

I should like now to make some mention of the main roads system in Queensland and to pay a tribute to the Minister for the activity that has been carried on under his control. We have witnessed a tremendous improvement in almost all roads in Queensland. The improvement can be seen in our shires and we know that we are destined to continue that progress if we keep in office a progressive Government and a Minister with a progressive outlook.

The hon. member for Rockhampton North had something to say about how concerned the graziers in the Moura area, which is in my electorate, are with the franchise given to Peabody-Thiess. He was referring to those who might be affected by the shifting of equipment from one coalfield to another. Provision is made in the Mining Act, firstly, to protect property-holders against disturbance, and secondly, for the payment of compensation for any damage to property. Property-owners can apply to the warden to assess the damage. I assume that the franchise will afford further protection by giving property-owners access to a tribunal to determine damages. That is all I have to say on that matter. I think it clears the matter up. It concerns people within my area and, naturally, if they are to be harshly treated,

I am sympathetic towards them. However, I am sure that the Minister and the Government are, too.

Unfortunately, I will not be here for most of the remainder of this session, not because I desire to be absent, but because I shall probably be absent through ill-health. As I shall miss the debate on the Estimates of the Department of Health and Home Affairs I should like to say a little now about the Department of Native Affairs, with which I have had some association in recent years. After we became the Government in 1957 I accompanied the Minister for Health and Home Affairs and departmental officers on a visit to cattle properties controlled by the Department of Native Affairs. I was quick to realise that all that should have been done had not been done. I believe that the Government should always be a first-class tenant of the Crown. When they hold land they should develop it, improve it, and set an example. But what did we find? The property the Government had acquired in about 1946 did not even have a complete boundary fence.

Mr. Rae: Where was that?

Mr. HEWITT: Foleyvale. The area on which they were farming was completely flooded. They would lose a crop two or three times a year. We had the boundary fence erected in no time and we quickly did what was necessary about the farming area. I congratulate the Minister, the Director of Native Affairs, and all the others who have assisted. We developed a scrub area of 6,049 acres at a cost, including grassing, of £2 10s. 6d. an acre. I think that amount can be regarded as very reasonable because the land contained some of the most difficult terrain in the area. It will give an indication to departmental officers of what the cost should be when developing the brigalow land.

I said, "As all these things are not right, before starting off let us have a bang-tail muster and find out where we are going." What did we find? On Woorabinda there was a shortage of 385 head that could not be accounted for. On Foleyvale there was a shortage of 113 head, including bullocks and steers. Who was playing round I would not know. I am not necessarily criticising the people there. They never had anyone directly in charge and able to maintain the necessary supervision. The income for the year prior to my taking an interest was £9,104. Over the last four years it has been in excess of £120,000. If we get a reasonable season this year and we pay the attention to the properties that I hope we can, we should reach an income figure in the vicinity of £40,000.

(Time expired.)

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Mulgrave) (12.49 p.m.): I should like to associate myself and the people of my electorate whom I have the honour to represent with the expressions of loyalty of other hon. members. We are delighted at the news that Her Most Gracious Majesty and Prince Philip will again grace the shores of this State with their presence next year. Naturally we regret the very short time that has been allotted to their visit, and their inability to travel more extensively in this State, more particularly to the northern part which, as you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is one of the diamonds of the State. However, we are delighted to know that Her Majesty and Prince Philip will again be visiting us. Her Majesty is highly regarded by the people of Queensland, and they are very loyal to her.

I congratulate His Excellency, Sir Henry Abel Smith, on the extension of his term as Governor of this State. I sincerely hope that he and his good lady are blessed with continued good health to carry out their duties. As hon. members know, during his term of office Sir Henry has never spared himself physically. He has travelled extensively and made himself familiar with most of our industries. We have only to read some of his speeches to realise just how much he knows about the many industries in this State, particularly primary industry, also the problems associated with them. He has made his presence felt in almost every corner of the State and has endeared himself to all Queenslanders. Indeed, many of us think he is a good Queenslander, and when he returns to his native land at the end of his term of office he will indeed be a worthy ambassador for Queensland.

I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. As we know, the hon. member for Flinders, who moved it, was not in good health at the time, as he had contracted one of the diseases that have been so prevalent in Brisbane in the last few months. He was labouring under extreme difficulties, yet the Leader of the Opposition snidely implied that he could not understand or hear the hon. member and had to wait to read his speech. I venture to suggest that if the Leader of the Opposition had been suffering from the same disability he may not have been here. During their speeches the mover and seconder of the motion tried to cover in no small way some of the developments that have taken place in the State since this Government assumed office. From time to time we hear a great deal about how little the Government have done. If hon. members on my right are preserved until history is written they will find that is not true. The Nicklin-Morris regime will take its place in history as one of the most virile Governments the State has ever known.

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I will tell the hon. member more about the Moore Government if I have time. I remind him that the Scullin Government were in power at that time, and, as he knows, the national Government have a substantial effect on any State Government. I have heard much from hon. members opposite about the Moore Government, but very little about the Scullin Government, who reduced pensions and other benefits. It took years for this State to recover from some of the Scullin Government's actions.

I congratulate the Minister for Justice on his election as Leader of his party. Knowing him as I do, I have no doubt that he will discharge his duties very conscientiously, with satisfaction to himself and, no doubt, with advantage to the party that he has the honour to lead and also to the Government.

At this stage I should like to pay a tribute to the two Cabinet Ministers who have been unfortunate enough to be stricken down with ill health, the hon. Mr. Morris and the hon. Mr. Pizzey. I know that hon. members opposite are very charitable in this regard and that they share the views I am about to express.

I suppose no Minister has, during his term of office, knocked himself about physically, and perhaps mentally too, as Mr. Morris has. He has been a very enthusiastic worker, not sparing himself in any way. He has done much for the tourist industry of Queensland, something I hope to have time to tell the House about later. He has done much to encourage industry. He has done much in his capacity as Minister for Labour and Industry. He has taken a great interest in the safety of workers in this State and in protecting the lives of people who use the roads and footpaths. All this has added up and caught up with him. He put the State before himself and unfortunately he is now suffering for it. We sincerely hope that, following the short rest he is taking and his resignation from the leadership of his party, he will before long be restored to very good health and once more be able to carry out his duties in his usual virile manner.

I am sure all hon. members share my views about the hon. Mr. Pizzey and the way he has not spared himself in his contribution to the State. He has been very active. He has moved round the State and has made himself familiar not only with the problems of education but also with nearly every other field of government. I know. I have had the opportunity of moving round with him. One has to be in very good fettle to follow him. Wherever he goes his policy is that, if someone wants to see him, he does not mind if it is midnight or 6 o'clock in the morning; he will always do his utmost to interview him and to help solve any problems. He is a comparatively young man and it is indeed unfortunate that the strain has caught up

with him. I sincerely hope that eventually, when he is discharged from hospital, he will see fit to put himself before the State for a brief time and take a holiday so that he may be restored to good health. I can assure hon. members that he is a very noble Queenslander and one who will leave his mark when time with him is no more.

Let me say at the outset that I am very proud to be a member of this truly democratic Government, who have dedicated themselves to the development not merely of the southern or the northern part of the State but of every part of it. It is a Government with a great record of unparalleled achievements. Study those achievements and they will speak for themselves.

Naturally, as a representative of North Queensland I am more interested in the welfare and development of the North than that of any other part of the State but I still realise that, as members of this Parliament, we have a responsibility to the State as a whole. It is just that, having lived in North Queensland for many years and made myself very familiar with its potential, I am naturally more interested in it than in the rest of the State.

During the five years in which the present Government have been in office, we have witnessed great changes in the field of education. This is something that has been aired quite a bit in this Chamber, and I feel, as a Government member, that it is something that we should continue to air because our record in this field, as in many others, is very good. Much more care and attention has been given to the maintenance not only of school buildings but of all Government buildings. We have seen more houses built for public servants. We have seen more school-building and additions to schools, not only in my electorate but all over the State. We have seen more money spent on both building and maintaining roads. We have seen greater allocations from Commonwealth Aid Road Grants to local authorities, which have been of considerable assistance to them.

I have heard it said by members of the Opposition that the Government had no alternative but to go ahead with the education policy that has been followed. If my memory is correct, I heard one hon. member say the other night that any Government would have had to do it. Hon. members opposite were in office for 40 years and did not carry out such a programme. We have done more in five years than they did in 40. Had they remained the Government, there is no doubt in my mind that they would have continued up to the present time the don't-care attitude that they had for years towards education. This Government will go down in the history of education as one who recognised their responsibilities in the interests and welfare of future generations of this State.

Mr. Donald: You cannot find work for the children. What are you talking about?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That is interesting, and I shall have something to say about it later. I should like at this stage to pay my respects to the Minister for what he has done in my electorate.

Mr. Houston: You said that earlier.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I was then referring to his illness and wishing him well. On this occasion I am expressing to him not only my gratitude but also that of the people in my electorate whom I have the honour to represent. Since he assumed control of education, we have seen many changes. We have already secured an excellent high school at Malanda that would never have been built had hon. members opposite been the Government, as people there tried, unsuccessfully, for many years to get even a high-top.

Mr. Gilmore: They were completely ignored.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: More or less.

It has been suggested that people in the country have been reasonably well served with school-bus services. We, too, have been well treated. In my electorate we hope to have in the coming year two more schools, one at Gordonvale and one at Babinda, that will ultimately go to high-school standard.

We had a lot of trouble at Babinda because of the attitude that I referred to a while ago of the previous Government. What they did was one of the silliest things that any Government could do. In accordance with their general policy towards companies, particularly co-operatives, that are trying to do a job for the State, they took about 20 acres from the Babinda Central Mill. Who in his right senses would build a high school against a sugar mill?

Mr. Gilmore: The Labour Party would, in their wisdom.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Of course, and they took it at an unfair price. Immediately this Government came into office, those of us in my electorate who took an interest in the welfare of the children said to the Minister for Education and Migration, "If we are to have a high school, let us have it in a proper position, not up against a noisy sugar mill where there is a lot of megass—"

Mr. Donald: We are hearing a lot of gas now.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The hon. member will hear more if he listens.

We had a good deal of difficulty in getting land in Babinda—I know, because I played a small part in the negotiations—and one of our main difficulties was in overcoming the ill-feeling that resulted from the way in which Labour Governments took land from owners. They took it without giving the owners a right of appeal or anything else,

and we met a wall of resistance when we endeavoured to get land. The man from whom we eventually took the land was one of the few returned soldiers in the particular area, a man with a large family, and he is one of the happiest men in Babinda with the deal he received. He knew that a school must come, and he gave us the land with very good grace. The Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation will bear out what I say because he also played some part in the negotiations.

Hour after hour, hon. members opposite have told us a gloomy story about the lack of development under this Government. To give hon. members an idea of what has occurred in North Queensland, I will give them some figures showing that the Government are not merely sitting on their tails, as did Labour Governments for almost 40 years. In the period from 1 July, 1953, to 30 June, 1956, and on to 20 June, 1957, when, as hon. members know, we finally got rid of Labour administrations that had done so much to hamper the development of the State, £89,536 was spent by the Department of Public Works on school buildings—as an hon. member on this side interjected a short time ago, they looked something like gaols—and £49,730 was spent on other buildings. That is a total of £139,266. Let us now look at what has occurred in the two years that I have represented the Mulgrave electorate. No less than £154,006 has been spent on school buildings, yet we are told that the Government are doing nothing and that no development is taking place. That is not a bad record.

Mr. Donald: What about the decrease in the purchasing power of the £1?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Do not bother talking about that. I got houses built, and people were squealing for houses all the time that Labour were in government. They would not even build police residences or a residence for the clerk of petty sessions at Babinda.

Mr. Donald interjected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The hon. member should sit there and take it. He knows it is true.

The sum spent on other buildings was £54,677. The total expenditure was £208,683, compared with the miserable amount of £139,266 in almost four years of Labour rule. Those figures are correct, and the buildings I mentioned have not been erected at the expense of other electorates. Hon. members know that under Labour the policy was that those who were in favour got everything and those who were not in favour got nothing. I remember hearing a Labour Premier advising people during a political campaign that if they wanted anything done they should return a Labour member. That is a terrible state of affairs. We did not do that; we have recognised the rights of the people whether they were represented by Labour or by us, and they got their just dues.

I should like briefly to touch on the sugar industry. I have not much time and I have much to say. This year we have been blessed with a record crop. I am not going to say, of course, that the Government should take the whole of the credit for that.

Mr. Dewar: Labour did.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I know, but, we have instilled into this great industry—and it is a great industry and employs many men, paying them well—a great deal of confidence. If I had time I would tell hon. members opposite what their Government did to the sugar industry, both in this State and in the Federal sphere.

To outline the present position briefly, I remind hon. members that the present Commonwealth Sugar Agreement has only recently been signed. Prior to the signing of that agreement a very competent committee was set up by the Commonwealth Government to look into the price structure of the sugar industry in general and to see what was occurring in the industry. There were some very bright boys on that committee and after very exhaustive and far-reaching inquiries they recommended to the Commonwealth Government that the price of sugar in Australia should be reduced.

Having in the Federal sphere as Minister for Primary Industry a man who understands the problems of primary producers in this country and who knows how much is dependent upon them—if I had time I would point out to hon. members that we are still substantially dependent for our economy on these great industries, which still play a very important part so far as credit is concerned—

Mr. Davies: The Labour Party was the first to appreciate that fact.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Do not talk to me about the Labour Party.

As I was saying, having such understanding people who know the value of this industry and who knew full well what was occurring overseas in the international field of marketing, plus the uncertainty as to where Britain would line up in the European Common Market, the Commonwealth Government—and I know this Government played some part in it, advising them correctly and well—finally decided to leave the price of sugar as it was. This, as I indicated, instilled such confidence in the industry that today there is a record crop, the greatest in our history.

At the present time, the estimated quantity of cane—and these are the very latest figures and go a little further than those in "The Courier-Mail" this morning—is no less than 11,853,000 tons, which is by far an all-time record. It is estimated at this stage—and I might mention that the estimates are increasing—that from that crop of cane we will mill 1,700,000 tons of raw sugar, or 1,750,000 tons of net titre sugar, which also is a record.

This industry over the years has done much in research in every field. It has spent a great deal of money keeping itself abreast of the times and has a record in this field unrivalled in the primary industries of Queensland or Australia.

Mr. Donald: We did a lot of planning.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I know all about Labour's planning. Had I the time I should be pleased to tell hon. members opposite just what they did for the sugar industry. However, I do not want to waste time on that now because that is history and we cannot do very much now by looking at history. We will tell the people of Queensland, at the right and proper time, what hon. members opposite did and will again do if they are given the opportunity.

The total quantity of cane crushed in Queensland mills up to this stage is again a record—no less than 5,310,926 tons. That has been made possible by the expenditure of vast sums of money over the years. We have trained personnel in every field of activity and great credit is due to the men in charge of the various sections of research who have made this possible.

Another interesting feature is that 520,000 tons of cane have been crushed in one week—again a phenomenal figure. It is an increase of 70,000 tons on the previous record. At this stage roughly 45 per cent. of the estimated tonnage has been crushed. The overseas sales represent another interesting feature. Again it is something that has been brought about by the confidence that has been instilled into all sections of the industry. At this stage we have sold 1,000,000 tons of raw sugar, which is a remarkable effort. I think we should all pay tribute to the various organisations responsible for marketing that vast quantity of sugar, particularly to Messrs. Wheen and Jackson, who have been examining the marketing position for some considerable time. The sale of that great quantity of sugar will mean a good deal to the Commonwealth of Australia in overseas credits.

Yet another interesting feature is the world price for sugar. It will be remembered that the International Sugar Agreement collapsed about 12 months ago. The present New York market price is 3.35 cents. a lb., roughly £33 a ton. The London price is slightly in excess of £26 sterling. At this time last year it was considerably lower, namely, about £23.

I should like to place on record the great loss that the sugar industry suffered in the death of the former chairman of the Queensland Cane Growers' Council, Mr. Foley, who gave many years of good and faithful service and wise leadership to the industry. Men like the late Mr. Foley are responsible for what we are witnessing in the sugar industry today. I should like to say a great deal more about that industry but my time is running out.

Let me touch briefly now on the dairying industry. My electorate has the greatest amount of dairying of the northern electorates. Both butter factories are in my electorate. My colleague and friend from Tablelands is very interested in this industry, which has played a very big part in the development of North Queensland. We are particularly grateful to the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry for the assistance he has given but there is still room for a little more assistance in research. A very good job is being done on the investigation into improved pastures, but unfortunately it is again too late. Our friends opposite did not understand how important pastures and grasses were to Queensland and therefore they were not very greatly interested in them.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It has been left to this Government to do it. Pasture improvement has been going on in other parts of Australia for 30-odd years. Our Labour friends did not understand what pastures were. They would not know whether they are an ingredient of salads or are part of farming equipment. It is very interesting to learn that the champion R.N.A. pasture award went to one of the young farmers in my electorate, Mr. O. F. Daley, of Millaa Millaa, who is the son of a man who played a very big part in the development of pastures in the 45-inch rainfall belt. They are doing a particularly good job. It would be a very good thing if we could do something to assist them by way of other crops, but it is very difficult in that area. Had we been the Government over the years I have no doubt we would have endeavoured to solve the problem. But hon. members opposite have never had any interest in pastures. They were interested only in fostering the sale of margarine and the like. They were not very interested in the dairy-farmers or, for that matter, any other farmer. All they were interested in was getting their votes.

Mr. Gilmore: Did I understand you to say that the Labour Party were fostering margarine?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The hon. member knows that.

An Opposition Member: You have not altered it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: How could we alter it? It is something like their friends and the nationalisation of the banks. Once you strangle something you cannot unstrangle it.

May I say a little now about the tourist industry? It is extremely important to my electorate as some of the best tourist attractions in Australia are there. Hon. members opposite did not think the tourist industry was worth cultivating. Our Government were the first in Australia to realise the advantage of fostering the tourist industry and today it is worth no less than £38,000,000 to the State. That is indeed a handsome figure.

Mr. Thackeray: Where did you get those figures from?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: They are available to the hon. member.

The Government have done everything possible to encourage the tourist industry. If hon. members opposite are fair they will admit that when we took office hotel accommodation was sub-standard. What is it like today? We have some world-class hotels, and many others have been extensively renovated and remodelled. There are now 150 modern, up-to-date motels and that number is increasing daily.

Mr. Thackeray: Give them a liquor licence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I will deal with that, too.

In the last five years roughly £4,500,000 has been spent on motels and no less than £13,000,000 on hotels, both new and modernised. That is a pretty fair record. The Licensing Commission has ordered that a further £2,000,000 be spent in the current year.

Mr. Thackeray: That is not enough, either.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It is a damned sight more than was done by the A.L.P. Government.

The hon. member was worrying about licences. I am happy that he reminded me as otherwise I may have overlooked the matter. No fewer than 14 licences have been allocated to tourist areas since the Government took office. This has helped the tourist industry, and will continue to help it in the future.

There are two beautiful lakes in my electorate. It would be a good idea if some members of the Opposition came to the area for a rest and at the same time study what is being done there. They could make themselves familiar with the development that is taking place instead of living in a world of gloom and darkness, without hope, as they have been for many years. They are trying to gain the confidence of the people of Queensland to return them to the Treasury benches so that they can repeat their past performance, but the people have more sense than that.

All types of water sports are engaged in on the lakes. Last year both the North Queensland and the Queensland water-ski championships were held in my area and skiers who have competed overseas told me that nowhere in the world had they experienced such a magnificent place for water ski-ing. The accommodation is excellent at these places and in recent years it has improved out of sight. We also have Tinaroo, with a lovely motel and other forms of accommodation.

Mr. Thackeray: There is no liquor licence there.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: If I were the hon. member I would not worry about that. I thought he was a tee-totaller and was not interested in such things as liquor licences.

Mr. Dewar: A wardrobe drinker.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That is more like it.

All the small towns offer excellent accommodation and the Eacham Shire Council has done a particularly good job for caravanners. It has built two caravan parks, which are extensively used. Very many caravan parks in North Queensland have been built privately and by the local authorities, and it is interesting to note that they are always fully occupied. Since this Government came in to power and indicated that they would seal the road from the border to Mossman, the tourist industry has been greatly encouraged. We should thank the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads, and Electricity. He is a very good North Queenslander and a man of great wisdom and vision. He has done more for Queensland than all hon. members opposite and their colleagues put together did in 40 years. Time will prove that to be correct.

Mr. Dewar: It has proved it already.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: We are only on the fringe yet. We have oil. We have Weipa. I know some hon. members opposite do not understand it; God forgive them for that. The Minister has finished the work on the road from Mossman to Port Douglas and he has widened that beautiful drive from Cairns to Port Douglas, as the hon. member for Cook appreciates. He has done a lot in the Peninsula, which again is appreciated by the hon. member for Cook.

Mr. Thackeray: Why shouldn't he?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: If Labour were in office they would not do it for him. He is not a member of our Government. Theirs was a policy of non-activity and it is no good shrinking from it. They did nothing. We know it very well and so do the people of Queensland.

Mr. Duggan: You closed the port and you closed down the school.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: We closed nothing down. To the contrary, we have done everything to open things up. We opened Weipa. No doubt hon. members opposite would say they had plans and that everything was ready, but goodness knows how long it would have taken them. It was the same with their planning for schools. What is the good of planning if the plans are not put into operation? The Leader of the Opposition knows all about Weipa. We had the pleasure of visiting it together and I know he was impressed with it. Were his party the Government the project would still be lying in the pigeon-holes and nothing would have been done about it.

The Minister in charge of main roads has done a great job for the people of the Tableland in widening the Gillies Highway. Let us compare the money spent in my area by this Government with that spent by the previous Government. From 1952 to 1957 Labour spent £752,000 in my electorate, and for a good deal of that time a member of that Government represented the electorate. In the five years that this Government have been in office no less than £1,426,895 has been spent—almost three times as much—yet hon. members opposite say we do nothing.

I should like to go through the Commonwealth aid allocations to the various shires for main roads but time will not permit it. The total is more than £144,000 in excess of the best Labour could do. What is more interesting is what has occurred in the last 12 months. On permanent works and maintenance in the Mulgrave electorate, we have spent £335,176, or more than half the amount that was spent during the last five years under Labour.

Hon. members opposite have spoken of unemployment and told us what Labour would do about it. I assure them that the Government are very conscious of their responsibilities and have not ceased in their efforts to meet the problem of unemployment. This year our friends, the Federal Government, were very favourably disposed towards us and they gave money to help meet the position. Sitting in the House this session, I have come to the conclusion that hon. members opposite are using unemployment for nothing but cheap political propaganda.

(Time expired.)

Mr. INCH (Burke) (2.45 p.m.): In rising to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, I take the opportunity of again expressing my loyalty, and that of my constituents, to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. and also of offering my congratulations to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Henry Abel Smith, on his re-appointment for a further term as Governor of this State. He has travelled widely throughout the State, taken a very keen interest in the people, our industries, and our welfare as a whole, and has done a remarkably good job. I am quite confident, however, that before his next term has expired he will have the pleasure, as the result of efficient Labour administration, of presenting to this Assembly a report much more heartening than those that he has been able to present in the past.

In conformity with their usual practice of seizing upon any and every reason to cloak the ineffectiveness of the administration of the various departments, I notice that the Government have again resorted to this tactic as a means of excusing their inability to show much improvement in the cost of running the railways in the past year. Previously they have used drought as the excuse for losses in railway revenue. It is interesting to note

that this time the industrial stoppage at Mt. Isa has become the whipping-post and the Government's reason for their failure to show a greater improvement.

Nothing has been said about the £115,000 expended on obtaining a report from American engineers who are unable to run even their own railways at a profit. No-one will deny that the stoppage at Mt. Isa contributed to a substantial loss of revenue to the department, but I draw attention to the fact that it also caused financial loss to the workers at Mt. Isa and to thousands of other Queensland workers, the company and its shareholders, without mentioning the adverse effect that it had on the national economy.

Who is to blame for those losses? It is no-one but the Minister for Labour and Industry. He is responsible for the losses incurred by that stoppage. He studiously and relentlessly ignored my warnings, and those of my colleagues, when we tried to tell him what would be the eventual outcome of his introducing a Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. We have here a Government, and their Minister for Labour and Industry, supposedly dedicated to the encouragement of industry and a policy of full employment. Yet members of this Government sat idly by, without raising their voices in protest, when the Minister for Labour and Industry bulldozed through this House a Bill which caused the complete cessation of production in one of the largest and most important industries in this State. It also had the effect of adding several thousands to the army of unemployed. This fear of unemployment has become a daily threat in the lives of so many Queenslanders labouring under the maladministration of this Government. The action of the Minister and the Government in withholding £3,000,000, which will not be used for the relief of unemployment until just prior to the next election, is symbolic of the cynical and contemptuous disregard in which they hold the workers of this State and their indifference to the plight of those who are unemployed at present. For this reason they stand condemned in the eyes of every right-thinking elector in Queensland.

Other legislation that they have introduced, such as the Transport Act, which resulted in the gaoling of one person and the imposition of heavy fines on other transport operators, has lost the Government the confidence of their own traditional supporters, and they are now beginning to realise the full effect that their maladministration has had on the welfare of various sections of the community. The Premier, his Ministers, and members of the Government parties are now scattering over the length and breadth of the State in a frenzied attempt to retrieve the political fortunes that are already lost to them, as will be shown by the return of the Australian Labour Party as the Government at the forthcoming election.

It was interesting to hear the hon. member for Mulgrave speak of the assistance that "our friends in the Federal Government"—I think that is the way in which he referred to them—have given to Queensland. The only time that Queensland received that assistance was just prior to, and shortly after, the last Federal election. I point out that over the past year or two there has been a noticeable increase in the number of visits paid to the far-northern and western areas of the State by Federal Parliamentary members of the Liberal-Country Party. Their purpose was ostensibly to carry out an investigation of the potential of these areas—how it could best be developed and exploited, and the contribution that would be made to the State and national economy as a result of any developmental plan that they might put into operation. The potential of these parts of the State is well known to most Queenslanders, and we are aware, also, of the valuable contribution that is being made to our economy by the production and sale of the metals, beef, wool, sugar, and other commodities produced in them. If the Federal members had been sincere in their desire and had extended their stay over several days in each of the areas that they visited, instead of confining it to what might be termed bed-and-breakfast visits, they would undoubtedly have received a great deal of enlightenment from civic authorities, members of the chambers of commerce, and persons engaged in industry on the requirements for the further development and expansion of industries already established and for the establishment of new industries that would assist in the absorption of the huge army of unemployed and eventually lead to the closer settlement of sparsely-settled areas. It is rather significant that some of these visits were made prior to the last Federal election. No doubt the real objective was to bolster up the waning prospects for the return of their own party.

Most of these so-called fact-finding tours can be described only as political jaunts. However, I am pleased to say that not all Federal members made these fact-finding tours an excuse for a holiday jaunt throughout the State. That has been illustrated by the recent visit of a number of Federal parliamentary Labour members, who stayed in Mt. Isa for a period of several days, during which time they were active in obtaining as many facts and in collating as much information as possible to help them in submitting worth-while proposals for the further development of that portion of the State.

I had the pleasure of driving these Federal members to Mary Kathleen and Cloncurry. They were very interested in the small mining projects that are going on throughout that area and I feel that, when any proposition is put forward in the Federal Parliament for financial assistance to gougers, those members will be to the fore in assisting them in every possible way.

In addition there was a recent visit to Mt. Isa by my colleague the hon. member for Belmont, and the Leader of the State parliamentary Labour Party, Mr. Duggan. This clearly indicates the interest of Labour members in electorates throughout the State. As a result of their visits they are more conversant with conditions prevailing in my area where development and expansion have reached an unprecedented level.

Mr. Sullivan: They did not take much interest when in Government. That is the most remarkable feature.

Mr. INCH: The only interest the hon. member's Government is taking now is because a State election is close and they are frightened of going down the drain. They see the writing on the wall.

The development and expansion projects undertaken by Mount Isa Mines Ltd. over the past decade have resulted in a tremendous increase in population with a consequent increased demand for housing accommodation. Unfortunately, the Government have failed miserably in their obligation to house the people of Mt. Isa, preferring to leave it to private enterprise and individual landlords to provide this facility.

On what is known as the town side of Mt. Isa this has resulted in the mushroom growth of a jerry-built, sub-standard type of accommodation in most instances, and tenants are called upon to pay exorbitant rentals for the privilege of living in so-called houses and flats under conditions which, at best, can only be likened to those that one would expect to find in slums.

Housing conditions such as these are intolerable and a disgrace to any civilised community. The Government will have to realise that Mt. Isa can no longer be regarded as simply another source from which revenue can be derived to be expended on projects that will benefit metropolitan and provincial city inhabitants, and that we, too, have a population that requires to be housed and accommodated under satisfactory conditions.

There are instances of three or four families occupying the one dwelling with inadequate toilet facilities, and each family is called upon to pay a weekly rental of £7, £8, £9, or £10 a week. Similar conditions are prevalent in many of the so-called flats. I am sure that hon. members will agree that such an environment is not conducive to the good health and moral well-being of young children who are forced to live in such conditions because of their parents' inability to obtain adequate and reasonable accommodation. Local-authority officers are well aware of the squalid conditions under which these people are living, but rather than invoke an ordinance providing for the demolition of many of these homes they prefer for the time being to adopt a humanitarian attitude towards the plight of the people, and have refrained

from enforcing a law that would force them out onto the streets with no prospect of obtaining other accommodation.

Mr. Hughes: Your Government put them into all sorts of hovels, like the huts in Victoria Park. They did nothing about it. This Government removed that lot.

Mr. INCH: Those are the worries of the hon. members down here. My worries are in Mt. Isa.

The solution of our problem lies in the construction of Housing Commission homes, not only for purchase but also for rental. A reliable estimate of the absolute minimum number of houses that would be required to alleviate the acute shortage that exists at present would be 400 homes. That number would relieve the position of only those persons living in sub-standard accommodation. It does not provide for those who are renting reasonable accommodation and who would like to have homes of their own. If we were to take into consideration the number of married employees living in barracks at Mount Isa Mines Ltd. and those employed by large contracting firms, or engaged in other avenues of employment, many of whom are engaged in a vain search for a home to which they could bring their families, the number of homes required could be increased by a further 300 to 400.

I mentioned earlier that so far it has been left to private enterprise to provide much of the housing requirements in Mt. Isa. In this respect Mount Isa Mines Ltd. has played a major role. That company has been responsible for providing somewhere in the vicinity of 2,000 homes. In addition it has assisted many of its employees to purchase materials for the construction of their own homes on their own land. Had it not been for this company, housing accommodation in Mt. Isa would be in a precarious state indeed. Had they ceased to provide further after 1,000 such homes had been constructed, the Government today would be faced with the immediate necessity of providing 1,400 homes, instead of the minimum of 400, to relieve the present extreme shortage.

Although I surmise that the position has now reached the stage where this company considers that it has done its share towards the housing of the population, and that it is now up to the Government to shoulder their responsibilities in this direction, it still continues to provide a number of homes each year. A recent contract let to Kern Brothers for the construction of a further 20 homes is indicative of its activity along those lines. These homes will be sold to company employees at prices ranging from £3,300 to £3,750 on a 5 per cent. deposit, on terms spread over 20 years with an interest rate of 5 per cent. A factor that contributes to the delay in home-ownership in Mt. Isa is the difficulty experienced by

miners' homestead perpetual lessees in obtaining advances under the Housing Commission scheme. I understand that although the instrument of lease may be held by the Department of Mines pending compliance with improvement conditions, the applicant can, provided his land has been surveyed, authorise the department to make the lease available to the Housing Commission on issue, and the Commission will then accept a mortgage from the applicant. Unfortunately, applicants for advances are debarred from participating in this scheme because no general survey or design has been carried out by Government surveyors and these people are therefore unable to show that their particular piece of land has been surveyed and that they are eligible for assistance. It might be argued that lessees could make arrangements to have the survey carried out privately, but why should they? They have already paid a fee of £5 for a service that has not been fulfilled. In a sense the department is welshing on its contract with these people, many of whom are trying to raise a family and, at the same time, save the necessary deposit for a home. Why should the wage-earner be burdened with the added impost of having to pay for a private survey when, because of the disinterested attitude of the department, no complete survey and design has been carried out by its surveyors? Such a service is urgently required as there are 486 leases still awaiting survey in Mt. Isa and there is also a large number of areas in respect of which no leases have yet been applied for. Such a survey would prevent overlapping or encroachment on individual leases, which could possibly lead to costly litigation. It would also be of assistance to the shire council in the event of any proposed town plan being brought into operation.

Whilst speaking about the housing requirements of the general public in the area, I also take the opportunity of drawing the attention of the Minister for Education and Migration to the necessity to provide adequate accommodation for the teaching staffs in Mt. Isa and Cloncurry. Approximately 60 teachers have to be accommodated in Mt. Isa alone. At present, through the good graces of Mount Isa Mines Ltd., the majority of them have been fortunate enough to secure barracks accommodation at Mount Isa Mines Ltd. However, their future accommodation is very precarious. The expansion programme of Mount Isa Mines Ltd. over the next few years includes the extension of the open-cut system of mining. This means that eventually a number of the barracks will have to be demolished to make way for open-cut mining and, as a result, barracks accommodation will be at a premium. It is only natural for the company to give preference of accommodation to its employees. Increasing enrolments in the schools each year have now created a demand for the construction of

more schools and this, in turn, will mean that a far greater number of teachers will have to be provided with accommodation. Unless immediate steps are taken to provide homes for married staff and hostel accommodation for single male and female teachers, the situation will develop where, although the department may have enough school accommodation for the pupils it will be unable to attract and retain sufficient teachers to operate those schools because of the lack of adequate and satisfactory living quarters. I suggest to the Minister that without delay he has a thorough investigation made of the present and future accommodation requirements of teaching staffs in both towns, with the object of implementing the proposals I have outlined in an effort to overcome what is sure to happen in the near future.

I have mentioned that there will be a need for additional schools at Mt. Isa. That is very important because we expect that within 10 years, with the development that is taking place, the population of the area will rise to well over 20,000. At present the schools are congested. Five new classrooms are in the last stages of construction at the town State school and already the enrolment is such that those rooms will be crowded out and there will be at least three temporary classrooms under the school. The Department of Education will have to proceed with its plan for a new school in the town area. If they had it built for the 1963 school year, even if only on a small scale for a start, it would mean that at least 150 to 200 pupils would be enrolled immediately, which would relieve the congestion at the other schools.

Mr. Davies: During this debate Government members have claimed that they have overcome all the difficulties and problems.

Mr. INCH: Unfortunately they have not overcome them. In 1960 the Minister for Education assured me that a new wing would be built on the Mt. Isa High School. To date no block has been built. I received advice that the department would endeavour to have this work commenced early in September, but I seriously doubt that we will see a start on the construction of a technical block at the Mt. Isa High School this year.

One other matter that I wish to raise is the recent visit of the Licensing Commission to Mt. Isa to investigate beer and spirit prices. Following the visit, I understand, Mr. Kelly made certain statements to the newspapers. In the "Sunday Truth" of 9 September, 1962, under the heading, "Liquor Prices Action," the following appeared—

"'Sunday Truth's' claims of excessive liquor prices in many Queensland country towns have been found to be well-based by the State Licensing Commission.

"In the only area in which the Commission has completed investigations it has found that the prices charged for spirits are too high.

"Mr. J. Kelly, the Licensing Commission chairman, told 'Sunday Truth' that the Commission had 'intimated' to hotel-keepers in Mt. Isa and Cloncurry the maximum prices it considered should be charged for spirits.

"These prices represent a reduction on the prices that the booze barons in those towns have been charging, but Mr. Kelly would not disclose the extent of the over-charging.

"However, Mr. Kelly said that, on the figures the Commission had before it, a reduction in the price of beer in Mt. Isa and Cloncurry was not justified.

"The hotel licensees had 14 days in which to place a case before the Commission for retention of the present prices, Mr. Kelly said."

What we in Mt. Isa would like to know is where Mr. Kelly got the figures that he had before him and on what he based his argument that they did not justify a reduction in the price of beer in Mt. Isa.

My information is that the average return to hotels at Mt. Isa from each 18-gallon keg of beer is between £28 and £30. The cost ex brewery of each keg is approximately £13, and the commission paid to the merchant is approximately £1 2s. 6d. The price ex Townsville is £14 2s. 6d., made up of £13 ex brewery and £1 2s. 6d. for the merchant. The cost of a keg of beer from Townsville at the hotel in Mt. Isa is £14 2s. 6d., and the return to the hotelkeeper from that keg is between £28 and £30. The point is that the hotels cannot buy direct from North Queensland Brewery; all their orders must be given through Burns Philp, Samuel Allen, Cummins & Campbell, or Joseph Pease. At least three of these companies either own or control the three hotels operating in Mt. Isa at present, and what actually happens is that these merchants pay themselves £1 2s. 6d. on each keg of beer and sell it in their own hotels. Whether Mr. Kelly took that into consideration, I do not know. We in Mt. Isa are of the opinion that beer prices there can be reduced, and substantially reduced, too.

In relation to spirit prices, it was intimated by Mr. Kelly to hotelkeepers in Mt. Isa and Cloncurry that considered maximum prices should be charged, but why all the secrecy about the prices? Why is not the public allowed to know the maximum prices that he intimated to the hotelkeepers? After all, it is the general public that pays them. My information is to the effect that there has so far been no reduction in spirit prices in Mt. Isa, and that the hotelkeepers have no intention of reducing them till they have been officially notified by letter from the Commission itself.

We have had an investigation by the Licensing Commission in Mt. Isa, but we are no better off, even though the Commission intimated that there should be maximum prices.

One other thing that I should like to mention about the visit of the Licensing Commission to Mt. Isa is the granting of a fourth licence for a hotel in Mt. Isa. Some short time ago applications were called for tenders for a licence, and there was only one applicant. He submitted a tender price, but his application was rejected by the Commission on the ground that he was going to utilise portion of an existing building in the construction of the hotel. The fourth licence, which was granted to Thiess Brothers, I understand, was granted on the ground that this hotel would be built in a situation bordered by Sulphide, O'Doherty, Oxide, and Urquhart Streets. I understand that the original application was to build the hotel on that site. Since then, we find that the licence has been granted for the construction of a hotel on land bordered by Sulphide Street and the Barkly Highway. I made enquiries and found that the land is owned by Mount Isa Mines Limited. Until Monday last no application had been made by the company for a transfer of the land to Thiess Brothers, who have the licence. A licence has been granted for a hotel that is to be constructed on a certain piece of ground to which Thiess Brothers have no title, yet the application of the other unfortunate applicant for a hotel licence was rejected on the ground that he was going to use part of an existing building in constructing the hotel. Why should there be a difference in the treatment of the two applicants? I am not trying to prevent the establishment of a fourth hotel. It is badly needed in Mt. Isa. I understand that the proposed hotel will be built on luxury lines to cater for the luxury trade. That is all right, too, but we want hotels that will cater for the ordinary run-of-the-mill person—the small tourist, the person travelling through the area and needing accommodation. There has been some talk of the issue of a fifth hotel licence, and I suggest to the Licensing Commission that they call applications for that fifth licence as early as possible and give us the amenities that we require in Mt. Isa. I also suggest to the Commission that when they grant another licence they should ensure that the person to whom the licence is granted owns the piece of ground on which the hotel is to be built, thus avoiding the position that has arisen in this case, where a hotel is to be built on ground bordered by the Barkly Highway and Sulphide Street to which the applicant has no title and for which no application for transfer from Mount Isa Mines Limited to Thiess Brothers has yet been made.

Mr. ANDERSON (Toowoomba East) (3.22 p.m.): I desire to associate myself and the people of Toowoomba East with the motion so ably moved by the hon. member for Flinders and seconded by the hon. member for Wavell, and supported by many other

hon. members, and with their expressions of loyalty. I also assure the House that the people of Toowoomba are looking forward eagerly to the proposed royal visit next year. If it is at all possible to include a visit to Toowoomba in the royal tour programme, hon. members can be sure that the people of Toowoomba particularly and the Darling Downs generally will be delighted to again welcome Her Majesty and His Royal Highness. I commend this suggestion to the State Director of the Royal Tour for his consideration. At the same time, we do appreciate the visit of Her Majesty to Australia. Even if she cannot come to the country areas, we are very gratified to know that she is coming to Australia and to Queensland.

We appreciate the action of the Government in offering to Sir Henry Abel Smith a further term of office, and we are delighted to hear that His Excellency has accepted it. With his wife, Lady May, His Excellency has done a great deal for the State of Queensland and for Australia in general.

Toowoomba offers the tourist and visitor many attractions, and the board of management of the Carnival of Flowers is now preparing to launch what is expected to be the most spectacular floral event ever staged in Queensland. Our week of festivities commences this year on 22 September and will be officially opened, we hope, by the Minister for Labour and Industry, if he is well enough to carry out that duty. I appreciate what the Hon. Ken Morris has done during his term of office as Deputy Premier of this wonderful State of Queensland. He has been an inspiration to all of us by his vital interest in the development of the State, its secondary industries, and its tourist industry, and we thank him for the lead that he has given us. During this week of carnival, people will not only have the opportunity of viewing a wealth of floral beauty, but, at the same time, will see the marked degree of progress and development that have been taking place in Toowoomba and district. Much of this, of course, reflects the guiding influence of local government, but this authority is largely dependent on financial assistance from the State Government.

Hon. members are no doubt aware that capital expenditure in Toowoomba since this Government assumed office in 1957 has been of the order of £1,000,000 annually. In fact, during the last three years the annual figure has exceeded £1,000,000. This expenditure comprises projects carried out by such instrumentalities as the Department of Public Works, Queensland Railways, Queensland Housing Commission, Main Roads Department, Toowoomba City Council and other local-government bodies such as the Toowoomba Fire Brigades Board, the Toowoomba Hospitals Board and the Toowoomba District Abattoirs Board.

To be precise, I summarise the expenditure in Toowoomba as follows:—

Year	Amount £
1957-1958	737,305
1958-1959	863,615
1959-1960	1,059,802
1960-1961	1,249,738
1961-1962	
(Up to the end of April) 1,024,260	

Those figures provide a grand total of £4,934,720 and serve to illustrate that the Government's activities are not concentrated in one particular area but are fairly and impartially spread over the entire area of Queensland. I believe a similar analysis taken in other cities throughout the State would reflect the same pattern as that in Toowoomba. It is also interesting to observe that in Toowoomba a start is now being made on a major works programme, which includes the Perseverance Creek Dam, which will supply Toowoomba with an adequate supply of water. This project of the Toowoomba City Council receives a subsidy from the Government amounting to 32.9 per cent. of the cost. No doubt this contribution by the State Government has been and will be gratefully received and acknowledged by the people of Toowoomba.

Possibly the most outstanding Government achievement in Toowoomba at the present time has been in the field of education. In this regard I should like to voice the sentiments of the people of Toowoomba by stating that we are very appreciative of the educational facilities that have been provided in Toowoomba at both primary and secondary level. Our latest acquisition, of course, has been extensions to the Harristown and Mt. Lofty high schools, Mt. Lofty being the newer of the two. This work not only provides adequate accommodation and very genial conditions for pupils at secondary-school level, but it has been possible, too, to transfer the pupils from the present technical college, which is in the centre of the town, to suburban areas. This latter college will then provide adequate accommodation in the field of technical education.

Without wishing to be parochial in this matter, I feel that the only discordant note we have in the education field concerns the tertiary level of education. Hon. members will no doubt be aware of the existence of a very active committee on the Darling Downs known as the Darling Downs University Establishment Association. This association—quite rightly in my opinion—claims that a mandate exists for consideration to the establishment of university facilities on the Darling Downs.

I do not wish to labour this particular point as I have made previous reference to the matter, but I should like to take the opportunity of again reminding hon. members that we in Toowoomba have, in fact, the foundation for the establishment of such facilities. For this reason, I believe it is my duty to make these representations as

often as possible in the hope that our plea will be heard and that we will be given an assurance that a university college will be established on the Darling Downs, preferably in Toowoomba, as expeditiously as possible. It was very gratifying to read in "The Courier-Mail" last week about the probe of South Queensland's university needs. I feel sure that the association in Toowoomba will do everything possible to again state their case before that Commonwealth commission.

From education we turn to health. In this field we are indeed appreciative of the development that has taken place at the Toowoomba General Hospital, which was badly neglected over many years by the previous Labour Government. It was a disgrace to the city of Toowoomba. There is at last evidence of an energetic approach to the problems that have confronted our people for many years. Notwithstanding the excellent work of the medical and nursing professions at that hospital, there is a lamentable lack of adequate facilities. Admittedly a modern nurses' home is now a reality and suitable accommodation is being provided for the resident medical officers. This, I believe, will overcome a recurring problem in obtaining sufficient doctors to permit the hospital to function in the best interests of the community. However, it is not sufficient to have an efficient staff of highly-qualified medical practitioners; we must provide a place in which they can work. In this regard my mind turns to the proposed surgical block. Today I wish to make a very strong plea that an early start on the erection of the surgical block should not be hampered through lack of finance. I am aware that £50,000 has been made available for this work but now I am assured that unless an additional £30,000 is made available there is some doubt whether tenders can be called so that a start can be made on the construction of this building. I understand that the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works is aware of the position and that representations have been made by the Toowoomba Hospitals Board with a view to securing this additional vote of £30,000.

Dr. Noble: That surgical block will be started this financial year.

Mr. ANDERSON: That is very gratifying. I thank the Minister. I am very pleased to know that it will be started this financial year.

Some months ago I had the opportunity to attend a very successful conference organised by the Australian Institute of Management and held at the University at St. Lucia. The theme of the conference was "Positive Action for Queensland's Development". Throughout the addresses, which were given by very prominent and highly-qualified men, there was continual reference to the word "potential". Speakers at the conference reminded delegates that too much had been said about Queensland's potential,

and the time was now opportune to replace that all-too-frequently-used phrase with the words "positive action". It is interesting to note that one of the focal points of the discussions was the development of Central Queensland. In this regard it is very refreshing to learn that positive action is taking place. As a State, we are undoubtedly very grateful for the Commonwealth's financial assistance, which has made a start on this project possible. Nevertheless, concurrently we must look to our land-tenure laws. It is very pleasing to know that these laws will be revised with a view to providing greater security of tenure, because I firmly believe that, until such a revision takes place, we will be unable as a State to attract sufficient interest and, more important still, sufficient capital, to make the project worth while. However, we will have an opportunity during this session of debating the issue more fully and I feel sure that nothing but good will come of such a debate.

Anticipating that such discussions will take place at an early date, I draw hon. members' attention to the words of Sir William Gunn when he addressed the Australian Institute of Management Conference to which I referred earlier. In this address, Sir William had very strong views on why Queensland had not been developed at a rate comparable with other States. He said at pages 44 and 45 of the conference proceedings—

"It is not hard to find the reasons why Queensland's tremendous land resources have not been developed to the same extent as other parts of Australia. There is one reason only, and that is that sufficient encouragement has not been given to private investment in land development in Queensland. While Queensland persists with a land policy based on a system of leasehold tenure, we will not develop at the rate we should.

"Queensland cannot be proud of its performance over the last twenty years. It is indeed hard to believe that Queensland had less sheep in 1951-1960 than in 1931-1940, and only 1.4 million more than in 1891-1900, and that cattle population has only increased by 13 per cent. since 1941-1945, while in both of these industries prices have been satisfactory to the producer.

"Queensland has for too long been referred to as the State with the tremendous potential, and likewise the State that has done nothing to develop its tremendous potential.

"The time has come for Queensland to undertake a ten year plan to double its production for those commodities for which markets can be found, and these would appear to be wool, beef, cotton and grains, so let us all, whether we be engaged in primary or secondary industries, draw up a plan for a vigorous

development of our agricultural and pastoral industries. If we do this we will certainly see our secondary industries develop at a faster rate, and Queensland's population will grow, but I cannot see Queensland being developed unless we do see a vigorous rural development.

"Queensland will not be developed while we continue to have a policy of leasehold tenure, and our record of development proves this beyond any shadow of doubt.

"Why did people go to the 90 Mile Desert in South Australia and spend large sums of money in developing poor quality soils, and leave the brigalow country of Queensland undeveloped? The answer is clear. They were given a secure title to the land and were not faced with the threat that they would lose their land and would not be adequately compensated for the improvements, as has happened in Queensland.

"Queensland desperately needs finance for development, and every day finance is being turned away from Queensland because of our leasehold and land policy.

"South Australia has the A.M.P. land development scheme. This is not possible in Queensland because of our present policy. We need 10 plans such as the A.M.P. scheme. There are similar schemes in Western Australia also, and they are possible in the Northern Territory.

"I believe that our Land Settlement Policy must undergo a complete change. We must first decide what we are going to produce, and if it is to be wool, then let us decide on the area of land that will produce wool at the lowest possible cost per lb., and then make the minimum area of each sheep property not less than this area. The owner of this land should then be told that if he will develop this land to its full capacity, he will then automatically receive a freehold title to the land, and if he is not prepared to develop the land then it will be taken from him and given to somebody who will. Australian and overseas investors should be encouraged to invest in Queensland, and not discouraged as they are at present. It should be possible to have an A.M.P. scheme in Queensland."

Mainly because of Sir William's forthright address, this was the recommendation of that conference on land settlement—

"That a first requirement for positive development of Queensland is an immediate study of the existing land settlement policies to see if they attract development capital and give the necessary incentives to land-holders to achieve maximum development and productivity.

"If, after the study, it is found they do not attract capital and offer incentive, then it is strongly recommended that the policies be changed to achieve these desirable objectives, and the new policies be widely publicised."

12

If, on the other hand, the policies are found to give the right incentive and are sufficient to attract investment capital from large companies and dedicated land-holders, then it is strongly recommended that steps be taken at once to publicise widely the advantages and benefits of land settlement in Queensland.

The following elements of land settlement appear to require close attention during the study:—

Taxation concessions and other incentives.

Security of tenure.

The drawing of a contract.

Methods of borrowing for land development and interest charges.

Giving land-holders option re nature of agreement.

Compensation on resumption.

The size of holdings—living units versus economic units.

Early Government decisions on renewable leases.

Land development schemes as in Victoria and Western Australia.

A separate Land Settlement Commission for implementing land settlement and financing settlers.

I do not believe we can afford to disregard the pronouncements of such people as Sir William Gunn, whose advice no doubt is backed by a very profound practical experience in this field, so I commend his thoughts to all hon. members.

There has been a marked improvement in the standard of our roads system in Queensland since this Government took office in 1957. Again, the people of Toowoomba are appreciative of the work that is now being carried out on the Toowoomba-Brisbane highway. Furthermore, it was very gratifying to hear the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, in reply to my question this morning, say that the four-lane highway on the Range Road, Toowoomba, will be commenced this financial year.

This general pattern of positive action is reflected not only in that area but also, from my personal observation, in many other parts of Queensland. The general picture is evidence of a very healthy attitude and an energetic approach towards removing a stigma from which Queensland has long suffered, namely, of having notoriously bad roads.

Unfortunately the improvement in our road systems is tending to accentuate the road-accident toll. Perhaps the only redeeming feature of our bad roads was that they tended to keep road speeds down. May I at this stage, in making passing reference to the road-accident toll, which of course is exercising the minds of all hon. members, comment on the address given last week by the hon. member for Wavell?

Mr. Bromley: Do you think there ought to be more road-patrol officers?

Mr. ANDERSON: Yes, I do.

I was particularly interested in the suggestion made by the hon. member for Wavell that consideration should be given to the issue of provisional licences to the younger generation. I commend him for his very constructive thinking. No doubt his suggestions will receive the solid support of all hon. members. As I remember it, he suggested that those in the age group between 17 and 21 years should be issued with a provisional licence only, such licence to be confirmed upon their attaining the age of 21 years. If they become involved in any accident for which they are responsible, the licence should be automatically suspended for six months, during which period they will attend lectures, after which the licence may be returned to them if they are proved to be worthy. Should they trespass again, either by being involved in an accident for which they are responsible or by committing a breach of the Traffic Code, their licence should then be suspended until they turn 21. I thought the suggestion wonderfully constructive and I was greatly disappointed that it received very poor publicity through the Press. If I remember rightly, I think it was given about an inch-and-a-half or two inches in the metropolitan edition of "The Courier-Mail," and I did not see any mention of it in the country edition. I think some country papers did refer to it. On an important matter like this, I think that the Press should use a little of its power to let the people know where these suggestions come from. I commend the hon. member for Wavell in that regard.

Finally, the State of Queensland reflects the image of a Government who are alive to, and conscious of, the requirements of our people. It has not been easy to remedy all the mistakes and the lack of interest of the Labour Government for many years, but we have endeavoured to overcome them. Admittedly, I do not agree with all that has been done but, on the whole, we have undoubtedly consolidated our position and gained the confidence of Queenslanders. This very happy state of affairs indicates to us that, provided we maintain a high standard of progress and development, backed by honest and sincere administration, the job ahead can be left safely in our hands for many years to come.

Mr. PILBEAM (Rockhampton South) (3.47 p.m.): On my own behalf and on behalf of the citizens of Rockhampton, I join with previous speakers in the message of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty. I congratulate the Governor of Queensland, His Excellency Sir Henry Abel Smith, and Lady May, on their appointment for a further term of office. We in Rockhampton have a very high regard for Sir Henry and Lady May. Whilst they have been in office

they have always placed themselves at the disposal of the people of Rockhampton. They have proved to us on many occasions, as they have to people throughout this State, that they are our friends.

Sir Henry has always taken a keen interest in my electorate and its problems. He has readily visited Rockhampton and has unstintingly made himself available for any duty, social or otherwise. As he is a very keen sportsman, naturally he has often gravitated to Rockhampton, where the shooting and fishing in the immediate vicinity of the city is unsurpassed. I might say that he has never failed to voice his appreciation of the best and cheapest meat in Australia, which is available in Rockhampton and which we will continue to make available as long as we are protected from the possible construction of that uneconomic proposition, the district abattoir.

I should like to congratulate the Deputy Premier on his elevation to the leadership of our party. I think that he has all the qualities that make for a successful term in office. I congratulate also the Treasurer on his appointment as Deputy Leader. He, in direct contrast with hon. members on the other side of the House, is a most capable member.

I must commiserate with the Minister for Labour and Industry on the state of his health, and express my sincere wish that he is shortly restored to his full powers, which are considerable.

I would be a very poor representative of the people of Rockhampton if, today in particular, I did not congratulate one of Rockhampton's leading sportsmen, Mr. Rod Laver, on doing what no other Australian has ever been able to do in the long history of world tennis. He has completed the "grand slam" of championships. Rod has been a very close friend of mine for quite a few years. As a matter of fact, he made his first radio broadcast with me over the A.B.C. radio station, and even at that early date he was quiet, unassuming, and modest. I will not make any comparisons with members of the Opposition. He was so quiet that I had difficulty in inducing him to reply to my questions. He has proved himself a fine sportsman and a gentleman both on and off the tennis court, and he thoroughly deserves the honours that have been heaped upon him on this occasion.

In Rockhampton we have seen fit to commemorate his feats by erecting a pavilion in front of the courts on which he played so much tennis in his early years and on which he was coached by Mr. Charlie Hollis, a local professional. I discussed with Rod the matter of a testimonial, and where a number of sportsmen might have said, "You can give me a wallet of notes," or something like that, Rod unhesitatingly asked for this form of memorial—the "Rod Laver Pavilion"—which will be used by tennis players of the future. We

have already collected £3,000 in Rockhampton towards the cost of the pavilion, and I think that I am justified in widening the appeal because Rod's feat is national in character. Through the Press, particularly through the newspapers in the capital cities, I appeal to sportsmen to support the appeal. Instead of building all our memorials in the capital cities, let us now build a memorial of a national nature in a provincial city. I know it would give Rod the utmost pleasure to see that pavilion erected at an early date. He has already indicated that he is prepared to give demonstrations on the Rockhampton courts, the proceeds from which will help to pay for the pavilion. As I said, I feel justified not only in congratulating Rod but also in asking sportsmen throughout Australia to support the appeal to raise a fitting memorial to him in the city where he played his early tennis.

I wish to pay tribute to the work of the Government in my area over the past 12 months, work that has resulted in imbuing the minds and hearts of the people of Rockhampton and Central Queensland with a feeling of real optimism. When I first took up my duties as a Parliamentarian, I, in common with the thinking people in Central Queensland—

An Opposition Member: "Thinking," or "stinking"?

Mr. PILBEAM: I said "thinking" people. I did not mention the Opposition.

I, in common with all thinking people in Central Queensland, was at one time very downhearted because of the lack of progress and development in the area. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in my maiden speech I gave figures proving that Central Queensland had the lowest rise in population of any part of Australia. We had a bad start a few years ago in Central Queensland, and I think that the feelings of the population of the area reached their record low on the occasion of a joint meeting of protest that I called at the rear of the town hall in Rockhampton on 10 February, 1961. That meeting was attended by about 5,000 people. At that time, there was strong agitation to have the Government construct a major powerhouse at Callide and to support the development of Port Alma. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there was a feeling of general indignation at that time. We felt that we were being robbed of our rights in the possibility of not having a powerhouse constructed at Callide and we certainly felt very upset about Port Alma. You will recall that I crossed the floor of the House to vote against the Government on Port Alma. No-one worked harder than I to advance these projects, nor was there any sterner critic of the Government. I realise, of course, that the feeling of despondency at the neglect of Central Queensland was a culmination of years of hopeless administration by previous Governments. I am fair enough to say, however, that the apathy of the people of Rockhampton themselves was

a major contributing factor. There is an old adage, and a true one, that the people get the government they deserve. The apathy of the people of Rockhampton was reflected for years in the apathy of the Labour Government which controlled the destiny of the region.

With this background and with my strong regard for the people of Central Queensland, it must be realised that I personally would not be easily satisfied that the Government were planning to develop the area. Let me say here and now that over the past 12 months the evidence has been more than ample that if the Government continue in office Central Queensland's development is assured because there have been no more dramatic eventualities in any part of Australia than events that are starting to unveil themselves in my area.

Mr. Sullivan: Yet one hears the hon. member for Rockhampton North knocking the Government every time he stands up to speak.

Mr. PILBEAM: I am positive that the worst that could befall Central Queensland would be for the State to return to administration by the Labour Party as it is now constituted and for Central Queensland to revert to the state of the doldrums that existed for years under the previous administration. Now we know where we are going in Central Queensland, and for the first time we realise that we are moving in the right direction and that we have a Government who are prepared to co-operate with us in our ambitious schemes for the future.

Over the past few years on many occasions I have moved motions at party conferences, at Local Government Association meetings, and in particular at meetings of the Central Queensland Local Government Association and the Queensland Local Government Association, that the Government look with favour on the development of Central Queensland and develop Queensland on the basis that there are three regions of the State—the southern, central, and northern. For years, any thinking person could see that the allocations were gradually devolving to a two-way basis—Southern Queensland and Northern Queensland—and we had no developmental schemes whatever in Central Queensland.

As a matter of fact, the road from Rockhampton to Longreach was never even gazetted as a main road, and in some areas I would say it followed the line of the original bullock tracks. That is how badly off we were in Central Queensland and, although we could appreciate the requirements of Northern Queensland, we could not see any recognition of Central Queensland's needs.

Recently, although I had previously submitted motions that the Government should make allocations on a three-way basis and move to develop the three parts of the State, I was able to amend that motion at the last conference of our party to read that the

Government should continue to make three-way development of Queensland. What a vital difference in the motion and what a vital difference there is today in the outlook of the people of Central Queensland who at last are seeing the way to reaching their proper place in the sun.

Let me tell hon. members some of the things that have caused this optimistic feeling in my electorate of Rockhampton South in particular. For years in Rockhampton we have had apathetic harbour boards. I am not trying to blame Governments any more than I blame ourselves.

We have had apathetic harbour boards. We have allowed Port Alma to remain undeveloped for years. It was not even connected with Rockhampton by road. The old wooden wharves were becoming obsolete; they were falling into the sea. With the co-operation and support of the present Government, and through the work of an active and energetic harbour board, we have completed a £250,000 bitumen-sealed road to Port Alma. We are commencing the construction of a £500,000 concrete breast-wharf. Our schemes include refrigeration, bulk-storage and bulk-loading facilities. We will soon be in the happy position of being able to provide the primary producers of Central Queensland with two excellent ports—Gladstone and Port Alma. It is most important that we have these two ports to export the products of Central Queensland—meat and grain in ever-increasing quantities, and coal.

The people of Rockhampton made considerable sacrifices to make the development of Port Alma possible. I should say that no other city has entered into such commitments as the city of Rockhampton has in order to build Port Alma into a first-class port. We had to provide £90,000 towards the cost of that road. We had to guarantee interest and redemption payments on the new wharf. I am proud to say that in this, the first year in which the Rockhampton City Council assumed the financial responsibility, the Rockhampton Harbour Board presented a balanced budget. Out of bankruptcy it produced a balanced budget. What is even more important, after about 35 years, the people of Rockhampton are no longer suffering any differentiation in the price of petrol. They are getting it 1½d. a gallon cheaper than previously and at the present time the price is under consideration by the judiciary, which is beyond the carping criticism of half-witted people. A determination will be made in accordance with the facts. When I say that it is under the consideration of the judiciary, I mean that it is being considered by Mr. Fullagar. Despite the criticism of Mr. Fullagar, I am confident that he will arrive at a just decision. Even if a further reduction in the price of petrol is not allowed, at least the people of Rockhampton are now getting it 1½d. a gallon cheaper. Had the knockers who said, "We

won't develop Port Alma under those terms" had their way, that advantage would not have accrued to the people of Rockhampton.

I think it is only fair that I should give some indication of the policy of the Rockhampton Harbour Board, of which I am deputy chairman, towards Port Alma. I am very grateful for the support we get from all sides in the development of Port Alma. We even get it from responsible members of the Opposition who have come to Rockhampton and have seen the development that has taken place. The only opposition we get to the development of Port Alma comes from unthinking citizens of Rockhampton. I suppose you would get that in any community. After all, you have sub-normal schools and sub-normal citizens. As I say, the only opposition to the development of Port Alma has come from within the city. From that development already we are getting petrol 1½d. a gallon cheaper, with prospects of a further price reduction. It would gladden anyone's heart to see the rehabilitation of what was previously a desolate, broken-down scene. I think the Leader of the Opposition will agree that a great deal of development has taken place at Port Alma, although he saw it in rather unfortunate circumstances.

We advanced the development of Port Alma in the light that, with Gladstone, it should help to export the produce of Central Queensland overseas. We have never advanced it in opposition to Gladstone. In the development of Central Queensland we see a real necessity for two ports and we think it would have been a sorry day for Queensland and Australia if we had let this port fall into disuse and disrepair. We believed it would be needed, and needed very shortly. If it had been allowed to die it would have cost considerably more to rehabilitate it after the wharves had been allowed to fall into the sea, and after the railway line had fallen into disrepair. We said we were quite happy to share with Gladstone the produce of the area. In our negotiations with an oil company for a share of the through-put of the oil trade we advanced no other proposition than that we required Rockhampton sales to pass through the Rockhampton port. In effect, we said to Gladstone, "You take 75 per cent. and we will take approximately 25 per cent." Is that unfair? I have been told that I am unfair and have been sneered at by people in Rockhampton for what I have done. We have never been unreasonable and never on any occasion have we represented to the oil company that we should get more than one-quarter of the trade.

At a grain-growers' meeting in Emerald recently, attended by at least one member of the Opposition, all the grain-growers in the area supported a motion—and I give the assurance that it did not come from me, nor was it prompted by me—that Port Alma be accepted as the second port—

Mr. Thackeray: You were behind it.

Mr. PILBEAM: Is the hon. member against it?

It was moved that Port Alma be accepted as the second port for grain shipments as soon as facilities were provided by the Rockhampton Harbour Board. That is clear evidence that the grain-growers in Central Queensland are on side with the development of Port Alma and that they realise the urgent necessity for two ports to carry the Central Queensland export trade.

In the past, Central Queensland had no unity, even in the field of local government, but now we have a thriving Central Queensland Local Government Association of which I am proud to have been the original president, and am now the vice-president. This association includes almost all the local authorities of Central Queensland and is daily gathering strength. In common with Rockhampton, this association realises the necessity for an all-weather highway linking Rockhampton with Longreach and Winton, without which the area has no real backbone, and without which, during wet weather, there is very limited access to the coast from the far-western parts of Central Queensland. Any true Central Queenslanders would be distressed to see all the produce from the West, including wool, going direct by road to Brisbane, and the railway system neglected. I say quite definitely that no longer will it be the road age against the rail age. Roads must be considered as complementary to, and not antagonistic to, railways. If we wish the railway system to develop, we must develop the road systems parallel with the railways. That has been proved abundantly in the case of the railway from Rockhampton to Longreach. It was wonderful to see the blueprint of Queensland roads produced by the Commissioner for Main Roads to the local authorities throughout the State. The Rockhampton City Council had the pure and unadulterated pleasure of seeing that blueprint at its last meeting and I congratulate the Minister on it. For the first time we have hopes of getting that road gazetted as a highway by Christmas or thereabouts.

In the meantime I am more than gratified to see the work that is going on and at the decentralisation policy of the department. We are reaping plenty of dividends from having our own Main Roads Department office in Rockhampton with an excellent engineer, who has been very co-operative and has even helped with the city's unemployment problems. He is developing schemes between Rockhampton and Emerald, particularly on the hairy sections this side of the Dawson River and the other side of Daringa. He is also bringing into being schemes between Emerald and the Zamias in the black-soil country. The position with roads is excellent.

We have the two seaside resorts of Emu Park and Yeppoon. Emu Park is connected to Rockhampton by a road that is not even gazetted after 70 years. I need not remind the House who has been in power most of that time; I will let hon. members guess.

Mr. Evans: It is on the list now.

Mr. PILBEAM: It is on the list for gazettal as a main road and I am hopeful that it will be built very shortly. Those are two very beautiful seaside resorts, both free from the danger of shark attack. We have never had a shark attack there. I commend the Government for giving the area tremendous publicity by putting shark-catching squads on the beaches of Southern Queensland and North Queensland. We do not want any in Central Queensland because we never get sharks. But we do want the road to Emu Park and I will be most grateful for the Minister's continued good offices.

I must take exception to one aspect of the policy of the department—I took exception to it under the previous Government—and that is the proposition involved in the construction and maintenance of major bridges. I am strongly of the opinion that major bridges should be part of the State highway. That recommendation will be made as the result of the inspection of the blueprint by the Rockhampton City Council so the Minister might as well prepare himself for it. I made approaches to the previous Government and I have made approaches to this Government. The department's policy is still that, when a bridge goes through a shire, the shire pays nothing towards its cost of construction. When a city is unfortunate enough to be situated on a highway and to have a river cut it, the city has to pay about 52 per cent. of the cost of construction and a considerable sum towards its upkeep. That is too great a handicap. Take the case of twin cities like Ayr and Home Hill, which are connected by a very large bridge to which they contributed nothing. By the time Rockhampton pays for its bridge it will have contributed over £1,000,000 in interest and redemption. That is too big a handicap to impose on Rockhampton as against cities like Toowoomba and Townsville with somewhat similar populations.

Mr. Duggan: Give us a river like the Fitzroy and we will pay for the bridge.

Mr. PILBEAM: I might take the hon. gentleman up on that.

We commend the Minister for Transport on his improved attitude towards concessional railway freights. Recently I was in the West when he announced his latest decision to reduce freights on general merchandise from Rockhampton to Longreach to £7 a ton. All the storekeepers in the West, who had been in the habit of drawing their supplies from Rockhampton, were on the eve of changing their business to Brisbane and getting their goods by road at a cost of £10 a ton. That decision of the Minister saved the day. It was a wonderful piece of good news for the merchants of Rockhampton, who played a vital part in the representations to the Minister. If that attitude is applied to freight moving the other

way, in particular to the movement of wool from Longreach to Rockhampton, the railways will receive very much more business in that part of Queensland.

Great progress is being made in our city undertakings in Rockhampton, with the help of the Government of which I am proud to be a member. Thanks to a wonderful agreement with the Department of Public Lands, we are at last building a road up Mt. Archer, something that for 70 years was only talked about. It appears that one will be able to drive to the top in a four-wheel-drive vehicle by Christmas, 1963. When we put forward reasons why we wanted a road there, it was argued that people would not use it. Now, every week-end, before the road is completed and whilst only basic earth work is done half-way up, we have to pay a policeman to perform special duty controlling the traffic. People climb up there and others try to ride motor-bikes up. There is tremendous interest in it, and it will be one of the best tourist roads in the State and a great asset to the city of Rockhampton.

We are also receiving Government support and co-operation in our scheme to provide Rockhampton with a first-class water service. We have for some time been seized with the certainty that we would have to increase our supply of water to a marked extent if we wished to provide it in commercial quantities. For that reason, we have sought permission to construct a barrage across the Fitzroy River, which would give us possibly the best water supply in the State. By stopping the tide at Rockhampton, the river would be converted from a salt-water stream to a fresh-water stream, and a tremendous amount of water could be given to industry for merely the cost of pumping the water from the stream. A large-scale model has been built, and tests are being conducted at the University. We have already received the assurance of the Premier and the Treasurer that, as soon as the answers are available to us, they will co-operate fully in this very progressive and wonderful scheme, which will give us an opportunity to develop industries in Rockhampton. As everyone realises, the main requirement of industry the world over is water.

To refer to normal city amenities, despite criticism that one may hear from time to time, I say that no city in the State—and I say this in defence of my council—is making the progress with its normal amenities that Rockhampton is. I shall quote some figures, and hon. members can see how they compare with fairy tales. In the past five years we have increased our road building from 2½ miles of bitumen a year to 11 miles, and our kerbing and channelling from half-a-mile to 30 miles. We are sewerage houses now at the rate of approximately 1,000 every four years. We have completely sewerage the southern part of the city, and we are com-

pleting, on the basis of five years, the sewerage of the northern part of the city. We are reconstructing the School of Arts and the Library. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have constructed a first-class swimming pool, and we have almost completed a beautification scheme on the river bank. We are building a new little theatre. With all these amenities and this tremendous acceleration of effort on the local-government front, none of which would have been possible without the support of the Government, we have not increased the rates in the last four years. So do not listen to the Jeremiahs who say that Rockhampton is flat.

Mr. Duggan: Isn't it true that the Government reduced the subsidy to local authorities?

Mr. PILBEAM: The Government definitely reduced the rate of subsidy, but each year we have received more in total. We cannot have it both ways. This year a record amount of subsidy has been provided by the Government; this year we have a record loan programme. People may make disparaging remarks about Rockhampton, but what other city can say at this stage that it has already completed its loan-raising negotiations? We have firm offers for the whole of our loan requirements, and I doubt whether any other city in Queensland can say that.

In answer to the people who are trying to knock Rockhampton and say it is flat, I will tell you another thing, Mr. Speaker. Since the war we have contributed £250,000 more to Commonwealth Loans than the city of Toowoomba, and over £500,000 more than the city of Townsville, despite the fact that Townsville's population is 5,000 or 6,000 greater than Rockhampton's. The latest loan programme shows that Rockhampton has a higher quota of loan contribution than Townsville.

Mr. Campbell: The hon. member for Rockhampton North supports the Government, doesn't he?

Mr. PILBEAM: Sometimes.

I have not time to enlarge on the other wonderful schemes that make me so excited about the future of Central Queensland, but I should not be a true Central Queenslander if I did not refer to the erection of the power-house on the Callide coalfield. How can one not feel excited when one realises that at present a power-house at Callide, to cost a total of £23,000,000, is being constructed and will be in full production by 1965 or 1966? Preliminary contracts involving the expenditure of £3,000,000 have already been let for boilers, turbines, and parts of the power-station. The power-station will have a capacity of 60 megawatts, or 60,000 kilowatts, which is slightly larger than the capacity of the present power-house in Rockhampton. A power-line is now being constructed from Rockhampton

to Moura at a total cost of about £1,000,000, including the cost of sub-stations, and it will be completed by the end of this year. There is no sweet by-and-by about that proposal; it is definitely with us. The Government plan to increase the power of the station ultimately to 120 megawatts, and I think everyone knows that we are putting a power-line through from our present power-station in Rockhampton to make power available for one of the biggest dragline excavators in the world, the cost of which is about £1,500,000. No-one can tell me that that is not an exciting eventuality in the life of any Central Queenslander. It is difficult to appreciate the value of the work that is now proceeding for the development of the coalfields. I hope later this week to speak in support of the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity about the agreement between Thiess Bros. and Peabodys and the almost fabulous development that is taking place in the coalfields of Central Queensland. Those coal deposits have been there for years, and the possibility of building a power-house at Callide was always there. You cannot blame me, Mr. Speaker, for supporting a Government that has discovered them. It needs courage and determination and faith in the area to make these exciting possibilities come to life.

Like every other person in Central Queensland, I am more than pleased with what is happening in the development of the brigalow lands. How can anyone conscientiously knock that? How can anyone say a word against the spending of £1,750,000 on it in the immediate future? It cannot be other than a good thing for the area. It is a wonderful scheme that will develop a first-class area. There are only three matters to be watched, namely, sufficient capital, proper tenure, and a reasonable area. Once those three equations are solved this scheme cannot help but be a brilliant success, especially when one realises that at the present time that country is not being used at all.

I do not think anyone will deny that the brigalow belt is possibly the largest area of undeveloped fertile land in the world today, and a major scheme like this must be applauded by every loyal Australian.

I started my speech by a message of loyalty to the Governor; I followed it up by thanking the Government for at last realising that there is such an area as Central Queensland. I am most sincere in voicing my appreciation of the work of the Government and in testifying to my complete agreement with this most ambitious scheme for Central Queensland.

(Time expired.)

Mr. TOOTH (Ashgrove) (4.27 p.m.): I rise to oppose the amendment and to support the motion which was so adequately moved

by the hon. member for Flinders and seconded by the hon. member for Wavell. I take the opportunity, in common with other members, of congratulating them on their speeches. I should also like to take the early opportunity of placing on record my personal regret—and I know I can associate with this not only members of the House but also the great majority of people in my electorate—at the illness of the Minister for Labour and Industry, and his consequential retirement from the leadership of the Liberal Party. Mr. Morris is widely known in the Ashgrove electorate and the general regret is very intimately shared by people living in that area.

Those who have been close to the hon. gentleman in recent times have long feared that something of this nature would happen because, driven by a boundless enthusiasm and wide-ranging imagination, he spent himself selflessly, indeed with a measure of reckless prodigality, in the service, not only of his department, but of the State as a whole. We do hope that the enforced rest that he is about to take will so restore him to health that he will be able to continue his valuable services to this State.

I should also like to join in the congratulations that have been extended to the new Leader of the Liberal Party, the Hon. Alan Munro, Minister for Justice, and to extend to him sympathy in the burden that he assumes in this particular task, because it has been made abundantly obvious already that he is to become the object of the personal vilification that was directed at the former Leader, Mr. Morris. Indeed, in this House already one hon. gentleman on the opposite side has used these extraordinary words: "I do not know anyone who is more cold-blooded or calculating than the newly-elected Leader of the Liberal Party." Of course, that sort of talk is what we have come to expect from some hon. members opposite, but it is quite unworthy of the dignity of this House and of the attitude that should be adopted on occasions such as this.

I should like to associate myself and my electorate with the expressions of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and also to say with what great enthusiasm and anticipation we are all looking forward to her pending visit to Queensland. I join also with the expressions of satisfaction at the extended term of His Excellency the Governor.

I should like to refer to some of the criticisms by the hon. member for South Brisbane of the Government's arrangements for the visit of Their Majesties, the King and Queen of Thailand.

Mr. Knox: Where is the hon. member for South Brisbane.

Mr. TOOTH: I do not know where he is. We will have to deal with him in absentia.

He said something to this effect—

“While dealing with Royal activities and Royal occasions I must say that I was somewhat disappointed . . .”

and then he came to a climax and said—

“ . . . and to a large extent disgusted last week with the Government’s arrangements for the Royal visitors.”

He does not give one single example of this alleged neglect or failure of the Government but goes on to complain about its being a glamour crusade of artificiality. He calls for a ministerial apology for something or other that was printed in a Sunday newspaper somewhere. He made a whole series of derogatory remarks. I do not think it is particularly helpful when we are endeavouring to establish cordial relations with our near Asian neighbours that that sort of irresponsibility should be indulged in in one of the Legislative Chambers of this Commonwealth. It is typical of the querulous, whinging attitude of the hon. member. Indeed, I think it is safe to assume that we will never be able to win a smile from the hon. member. I must at this stage confess that I do admire his courage, indeed his hardihood, in criticising our women-folk for their keen interest in the glamorous little Royal visitor, Queen Sirikit. I feel that any man who did not have some sympathy with them in this matter must indeed be getting very old.

These things perhaps may be regarded as trivialities, but a much worse feature of the situation was the attack by the hon. member upon a senior public servant, and indirectly upon the Public Service generally. Under this Government public servants have full political rights. The only proviso is that they do not engage in politics during working hours, and that they do not criticise the administration of the various departments. Of course, those bars have been in existence for many years under Socialistic Governments. Other than that, they have full complete liberty. I would say that public servants in Queensland today have a greater feeling of freedom, confidence, and ability to exercise their civic rights than they have ever had in the past. There are frequent signs that the Opposition have become restive and regard public servants with considerable distaste. Of course, that is the inevitable result of increasing Left-wing influence in the ranks of the A.L.P. The people associated with the Trades Hall regard the Public Service and public servants as a bunch of silver-tails who are to be put in their place and kept in their place. Of course, the hon. member for South Brisbane has been in considerable awe of the powerful union chiefs at the Trades Hall. Indeed, we have been told recently that he is under a very deep debt of gratitude to one of them in the person of Mr. Frank Nolan. Therefore, it is not to be wondered at that he should be making every endeavour to curry favour with those gentlemen.

Mr. Armstrong: Didn’t he have a bit of difficulty getting endorsement.

Mr. TOOTH: I do not want to canvass the difficulties of the hon. member in obtaining endorsement. In fact, I do not want to canvass the difficulties he will face in being re-elected. The important thing at this stage is to consider the evidence of a certain attitude to the Public Service by the Socialists in this State, an attitude that was conclusively revealed during the recent Westbrook incident. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the former superintendent, Mr. Golledge, came under general criticism from the public, the Press, and the Opposition, who hoped to embarrass the Government. The Opposition, like a pack of hungry wolves, attacked him personally, and demanded that he be sacked. He had served successive Socialist Governments for more than 30 years without ever being given an opportunity to obtain special training or assistance in his duties in Queensland, or to travel to other parts of the world and study similar institutions. He was given no opportunity to improve his outlook. He was left to carry on as best he could in the hope that what was out of sight was out of mind. When the trouble blew up the Opposition were keen to seize some political advantage from it and they were prepared to throw to the wolves a servant who had devoted years of service to them. The Leader of the Opposition demanded that he be sacked. He was supported by cries from back-bench members of the Opposition, led by the hon. member for Brisbane, who said, “Sack him! sack him! sack him!” What would have been involved in his sacking? The loss of all his superannuation rights, the loss of his long-service leave entitlement, and so on. He would have been tossed out without a job in the evening of his days. That is the Opposition’s inhuman approach to the public servant. I emphasise this because it is important that the public servants of the State should understand what they have experienced in the past. Younger members of the Public Service are not acutely aware of it, and probably will not be aware of it, but we must make certain they understand what can happen. After 30 years of faithful service the Opposition demanded that this man be dismissed although, according to his limited lights, he had done his best. The public servants of Queensland must remember the attitude of the Opposition in that incident.

To emphasise the determined attack the Government have made on inherited problems, I turn now to another aspect of Government policy. The hon. member for South Brisbane said that the heart of the city was being eaten out. Of course, that was a fabrication. It is utter nonsense! The heart of the city is improving day by day. The fact that some city buildings are for sale is evidence of growth, not of decay. The largest city building for sale today is probably the “Telegraph” building in Queen Street. Is it for sale because the city is decaying? Of course not! It is

because greater development is taking place, thus making the building too small for its purpose. It is up for sale and there is no doubt that it will be bought very quickly and used for some other purpose.

Nothing will lead more rapidly to the decay of the centre of a city than traffic strangulation and the Government, realising this, and realising that former Governments were doing nothing about it, took steps prior to accession to office to inform themselves on these matters. At its own expense the Liberal Party imported a traffic expert to investigate traffic problems. When we assumed office we tackled the problem with vigour. As the Minister has reminded us, we averted a situation that could have led to the decay of the centre of the city. In the city and inner suburbs we have today 38 sets of co-ordinated traffic lights. At present 13 more are approved or under construction. We have 10 permanent channel islands for traffic and over 64 miles of traffic lines and lanes. I mention these because, on the 22nd of this month, two sets of co-ordinated traffic lights will begin to operate in Enoggera road, Newmarket. It was not so long ago that opponents of these traffic aids were complaining that they were turning the city into a Coney Island. It is evidence of the changed public attitude that the Newmarket branch of the A.L.P. recently tried to claim credit for the installation of the co-ordinated lights in Newmarket. Of course it was not so. They were under consideration from the time the office of the Traffic Engineer was established. Throughout that time, month by month it has been my task to see that the office of the Traffic Engineer has been continually aware of them, but they came in their right priority in a general, co-ordinated scheme for the whole city. They are now there and the Government are very happy indeed to receive the commendation of people of political colours and loyalties differing from ours on these developments.

I am sorry that the hon. member for Belmont is not present in the Chamber because I want to comment on two or three observations he made.

Mr. Davies: He will be back in a moment. He has only gone to the telephone.

Mr. TOOTH: I am glad to hear that he will be returning. The Opposition generally, and the hon. member for Belmont in particular, if they wish to assist with Brisbane's traffic problems, might get to work to persuade their colleagues in the Brisbane City Council to improve street lighting, particularly in suburban areas.

Mr. Bromley: They have improved it.

Mr. TOOTH: If they have, I have not seen any evidence of it in the areas that concern me. The murky gloom in the streets of Ashgrove and Newmarket, and nearby areas, imperil the lives of pedestrians

and those who ride in vehicles. It compels motorists to breach the traffic regulations by driving with lights on the high beam. If, when driving through these streets, they do not occasionally use the high beam they will be sure to be involved in some sort of traffic accident, probably with tragic results. Overseas investigations indicate clearly that night accidents can be reduced by as much as 30 per cent. by adopting adequate street lighting, and the problem in Australia is now under consideration. In New South Wales night accidents represent 40 per cent. of total accidents, although night traffic is only 25 per cent. of total traffic. At short notice I have been unable to obtain precise figures for Queensland, but I understand they are comparable with those of New South Wales. This illustrates the importance of the problem and its influence on the accident rate, particularly the pedestrian-accident rate. So I suggest to the hon. member for Belmont that he raise the problem with his colleagues in the Brisbane City Council. While about it, he might be able to help me with a problem that concerns the Brisbane City Council in Ashgrove because I frankly confess that I have not been able to move the council on it. The most dangerous traffic junction in the whole area is the junction of Ashgrove Avenue with Graham Street. The Traffic Commission has had plans for over a year for dealing with the problem but it is unable to implement them until a relatively short section of the junction is sealed from kerb to kerb. This the council refuses to do. It is a comparatively small job. Night after night lives are being imperilled because people coming over the hill making a blind approach to the intersection are forced out into the middle of the road owing to the condition of the road close to the kerb.

These things are happening and yet, owing to stupidity, obstinacy, or just political bias somewhere or other, we cannot get any action for the expenditure of a relatively small sum to deal with the matter. In view of my experience with this particular case and one or two others, I feel that serious thought should be given to vesting the Traffic Commission with power to compel authorities to co-operate in the removal of serious traffic hazards. I know that that is a big question that opens up difficult legal and administrative problems, but these things should not be allowed to remain as they are.

I now wish to change the subject and make brief reference to the melancholy event that occurred on 2 September last when Senator Max Poulter died, and to the events that flowed from it. The general regret in the loss to not only the party of which he was a member but also to Queensland as a whole is a clear indication of his personal worth. I regret also the unseemly speed with which political speculation occurred

immediately his death was known. One newspaper, in a flight of journalistic imagination, made this categorical statement—

“Strong pressure will come from the Liberal Party for the appointment to the Senate of the former Premier and Q.L.P. Leader, Mr. V. C. Gair, to succeed Dr. Max Poulter, who died yesterday.”

The roundsman goes on to say that several Liberal members said this. The interesting thing to note is that this was published well before mid-day on the day after the death of the lamented Senator. It is obvious that it had been prepared and was in print very early on the Monday morning. How anybody in that short time could have contacted a group of Liberal Party members on this issue passes my comprehension, and, from my investigation and inquiries, the indications are that the statement in that report is merely a flight of journalistic imagination. It is an invention.

It has been adequately answered in another quarter, but I should like to say that in my opinion Liberal members generally hold the view that on 9 December the people of Queensland elected three Government senators and two Opposition senators, and the status quo should be preserved. I shall repeat that. I personally feel—and I think many of my colleagues feel—that the status quo in this matter should be preserved.

To refer again to this article, it struck reader a humorous note further on when it read—

“It was pointed out that if the Government overlooked an A.L.P. successor this time, an A.L.P. State Government of the future in one of the southern States, or even in Queensland, could overlook a Liberal-Country Party candidate in similar circumstances.”

Of course, that is precisely what has always been done by Labour Governments in this State.

Mr. Row: They will do it again, too.

Mr. TOOTH: I do not think that they will be given an opportunity to do it again. During the regime of Socialistic government in this State, when one of our Senators died he was replaced by a Labour senator. It happened on the death of Senator John Adamson, who was replaced by Mr. J. V. MacDonald, the then editor of the “Daily Standard”, way back in the early 1920s. Immediately this new Senator came before the electors at the next election, he was unceremoniously tossed out on his pink ear. A few years later, when Senator Givens died, the same gentleman, still editor of the “Daily Standard,” was appointed in his place.

Mr. Ramsden: In spite of the public's decision?

Mr. TOOTH: In spite of the decision on their earlier appointment, they tried again. At the next Federal election the gentleman again lost his seat.

Mr. Tucker: What are you paragons of virtue going to do?

Mr. TOOTH: The hon. member will find out in due course what we paragons of virtue are going to do.

Mr. Davies: Are you the new Premier? Is this a public statement?

Mr. TOOTH: I am speaking about my own attitude. Apparently the hon. member does not understand the constitutional position. I understand that Parliament appoints a new Senator when information is received from the Federal Government of the death of a Senator. On every occasion Labour Governments have appointed a Labour Senator to replace a Liberal Party or Country Party Senator.

This brings me to the gravamen of my story. It is rather ironical that the Deputy Leader of the A.L.P., the hon. member for Kedron, Mr. Lloyd, should lecture us, according to the report in “The Courier-Mail” this morning, and tell us that we should appoint Mr. Arnell to the vacant Senate seat. Let me make my own position perfectly clear. I believe that, notwithstanding the precedents established by former Labour Governments in these matters, the decision of the electors that there should be two A.L.P. Senators should be confirmed by the Parliament. That is my personal view. But I wish to make it equally clear that personally I am completely unable to vote for Mr. Arnell, and I will tell hon. members quite frankly why.

Mr. Tucker: I thought you were getting round to something.

Mr. TOOTH: I am getting round to something.

Mr. Arnell, as hon. members know, has been the President of the Brisbane branch of the Waterside Workers' Association for a considerable time. I understand that he is known in trade-union circles as “Unity Ticket” Arnell, but I have no personal knowledge of that. I do know that he has appeared on unity tickets every year since 1957. These unity tickets have been circulated frequently, and I have here a photostat of one of them.

Mr. Bromley: That is the old one you had.

Mr. TOOTH: I do not know whether it is old or new, but it is sufficient evidence to enable me to make up my mind what I should do. There is a group of photographs on the photostat, and Mr. Arnell's photo is the first in the group. Then there is Mr. Graham, Mr. Stimson, Mr. Stubbings, and so on, through to Mr. Healy on the far end. It is interesting to note that Mr. Graham is an open and confessed Communist. He has stood as a Communist Party candidate.

Mr. Melloy: Who—Alf Arnell?

Mr. TOOTH: Mr. Alby Graham. Mr. Stubbings stood as a Communist candidate for the Salisbury electorate in the 1960 State election. No doubt the hon. member for

Salisbury will recall him. Of course, Mr. Mick Healy, who was at one time secretary of the Brisbane Trades Hall, is a gentleman whom I have known personally for a long time. I knew him when he was the proprietor or manager—it is a bit difficult to know whether a man owns or manages an establishment of this type—of the Anvil Book Shop in the Queensland Teachers' Building before the last war. I should say that Mr. Mick Healy is one of the most pleasant fellows I have ever met, but, by George, I should not like him to be in power in this country!

Mr. Davies: Tell us about the Western Australian Liberal who was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TOOTH: I do not propose to talk about matters in Western Australia. I only know that when the A.L.P. endeavoured to use a man's father against him as a candidate in the election, the electors there dealt with the matter in a very suitable way. Any organisation that would drag a man's father into a matter like that should be rather diffident about talking of it afterwards. I strongly advise hon. gentlemen opposite to let that matter ride.

Hon. members are apparently very interested in this photostat, and I propose to table it for their information.

(Whereupon the hon. member laid the photostat on the table.)

This clearly indicates Mr. Arnell's position. Mr. Arnell has every democratic right, while we in this country, at the urging of the A.L.P., have decided that the Communist Party is an ordinary political party, to associate himself with Communists. But whilst this indicates Mr. Arnell's position, it also justifies a reservation on my part—and I hope on the part of many members in this House—that whilst we desire to appoint an A.L.P. Senator, I hope hon. members opposite will endeavour to make our task in this difficult situation a relatively easy one by providing a candidate whom we can accept.

Mr. Melloy: What is your party doing about the Comms? Nothing whatever.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I once again draw to the attention of hon. members on my left who are engaged in continuous heckling of the hon. member the fact that the Standing Orders require that every hon. member must be heard without interruption. If there is any further interruption I shall have no hesitation in dealing with the hon. member who interrupts.

Mr. BROMLEY: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is being nasty to a fellow member of the A.L.P.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The hon. member will resume his seat.

Mr. TOOTH: I turn again to the hon. member for Belmont for a moment or two. I am sorry that he appears to be still telephoning. He complained during his speech about states of emergency and said that they have been declared against the workers on several occasions. He went on to say that more states of emergency have been declared since this Government have been in power than by any previous Government in this State. That is an interesting assertion so I took the trouble to make some inquiries. I found that during the life of the Hanlon Government, proclamations under the particular Act by which states of emergency are issued were made on seven occasions.

An Opposition Member: Seven?

Mr. TOOTH: There were seven proclamations. There was one on 28 June, 1946; there was one on 27 February, 1948, which was extended by a second proclamation on 25 March in the same year; there was one on 27 June, 1949, which was extended by a further proclamation on 27 July, 1949. Under the Gair Government there were two proclamations, and under the Nicklin Government there have been three, so that, on a relative basis, we have been fairly moderate in this matter.

What interests me about all this is that the hon. gentleman should start complaining during this debate when, less than three months ago, during the currency of this year, he and every other member of the Opposition voted to maintain the legislation under which these states of emergency are declared. I want to emphasise that because states of emergency are proclaimed under the provisions of Section 22 of the State Transport Act of 1938, which was one of the Acts that were validated in the schedule to the Bill we debated on 6 and 7 June, and passed late on 7 June this year. Hon. members opposite no doubt studied that Bill and the schedule thereto, therefore they must have been well aware that in supporting the Government in the validating legislation before Parliament they were in effect endorsing, without any debate, criticism, or complaint, every proclamation that had ever been made under the Act. Therefore I should say that this complaint is a very frivolous one indeed. Any complaints about excessive use of those powers by the present Government have no basis whatever.

As I have little time left I do not propose to proceed further with the material I have prepared, but hope to have an opportunity during the Budget debate to deal with other matters.

Mr. BYRNE (Mourilyan) (5.1 p.m.): I rise to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Before speaking to the amendment I desire, as is my usual custom, to express my devotion, sincerity,

and loyalty to the Throne in the person of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I always associate the people of my electorate of Mourilyan with those sentiments. I pay tribute to the Governor of Queensland, Sir Henry Abel Smith, and Lady May. I assure them that they have our deepest respect. He and his wife have been great advocates of Queensland. Never have they left anything unsaid or undone that they could say or do for the benefit of Queensland. Consequently we must have a very high regard for them. They are tireless and energetic. Indeed, they are delightful people and the State is much the better for having two such very fine people.

During the debate the subject of unemployment has been tackled from all sides. There is no harm in my presenting my views on this most important and serious problem. I propose to examine it without bias. It is a challenge to the capacity of Governments to govern. As members of Parliament we heard the many promises that were made that everything in the garden of employment would be lovely in the future. Unfortunately those promises were never to bear fruit. In my opinion the speeches made by the hon. member for Redcliffe and others on that side were disappointing. It is no use their playing up to Ministers because they are on side. It is no use complimenting Ministers for doing this and that, while at the same time we have the terrible burden of unemployment with us. It is with us. We have to face up to it whether we like it or not. We cannot continue to have the number of unemployed in Queensland in what we term the "off season" that we have had in the past. It is our greatest problem. Suggestions have been made by Government members that, because we draw attention to this, we are irresponsible knockers. Very often we are told that it is the worker's fault, that there is no unemployment to speak of, and that we should not be raising the subject. That is all eye-wash and is a disservice to the community. When hon. members say there is no unemployment they are not looking at the problem properly and are doing nothing to help to solve it.

Hon. members opposite are lavish in their compliments to various Ministers on what they are doing and, to the extent that the Ministers are providing a certain amount of employment, everything is all right and we are quite happy about it. However, when we have Press publicity, as we have had in the past, and when the Premier makes various pronouncements about unemployment and the difficulties in which he finds himself, and Ministers have openly stated that they recognise the seriousness of the problem, it is very hard indeed to understand Government members saying we should not take much notice of unemployment.

At this stage I should like to quote Mr. J. R. James, secretary of the Queensland Employers' Federation, who was reported as follows:—

"He said the matter was so urgent no time should be lost in facing up to the situation."

He was dealing with a suggestion that the State Government should call an immediate conference of representatives of private industry and responsible unions to tackle the State's population problem. The article continues—

"Mr. James said statistics released by the Bureau of Census and Statistics presented a disturbing picture.

"At December 31, 1961, Queensland's estimated population was 1,522,329—an increase of 20,043 for the preceding year—yet the natural increase for 1961 was 23,881.

"It was estimated that 624,000—or a rise of 40,800 during 1961—were congregated in the metropolitan area, he said.

"The metropolitan area was re-defined for the 1961 census to include Brisbane, Redcliffe, and the urban parts of Pine Rivers Shire.

"But even so, it was apparent the population growth rate outside the metropolitan area, and particularly in the largely undeveloped areas of the State was dangerously low.

"For decades platitudinous public statements have been made by politicians and others about the urgent need for developing North Queensland and populating our "vast empty spaces" in the interests of national safety as well as national progress," Mr. James said.

"But actions speak louder than words, and, to date, there have been far too many words and far too little action."

So many statements have been made about development, unemployment, and so on, that it is refreshing to find a person with the status of Mr. James telling the Government what is happening with the State's population. The North is being depopulated because there is no continuity of work. That statement cannot be challenged except in towns like Townsville and Mt. Isa, where there has been industrial progress unprecedented in Queensland for a great many years.

Hon. members who have asked us not to take any notice of unemployment must be speaking within very narrow limits, and we cannot accept them as competent to speak for all Queensland. Their views are not put in accordance with the facts and are therefore useless. They do a disservice to the State because their statements are taken up by people in the South, who say, "Queensland is all right. Here our own politicians tell us that everything in the garden is lovely. The unemployment situation is not as bad as they make out."

But let us examine the facts of the matter in detail. At this time of the year the primary industries are in full swing and the number of unemployed is not nearly as high as in the early part of the year. That is quite obvious and understandable. Protests from the unemployed and from various organisations tend to subside at this time. However, the agitation will arise again and when the primary industries cease operations for the year the people will tell the Government of the serious situation. Naturally the Government now become complacent and take some comfort in the belief, "We are all right for a few months and nobody will stir us into action." But towards the end of the year, when the crops are harvested and the processing by the various industries is completed, a bleak period of unemployment will return. We will then discover whether the Government have been sincere in their promises to find employment or whether their planning has been of any use. We understand that at the moment the Treasurer has quite a lot of money to spend and that he will spend it to provide employment for those who usually are unemployed in the early part of the year. Let him tell us now how much he proposes to spend and what he proposes to spend it on. It is no good keeping it a secret.

Unemployment in the North is accentuated by the introduction of new and progressive methods in industry, the main purpose of which is to limit manpower by the use of machines. We of the Australian Labour Party cannot and do not complain about progressive methods. The Government were always aware of the displacement of labour, that would come about through the use of these new and progressive methods. For instance, bulk-handling has done away with a considerable amount of labour, and so have the mechanical harvesting of cane, the various forms of transport, and the actual method of handling sugar at ports. The dieselisation of railway traffic, too, eliminates a great deal of employment.

The coastal towns feel the impact most. It is very upsetting and injurious to the status of many little towns in the North. Worse still, it is reflected in the home. It brings discontent to the family who, eventually, because they are unable to find continuity of work, must leave the district. That is the sore point with me. There are many very estimable families in the North, particularly in Innisfail, who have been in the industry for many years and who find that the continuity of work is not available, so they must leave for parts that offer permanent employment. This is a great loss to the district and it is what we want to stop. They come to the city and swell its already overcrowded population. It has various side effects. For one, the drift from the North to the cities depresses real-estate values. For instance, they are decreasing in the northern coastal towns and they have been for a number of years.

Mr. Hughes: The drift to the cities occurred in Labour's time, too.

Mr. BYRNE: Not to the same extent. From 1951 to 1957 there was the greatest activity ever known in the sugar industry. That was brought about by the representations of the late Ned Hanlon and the late Ben Chifley on the additional quantity of sugar to be harvested in Queensland. When all the equipment had been purchased and buildings erected, from 1957 onwards—from the time when this Government assumed office—came the decline in the value of real estate.

In contrast, let us consider what has happened in the city. Here increases are going on all the time. There are very few places in the South where real-estate values have not shown considerable increases. In the sugar towns in the North to which I have just referred a person owning his own home would be pleased to get today any amount near its value or the value that he has put into it, let alone anything in addition. It is true that on the books of agents in the North there are available for sale hundreds of dwellings owned by people who have lived there for many years but who now find, because of lack of continuity of work, that they must leave, and the only place to which they can go is the city. That is the present unfortunate state of affairs, and this Government are responsible for it.

This is something that requires thinking and planning. It is not a personal matter but something that should exercise the best available minds that can be directed to solving the problem. It is the Government's job to do more than they have done, otherwise they will not continue to occupy their present position. The Government should sponsor industry. Private enterprise cannot do the job. Very often population and markets are far from the production areas. There are exceptions, of course, but capital for investment is attracted more to the South.

This is a peculiar situation. We in the North are well situated for ports, roads, and railways. Our ports are closer to the markets of the Far East than are those in the South, and we must actively develop the North, irrespective of cost. The Government must sponsor industry. Without that, we shall remain as we are today. I invite hon. members to look at the map of North Queensland and see how many decadent places there are there. What is the population of the North? Are we to allow this situation to continue? What are we to do to populate it? The only way in which I consider the population can be increased is by the Government's sponsoring of industry in those areas. We have to wake up to ourselves; we have been asleep for far too long.

In spite of the promises of the Government that they would do this and that, North Queensland today is going back each year.

To take the hinterland of Cairns, I could tell hon. members of dozens of towns with considerable populations in earlier days, but which today have few residents. Do not let us run away with the idea that the sugar industry, because it is so wealthy, will populate Queensland. We realise the tremendous wealth that is produced by the sugar-growers, the mills, and the other persons employed in the industry. But if we take a map and draw a line from Cairns to Normanton and compare the population in the area north of it with the population 40 or 50 years ago, it will be seen that what I am saying, although unfortunate, is perfectly true. The Minister for Transport is going to pull up the lines from Alma-den to Forsyth and from Mareeba to Chillagoe.

Mr. Gilmore: Who said that? That is completely wrong.

Mr. BYRNE: It is correct. The Minister said that unless sufficient cattle were supplied he would pull up the Chillagoe line.

Mr. Evans: Your Government closed Chillagoe.

Mr. BYRNE: A Labour Government closed Chillagoe?

Mr. Evans: Yes. You remember that.

Mr. BYRNE: Yes, and it is the most unfortunate thing that ever happened in the North. The Labour Government had to draw the ore reserves from Cloncurry, which is about 600 miles from Chillagoe, and the costs were so high and the value of the metals so low that they really could not carry it on at a profit. The State enterprise at Chillagoe was the greatest single feature in the development of North Queensland that we have seen, irrespective of the Mungana case and Theodore and McCormack. We had towns of 2,000 men, and smelters employing from 1,100 to 1,500 men giving full employment throughout the Peninsula. Contrast that development with what we have there today. We have only cattle stations and a few small towns.

Mr. Evans: It has not changed since we took over. Chillagoe was dead when we took over.

Mr. BYRNE: It was not dead when this Government took over. It was started by Theodore in 1918, it was re-started when an anti-Labour Government came into power in 1929, and it was eventually closed. I am pointing out that the development of North Queensland will be achieved only by the Government sponsoring private enterprise and encouraging the establishment of industries. If they do not do that, North Queensland will slip back even farther. We certainly have cattle stations there, but they do not employ many people. The question for politicians on both sides of the House is, are we going to permit the present state of affairs in North Queensland to continue? We must keep in mind the

expanding trade with the East and our defence responsibilities. It is our job to take action, and when the Labour Government are returned to the Treasury benches next year I hope that there will be a great revival of employment in North Queensland.

Mr. Sullivan: You referred to the graziers in the Peninsula. Do you agree with the statement of the hon. member for Cairns that all those graziers were scabs?

Mr. BYRNE: I am not entering into that subject. I do not think that the hon. member would expect me to answer his interjection, and I do not propose to.

Although a number of the major capital works undertaken by the Government do employ a large labour force, what happens when they are completed? The workers are dismissed and there is no plan to give them further employment. In these capital works there are many avenues for skilled and unskilled labour, which is, or course, the first essential for development, but when they are completed what do the Government do? They simply give these men notice and say, "You are not wanted; get out and fend for yourselves". There is no doubt that that happens, and it is unfortunate. Government planning is required and unless the Government take into serious consideration the situation that has arisen annually, we will continue to find ourselves in the situation we have been in for years past. Failure to do this will only perpetuate the state of affairs to which I have referred.

Coming from a sugar district, Mr. Speaker, I crave your indulgence to make a short survey of the sugar industry and to expand on the fact that the industry is controlled by several organisations which are effective in its management and control. I refer to the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board, and, in doing so, it would be only right for me to refer to the personnel of the Board. The Chairman is Mr. K. R. Townley, a former Justice of the Supreme Court, and a man held in high esteem by everybody. Mr. George Mocatta is the growers' representative; Mr. Alley is the millers' representative; Mr. Clayton is the sugar-chemist member; and the Secretary is Mr. Bill Forgan Smith.

The members of this Board are all excellent men and are doing a great service to the industry in promoting a harmonious state of affairs. Because of their ability they are able to solve all sorts of difficulties associated with the growing and manufacturing of sugar. They arbitrate between the miller and the grower, and often between growers themselves.

Included in the organisations that are so very helpful to the efficient working of the sugar industry are the growers' organisation and the millers' organisation, as well as the Australian Workers' Union, without which the industry would be in considerable conflict. This industry runs harmoniously

because the A.W.U. have taken a great interest in it. They realise their responsibility and see that a fair return is given to their members from the industry.

The authority of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board has been unquestioned for a great many years. It derives its authority from the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act, which came into being as a result of legislation by a Labour Government.

At this stage it might be well to mention that recently the Full Court of Queensland, in the matter of *The Queen versus the members of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board and another*, ex parte Maryborough Sugar Factory Ltd., held that it was beyond the power of the Central Board to hear and determine an application for the variation of the base price fixed by the Maryborough Central Board Award for the 1958 season and that they should be prohibited from doing so.

I am not going into the legal interpretation of this matter, because naturally, not being a solicitor, I would be incompetent to do so. However, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board must be given additional powers to function as such a body should. If anything arises so that it is not competent for them to carry out what is contained in the Act, the necessary full powers must be given.

The judgment in the case that I have mentioned reads—

“Although the Act as a whole is so much a thing of shreds and patches and there is in it such repetition and overlapping that it is not possible to apply strict legal reasoning with any certainty that the real meaning of Parliament is achieved thereby . . .”

Mr. Evans: Has there been an appeal against that decision?

Mr. BYRNE: Yes. The decision was that it was beyond the power of the Central Board to hear and determine an application for the variation of the base price fixed by the Maryborough Central Board Award for the season 1958 and that it should be prohibited from doing so.

The Full Court has indicated that the Act is a lot of shreds and patches. We must realise that the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act has been in operation for a great many years and that generally it has given great satisfaction.

The judgment continues—

“It is difficult to come to any conclusion on the subject of this appeal which is not open to criticism, and I can only say that I think the conclusion to which I have come is less open to criticism than the opposite one. That represents exactly our state of mind on this question.”

No doubt the Government will be bringing down amending legislation to tighten up the loopholes. I am of the opinion that the

Central Sugar Cane Prices Board should be given every facility to operate as it was always intended to.

The Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act came into force in 1915 under a Labour Government. Since then it has been amended from time to time. It has proved so valuable to all concerned in the industry that one is inclined to say that if it is patch-work then let us have more of this patch-work. Under that legislation we have had many years of harmonious working in the industry.

Mr. Evans: It has been the core of the industry.

Mr. BYRNE: That is true. We want it to continue with full power. I think everybody in the industry would be of the same opinion. I have no doubt whatever that the Government will bring in amending legislation to fix the matter up.

Let me now say a few words about the production of sugar this year. Not very long ago the estimate of cane to be harvested was something over 11,000,000 tons. This year we shall exceed peak quotas by tremendous amounts.

On the matter of price, apart from home consumption and that which England has agreed to take on what we regard as the negotiated price, which we have reason to believe will be satisfactory, it is hard to say at this juncture what price will be paid for the additional quantity that we have to sell on the open market or to the countries that will take our sugar. I would hazard the guess that the prosperity and efficiency of the industry are such that we will be able to surmount all our difficulties. I hope that we will be able to increase our exports of sugar to other countries and to maintain production at this year's level, which will be about 1,600,000 or 1,800,000 tons.

Mr. Windsor: It is certainly encouraging to hear you speak.

Mr. BYRNE: It is encouraging, when one looks at the returns of the farmer, to see that he has done so well in past years. When one looks at the profits made by the mill one is inclined to say, “Well, now your industry is so good, to what extent can you further it by manufacturing from your product goods that will sell elsewhere on the open market?” I do not think we manufacture by-products from sugar-cane, except to a very limited extent, but firms in the South must be making a great number of by-products from sugar for sale on the market. We do not receive benefit from any of that because in the North we do not have the assistance of science and research. That is something we need.

I pay a compliment to the late Ned Hanlon and the late Ben Chifley. The sugar industry should never forget their names, because they worked so hard for it. In 1950, with others, they were instrumental in achieving the present wonderful state of affairs in the industry. The cane-farmers, the mills, and

the employees are well off. May I refer to "Three Decades of Queensland Political History", by Clem Lack, at page 308, where we find—

"Representations made to the Commonwealth Government in August by the Premier (Mr. E. M. Hanlon), on behalf of the sugar producers, resulted in the depression cut of a halfpenny per pound being restored to the industry in December, 1947."

I am proud of my association in the industry with the late Ned Hanlon and with others like him.

Mr. Evans: What about the committee of inquiry?

Mr. BYRNE: I said "others".

Mr. Evans: They recommended a halfpenny reduction and the Government knocked it.

Mr. BYRNE: I remember—and the Minister does, too—that in 1932 Senator McLachlan came to the North and forced the Government of the day, and the industry, to reduce the price by a halfpenny. This passage refers to the occasion when Ned Hanlon was able to get that back.

Mr. Evans: The present Federal Government disregarded the report of the committee of inquiry, notwithstanding its recommendation that there be a reduction. That is true, is it not?

Mr. BYRNE: That is quite true. No Government would be worth their salt if they sought a price reduction for the sugar industry. The Federal Government did not accept the recommendation of the committee of inquiry that the price be reduced.

Mr. Evans: They were guided by the State Government when they made the recommendation.

Mr. BYRNE: No State Government would recommend a reduction in the price of sugar by the Commonwealth Government. We have had great men in the sugar industry and we must not forget Forgan Smith and Ned Hanlon, and Ron. Muir and Ben Foley on the cane-growing side. There are others, too numerous to mention. We regard the industry as essential to the progress and well-being of Queensland, but unfortunately we do not go far enough. Primary products will have to be processed in the North. We have the ports and railways, and roads to them. We are very close to the Eastern markets, but unless the miller, the grower and the Government combine to develop manufacturing processes we will not be any better off for employment, development, and population than we are today.

I am perfectly sure of the correctness of my contention that the deathknell for the railways of North Queensland's hinterland

has been sounded. They have been in operation for very many years but I know that the Minister is anxious to eliminate lines that are not paying.

(Time expired.)

Mr. SMITH (Windsor) (5.41 p.m.): At the outset I wish to reaffirm, on behalf of myself and my constituents—

Mr. Bennett: The constituents of Clayfield or the constituents of Windsor?

Mr. SMITH: If the hon. member for South Brisbane stayed in the Chamber long enough he would know that I represent Windsor and that, when I talk about my constituents, I refer to the constituents of the electorate of Windsor. So my expressions of loyalty are made on behalf of myself and my constituents. As well, I desire to congratulate the Governor, Colonel Sir Henry Abel Smith, and his lady on his reappointment for a further term. I know that it will be warmly welcomed by all members of the community. I can recall a number of Governors in my lifetime but I cannot recall at any stage as spontaneous a welcome and response as our present Governor has evoked from the people of Queensland.

In previous years I have used the Address-in-Reply debate as the vehicle for making suggestions for reform, not only in matters of legal importance but also in other matters. I am very happy to be able to point back to the fact that it was in an Address-in-Reply speech that I advocated making available police reports to people who were involved in accidents. I am glad to say that that is now a matter of history; police reports are available.

I also advocated reforms in the matter of third-party insurance—compulsory motor-vehicle insurance—and, to my extreme pleasure and satisfaction, some of those reforms have been adopted and an all-party committee is at present sitting, under the chairmanship of the Treasurer, to investigate still further reforms that have been advocated from time to time.

As for another suggestion I have made relating to the recording of evidence in courts, I am glad to see that the Minister for Justice has recently, on a couple of occasions, caused a test to be made of the mechanical recording of evidence.

Mr. Bromley: You are doing a good job.

Mr. SMITH: I agree with the hon. member. I intend to use this speech as a vehicle for making further representations to the Government in a matter that I know is sympathetically entertained by the Minister for Justice and one in which he has expressed himself as having considerable interest. Most of the problems that confront the Government today hinge on financial difficulty as well, and the particular matter I wish to raise today is that of legal aid to

litigants of limited means. Legal aid is assuming increasing importance in today's life. It is common knowledge that our way of life is more complex than it was in grandfather's day. Life is not nearly as simple as it was even 50 years ago, and, with that more complex living, there is of course greater need for the average citizen to have recourse to law from time to time. It is unfortunate, but in the Press today one reads that a large commercial undertaking is being investigated in New South Wales, and I understand that that investigation will extend to Queensland. This large enterprise will have had numerous dealings with many of our people in Queensland and, as a result of them, those people may wish to have recourse to law. However, we have not in this State any effective system of legal aid. There is a limited one, but it is by no means comprehensive. As a result of the failure of this company, no doubt many people in Queensland will face what is virtually ruin. It may be that if they had at their disposal some legal assistance, that ruin could be perhaps not avoided but at least softened, and I commend seriously to the Government further consideration of the introduction of legal aid.

Mr. Bennett: Is your practice falling off a bit? Are you looking for more work?

Mr. SMITH: No, my practice is not falling off. What I am attempting to do is offer to those people who cannot afford to pay my fees, who may desire to go to other counsel, the opportunity to engage counsel and solicitors by means of some form of assistance. This has been done in England for some years past. In 1949 the Legal Aid and Advice Act was passed, and that Act was administered, and is administered, by the legal profession. It does not mean that that profession reaps a harvest; in fact, the Act requires that a practitioner shall be paid less than—85 per cent., actually—he would normally recover in an action. I say to the critics that it is no use suggesting that such a scheme means a bonanza for the legal profession. It does not, because time is all that a lawyer can sell and, when he has to sell that at 85 per cent. of what he could receive for it in other places, there is hardly any profit to him.

I ask hon. members to consider that if they went to a builder to have a house built, they would not ask him to do it for nothing. If they go to a doctor for a medical examination, they expect to get a bill for it. Consequently, it ill-behoves anybody to regard legal practitioners as being available to work for nothing, although in many cases that is what is called for.

Mr. Bromley: What about a legal-benefits scheme?

Mr. SMITH: If there could be a legal-benefits scheme, well and good. For the benefit of those hon. members who at the

moment are making rather nonsensical interjections, let me point out that one of the most unfortunate aspects of this matter, and one of the most heartbreaking, is what can be seen by anyone who cares to visit No. 5 court in the Summons Court where deserted wives seek maintenance for themselves and their children.

Mr. Bennett: It is heart-breaking watching your clients after they leave the court.

Mr. SMITH: I shall not remind the hon. member for South Brisbane about his client the last time I encountered him.

In cases of deserted wives we could perhaps have the first assistance rendered. I realise only too well that there are other matters of importance at present. The Education Vote in itself is one that would strain the finances of any State, yet this Government have quite bravely entered upon a scheme to build up education resources so that we shall have in future well-informed and well-instructed citizens. Undoubtedly it is a worth-while investment, but hand-in-hand with education must be considered the other commitments of this State.

Whilst appreciating the need to stretch a small purse a long way, I ask that consideration be given to an early institution of this legal aid. It may well be that the Commonwealth Government could be approached. An earlier speaker advocated an approach to that Government for a grant to preserve historical monuments. I should say that if there were any claims in that regard this would have a higher priority.

Let us follow the course of the deserted wife if she goes to court. If she is unsuccessful in her application to the court, she then goes to the Commonwealth Department of Social Services and is given the pension that is paid to deserted wives, which comes out of Commonwealth funds. Had legal assistance been offered to that wife, in some cases she would have been able to pin the blame where it really lay, that is, on the deserting husband. His pocket could have been opened and the money that now comes from social services could instead have come from him. Many wives, because of an imperfect knowledge of their rights, do not now proceed to court with anything like as good a case as they might. They cannot afford representation. They have children to clothe and feed, and, in circumstances that do not fit them to present any case, they have to go to court against a husband who is not similarly burdened by children to look after, to educate, or to feed. Quite often the husband comes to the court in a much better frame of mind to refute the case that the wife, under these very difficult circumstances, presents to the court.

Mr. Aikens: Why doesn't the legal profession set up a committee to give them free advice?

Mr. SMITH: We have people who wander into the Chamber at odd times——

Mr. Bennett: Very odd people.

Mr. SMITH: The most vociferous hon. member for South Brisbane, who is making his first appearance for about seven days, is making more noise than a bagful of monkeys. Now the hon. member for Townsville South comes into the Chamber and asks, "Why doesn't the legal profession set up a committee?" Before he came in I pointed out that no-one would expect a builder to build a house for nothing or a doctor to work for nothing.

Mr. Bennett: We have a free medical scheme in Queensland.

Mr. SMITH: That shows how little the hon. member knows about the law.

Mr. Bennett: I am talking about a medical scheme.

Mr. Aikens: Many of them come to me and get free legal advice, and it is much better advice than they get from lawyers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I am quite sure that the "Hansard" staff is finding it very difficult to hear the hon. member for Windsor. Hon. members on both sides of the House should at least have some regard for the difficulties of the gentlemen in the "Hansard" gallery who are trying to take down this speech.

Mr. SMITH: Quite often a woman has to attend court with a babe in arms or with a child at her skirt, children who are not necessarily well-fed and who are to some extent confined to a court veranda for a long period.

Mr. Bennett: They need a lift in the building, too.

Mr. SMITH: Yes. A lift is needed in more than the building.

After standing on the veranda, towards the end of the morning the children often become tired, cranky, and irritable. Is it any wonder that the mother, having to go into court and present her own case, is worried not only by the cares and vicissitudes that confront her on the matrimonial side but also by the cries and wails that she hears from her children on the veranda?

Mr. Davies: Why does the hon. member oppose an increase in child endowment and State aid?

Mr. SMITH: I do not oppose it.

Mr. Davies: You do. You support Mr. Menzies.

Mr. Evans: You did not give any. We started it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SMITH: The matter of assistance is of some importance, particularly from the point of view of the deserted wife. I also point out that she cannot proceed to court on the day on which she is deserted. Certain legal formalities have to be gone through.

She has first to swear out her complaint and then have the summons issued and served. Many of the husbands who are to be served are wily birds. They can conceal their whereabouts very effectively, and it may take weeks before the summons is served. During that time, the wife, who has the responsibility of the children heaped on her shoulders—

Mr. Bennett: You gave this same speech to the Queensland Women's Electoral League about a fortnight ago.

Mr. SMITH: I am glad that the hon. member reads my Press cuttings. I thought he spent his time reading his own rubbishy statements about Mr. Bischof being the next Governor, or some other rot.

Mr. Bennett: They reckon you are going to be his batman.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have put up with the inane interjections of the hon. member for South Brisbane for quite long enough. I give him fair warning that if he continues to interject I shall have no hesitation in ruling that his conduct is grossly disorderly and asking him to leave the Chamber.

Mr. SMITH: I was pointing out that it could be some time before the summons issued by a deserted wife could be served upon the husband, and during those weeks—sometimes it is weeks, sometimes longer—the wife has no means of support; she is to a large extent dependent upon charity. It will be readily understood, in my submission, that, when she does come before the court, her position is unhappier than need be because she has had that long period without any funds; she has had a long period of worry and strain, and, added to that, on the day of the hearing she perhaps has this unhappy noise of her children in the vicinity of the court.

The hon. member for South Brisbane commented upon the need for a lift in the magistrates court building. I remind him that when his Government were in office for such a long period, they had ample opportunity to install a lift there.

Mr. Bennett: It is all very well for you to have a go at me now that Mr. Speaker has told me to be quiet.

Mr. SMITH: The building has reached a stage when the Government could be criticised if they put a lift into it now. It would be an unwarranted expense. It certainly is a convenience to which litigants are entitled—some easier access to the court in which they must contest their claims, but that raises a different matter. I do not want to depart from the subject of legal aid, or get onto the question of new buildings.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. SMITH: I support a greatly increased educational campaign because I think that, if this Government's education policy continues, in years to come, we should be spared some of these stupid interjections.

On this matter of legal aid I take a deserted wife as a prime example. It is unfortunate, but I do not think we can simply dismiss the husband as always being the villain in the piece. Irrespective of whether the husband is the villain in the piece, it is the children with whom we must be concerned. They are the main concern. Of course, they are certainly my main concern but, tied in with them is my concern for the wife and the difficulties she has in presenting a case. Can hon. members imagine the difficulties of a wife whose husband is represented by the hon. member for South Brisbane?

Mr. Melloy: It would be worse if she were represented by you.

Mr. SMITH: No, it would not. I have never lost an appeal against the hon. member yet.

I should like now to take the Chamber through the machinery of the Act to show them just what is done in England and to clear up a misconception in the minds of some hon. members. I found that when I went through the motor-vehicle insurance provisions in this way I was able to put at rest many misconceptions of hon. members. In fact, I finally drew a considerable amount of support from them.

In England the Act empowers the Lord Chancellor to be the nominal administrator of the scheme but it provides for the Law Society and the Bar Association to be the actual administrators. Here we have both those bodies. We have the Law Society, which concerns itself with solicitors, and the Bar Association, which is the official mouthpiece for barristers, although from time to time in this Chamber one would not think so.

As to the courts in which the aid is available, it goes right through from the lowest to the highest in the land, as far as the Court of Appeal and the House of Lords. So one could hardly say that it is insignificant assistance. Of course, not every litigant can get this aid. First of all, a means test has to be satisfied. At the inception of the scheme in 1949, that means test was fairly stringent in the monetary terms of today. It was relaxed to some extent in 1959.

I am happy to see that the Minister for Justice is in the Chamber. I extend congratulations to him on his appointment to the leadership of the Liberal Party in this coalition Government. I commend him for the way in which he has administered his portfolio over the last five years, particularly in matters such as this, which I know occupy

his mind. I suggest that it would behove his colleagues in Cabinet to consider that his portfolio is one which in future, with the growing tide of litigation, will have to receive larger allocations of funds to cope with situations such as I am outlining at the moment.

I pointed out that applicants for assistance under this scheme had to satisfy a means test. In 1949, when the scheme was instituted in England, a person who had a disposable income not in excess of £420 a year was entitled to assistance. In addition, he could have a disposable capital not exceeding £500. It is interesting to note that in calculating what was the disposable capital regard could not be paid to any house property that a person owned, to his tools and equipment of trade, personal effects, furniture and fittings or personal clothing. All those items were excluded. He could own those, and over and above them his disposable capital could be up to £500, and his disposable income up to £420 a year. In 1951 the income figure was increased to £700, so that we see that on the English scene legal aid is available to a person who has a disposable income of not more than £700 a year. Of course, that does not mean that if his disposable income is £699 he will have all his legal fees paid. It means that he can be issued with a certificate, which entitles him to the benefits accruing therefrom.

It is also interesting to note that, whilst legal aid is available, it is not available for all actions. One cannot get aid to bring a defamation action, so that some of our less financial members here would not be able to call in legal aid if they felt that they had been defamed. Similarly, one cannot get aid to bring an action for breach of promise, or for the loss of services of a wife or daughter through rape. If one spouse has been enticed to leave another spouse the party aggrieved cannot get aid to take action against the enticer. Those matters are outside the ambit of legal aid. Election returns cannot be disputed with that type of legal assistance. We have seen actions from time to time in this State when contenders at the polls have felt that they had been wronged. In such cases they cannot get legal aid. Nor can any plaintiff who brings an action with the ultimate possibility of getting an award of damages, as Mr. Hobler brought an action against the hon. member for Callide. It may be recalled that some time ago, before the passing of an Act to rectify the situation, Mr. Jones was challenged as to his right to sit in the House because of the contention of Mr. Hobler that he was a beneficiary under a contract with the Crown. That type of proceedings enables the informer to recover so much a day by way of damages from the holder of the seat. Under such conditions legal aid would not be given to Mr. Hobler or any other person in his place.

The aid is not restricted to court appearances; it may be given for legal advice. One may receive opinions and all other

incidentals that may lead to a later appearance in court. When we understand that a means test is imposed we realise that there is a graded system of aid and assistance. The litigant will be called upon, at the instance of the various committees, to make some contribution to costs, if he can. He will not get his legal assistance free. He must pay whatever is assessed to be within his means. I do not think anyone could cavil at the fairness of that scheme. It has worked very well in England as they have there a National Assistance Board which can undertake the assessment of a person's capabilities with much greater ease than any such organisation we have here. However, that is a small matter that should not worry us if, and when, the scheme is introduced here, as I hope it will be in the foreseeable future.

We must remember that there are local committees and area committees to decide contributions. The local committee, comprising both solicitors and barristers, assesses the litigant's prospects and that person's capacity to pay. If it decides he has not the capacity to pay it will issue him with the certificate that will entitle him to a reduction in court fees, filing fees, and various other expenses. If, on the other hand, the local committee refuses to issue a certificate the person can appeal to an area committee. This is a supervising body, larger in numbers, and sits in review on decisions of local committees. One can see that a litigant will not be denied aid if his case is worthy, nor will he be offered aid unless it is worthy. It is the function of the committees to sift from applicants those with some merit in their cases and those with none. It applies equally to plaintiff and defendant. People who have had a writ issued against them can get assistance just as well as those who bring an action. In allowing the appeal to an area committee the Act makes sure that justice is not denied any person who deserves it.

After the applying litigant is issued with a certificate, he goes to court and may be represented by any one of the panel of barristers. Let me assure the House that the English practitioner regards it as an honour and a duty to be on the panel of people who may be chosen by the litigant. Queen's Counsel, as well as juniors, appear on the panel and are utilised. By no manner of means is it a refuge for a barrister who otherwise would not get work, nor does it deny to the litigant the services of the most efficient counsel in the land. The whole function of this Act is worthy of consideration.

When the case comes before the court and the assisted person wins, of course costs are then recovered from the other party. We do not have to imagine the whole scheme of litigation as being financed from the Legal Aid Fund. The fund can be reimbursed from time to time in cases of success because if the action is won and

costs are awarded against the other side, the Act provides for those costs to be paid first of all to the administrators of the fund and, from the costs awarded, they will take sufficient to reimburse the assisted person for what he has paid, but the balance goes into the fund. In that way, to a certain extent, the expenses are offset by the recovery of costs.

No wild action will be brought by assisted litigants because cases are reviewed first of all by a committee of practising barristers and solicitors sitting together to consider proposed cases. No person will receive assistance unless there is a distinct likelihood that he will win, or certainly a distinct likelihood that there is a reasonable case to argue.

I pass to the matter of the area committees. In the whole of England and Wales there are some 16 of these. They are larger in London, of course, than in the provinces. Nevertheless, I submit to the House that in the framework of the English system we have an excellent precedent.

I have already pointed out to the Chamber the difficulties that beset the Government in finding money for the institution of these schemes but, while appreciative of that and while sympathising with the Cabinet in respect of it, I suggest that we have, in the case of the wives particularly, a valid ground on which to make representations possibly to the Commonwealth for assistance because, by bringing these actions, we are saving the Commonwealth from its expenditure. After all, wives who do not (a) get to court or (b) get the order of the court fulfilled are in fact a charge upon the Commonwealth. They receive the deserted wives and children's pension and those moneys are paid out of the social services grant. They could be saved if the wives could come to our courts and get that award of maintenance from the party who should pay it, that is, the husband. In that light I submit to the Minister for Justice that we have a reasonable ground on which to approach the Commonwealth.

There are always, of course, the difficulties of the wife recovering these awards once they are made, and that is another occasion when legal aid is of great assistance to the wife. Can you imagine an empty award that has been made some months ago and the husband has not made any payments under it? The wife will no doubt wish to pursue her rights. Quite often she will present herself to the clerk of petty sessions. He will take some proceedings against the husband but, in the long run, the whole of the arrears may be wiped out. Then we start afresh. It is very difficult for the wife in those circumstances to present her case adequately. I would say that, with at least some form of assistance to her, we would have achieved the first step on the road to the fulfilment of a scheme such as we see in England.

Earlier in my remarks I mentioned the state of the building in which these court cases are heard, and I referred with some delight to the fact that we have had a test or two of the mechanical recording of evidence. I hope that that will not be the last we see of the scheme. I have commended the Minister for Justice for entertaining it. I should like to point out the extent of the coverage by mechanical means in Victoria, where the system of recording evidence has been used for some seven years. It began when an Act introduced into the Victorian Parliament by two practising lawyers passed all stages. At the present date the Victorian courts—the Supreme Court, the court in general sessions on circuit, undefended divorce cases, courts of petty sessions, committal hearings and coroners' inquiries—are all recorded by mechanical means. I would suggest that the very fact that those proceedings are recorded by machinery indicates the possibilities of this method of recording. It could well be tried in this Chamber. We know that shorthand-reporters are getting harder and harder to come by.

Mr. Bennett: They tried it out here six weeks ago and they got the result. What are they going to do about it?

Mr. SMITH: Ah! The hon. member for South Brisbane is back in the Chamber.

An Opposition Member: Do you write to "The Courier-Mail" under the nom de plume of "Lawyer"?

Mr. SMITH: If I wrote to "The Courier-Mail" it would not be under a nom de plume. For the benefit of the hon. member, I am a lawyer. Under the system in Melbourne 26 courts are permanently wired. There is no need to set up any elaborate machinery, because the courts are already wired. The microphones are positioned. As soon as the proceedings are begun in that court, the tape is working not in that courtroom but in the office of the recording service some miles away. There can be no hitch in the recording. The system is virtually foolproof—I repeat, virtually foolproof.

Coming back to the question of shorthand-writers, where you have them you need typists. Shorthand-writers are becoming harder to come by, and it seems sensible that in this electronic age we should utilise the electronic devices that have been invented. With them only typists are needed to transcribe. They could be installed in courts and in Parliament, and there is no way that anyone can convince me that shorthand-writers can take things down more accurately than a microphone can record, because the microphone actually records the sounds that are uttered.

With the use of a microphone and tape, any particularly difficult passage can be re-run until the person transcribing is satisfied that it has been recorded accurately. I

am not decrying the ability of shorthand-writers; I am merely pointing out the physical limitations that obtain. Where there are interjections and cross-fire, we get a certain amount of noise in the Chamber that can be described ungraciously as babble. On those occasions, a microphone more accurately records what is being said, and the person transcribing has the opportunity of playing the tape over and over again. The courts, this Parliament, and a variety of tribunals, could well utilise the electronic devices that are available today. This would not cause any great difficulty, because, as we know, many of the shorthand-writers from this House and from our courts have gone to the Commonwealth service.

If we were to have a recording system in this Chamber, a simple means to ensure the most accurate record would be to have a microphone at each of the lecterns, and have the voice of the speaker recorded on one of the bands of the tape. Tapes with more than one band to record more than one conversation at the same time are available, so that the only person who might be disadvantaged would be the interjector, who may be too far from the microphone. However, judging by some of the interjections that I have heard in the last 40 minutes, I would say that that would be an advantage rather than a disadvantage.

Mr. Melloy: It would save you some embarrassment.

Mr. SMITH: It would not save me any embarrassment, but some of the hon. member's colleagues must feel rather foolish when they read their interjections in the daily Press.

I move from that subject to direct the attention of the Treasurer to the question of workers' compensation and the extent of common-law damages, which has been raised in recent times in connection with awards of damages in motor-car collision cases. A set scale is provided in the workers' compensation field, and quite often there are injuries to workers over and above the amounts that the scale provides. Quite often there is a right in the injured worker to sue his employer at common law, and he takes that right. Many employers seem to be unaware that they can obtain extensions of their policies to provide against common-law risk. I am not attempting here to assist employers half as much as I am to assist the workers. If common-law extensions were made compulsory, any injured person would be able to sue at common law secure in the knowledge that, if he succeeded, his award would be met. I see little point in a worker who is employed in a small business, and who is gravely injured, bringing an action at common law against his employer if he then finds that all he has done has been to send his employer bankrupt. A simple common-law extension to workers' compensation policies would cure that and

provide virtually unlimited cover to the employer, and so pave the way for payment in full to any workman who is injured.

I commend to the notice of employers particularly the need for common-law extension. That need is growing more and more urgent because, apart from the fall in the value of money, the growing use of machinery in industry has increased the risk of injury among workers, and the injuries are becoming more serious. With more serious injuries, awards of damages become larger and larger, and I suggest that where a workman is entitled to workers' compensation it is no comfort for him to know that he has had the full award of compensation and that he cannot get any more. On the one hand we have motor-vehicle insurance, which enables an injured person to recover large sums, while on the other hand we have workers' compensation, which is a limited award.

Mr. Mann: What about the Cardiac Board?

Mr. SMITH: Awards are made for cardiac trouble now.

Mr. Bennett: It is pretty difficult to get past them.

Mr. SMITH: We have apparently found one field in which the hon. member for South Brisbane is not a success.

Mr. Bennett: It is the only field.

Mr. SMITH: It is not the only field. There are many fields in which he is not a success.

There is one matter of a domestic nature to which I think we could give consideration—if Mr. Speaker were in the chair I think he might agree with me—and I refer to the matter of visitors to the House.

(Time expired.)

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) (7.37 p.m.): I support the amendment and join with other hon. members in expressing my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. I also desire to extend my congratulations and those of my constituents to the Governor on the extension of his term of office in this State for a further three years. The people of Maryborough have a very soft spot for the Governor of Queensland and his wife, Lady May. They have visited Maryborough on many occasions, and we always rejoice to have the opportunity of welcoming them.

Because of the success of the devastating attack by Opposition members on the Government's administration of the State, I felt inclined not to enter the debate. Government members, as was instanced by the speech of the hon. member for Windsor, made no attempt to defend the Government against the attack launched from this side of the House. But because of the scurrilous nature of the attack by the hon. member for Ashgrove, running true to form, on Mr. Alf Arnell, who is unable to defend himself in this Chamber, it is necessary that I should enter the debate and say something in his defence.

The attack was illogical. I often think that the hon. member for Ashgrove has the potential to rise to higher levels of conduct than he shows in the House. It is regrettable that he so often stoops to a low level because, if it were not for the fact that he will be beaten in the next election, he might possibly have a political future or a future in some commercial field.

Mr. Hanlon: Ashgrove will be much better served by Terry Kearney, I imagine.

Mr. DAVIES: Yes.

Mr. Alf Arnell is the president of the Brisbane branch of the Waterside Workers' Association, a position that he has every reason to be proud of holding. I have good and valued friends who are members of that union, and I am proud to have their friendship. Unity tickets, as is well known, can be issued by anybody, and anyone's name can be put on them. It is very well known in Labour circles that on numerous occasions in the political life of this country strong Liberal supporters have deliberately put out unity tickets in order to embarrass members of the Australian Labour Party. In the same way it is well known in Labour circles that some years ago Communist candidates were financed by Liberal supporters in this State in areas on the southern side of the Brisbane river. Certain unity tickets have been put out with Q.L.P. and A.L.P. names on them in order to embarrass the party.

Mr. Arnell immediately made his statement on this issue and I challenged the hon. member for Ashgrove to be at least politically honest enough to state in this House just what Mr. Arnell said, and then let us judge. He made no attempt to do that. It is well known by informed people in the community who take an interest in political matters that Mr. Arnell immediately made a statement on the matter, that his statement was accepted by the controlling body of his political organisation, and that he was endorsed by the Australian Labour Party as its candidate for the Senate election. It becomes the hon. member for Ashgrove to make an attack of the type he has made in this House.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. DAVIES: I could suggest many people who would not be worthy of being elected as representatives in this State.

We heard our Leader make a brilliant fighting speech in which he exposed the inefficient administration of this Government and, on behalf of the majority of the electors in the State, protested at this Government's pandering to certain powerful and wealthy interests and their failure to help those who need protection against these marauding commercial interests who have made Queensland their happy hunting ground. He also protested at the failure of the Government to carry out their promises and to honour their obligations. Hon. members on this side have

proved such failures and supported our Leader vigorously and effectively; so much so that, as an observer of the whole of the debate, I can say that I have never seen a Government so humiliated or embarrassed as a result of what has been said. The defence put forward by Government supporters was so weak that the Government were compelled to bring from a sick bed the Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr. Ken Morris. Whilst the Australian Labour Party Opposition disagrees very forcibly with this Minister on many matters, it must be admitted that he has been a hard worker and has not spared himself in his services to his department. It is most noticeable, however, that the Government have heaped on his head their collective misdeeds and records of failures and allowed him to bear the brunt of public censure while they have endeavoured to grasp a halo from the reflected light from some newly-painted school.

The Government as a whole stand condemned. That has been conclusively proved by the Opposition during this debate. The feeble arguments by Government members on the subject of unemployment reek with hypocrisy and humbug. The Government cannot deny that they have deliberately misled the people of this State. They said there would be more jobs than men to fill them, and that capital would flow into this State. They spoke about some glorious vista of industrial development, not only in Brisbane but in other cities along the coast, yet cities like Maryborough have fewer factories today than in 1957. The Government have failed, and failed dismally, in their shameful endeavour to cover up by claiming that more men are employed in the State now than in 1957. Surely since 1957 there must have been some increase in population. We know that the rate of increase in Queensland under this Government has been shamefully low. In fact, last year the population decreased by 3,534. As at 31 March, 1962, it was 1,527,405, while at 31 March, 1961, it was 1,507,398, a difference of 20,007. The natural increase of births over deaths was 23,881, which means that 3,534 more people left the State than came into it. In the previous year the figures were somewhat better.

One would naturally expect a greater number to be employed throughout Australia, including this State, as a result of migration and natural increase. The test is not that there is a greater number of men employed but the number of men who are unable to find work, that is, the percentage of unemployed. The number is always greater than the figure recorded because many men will not register as unemployed because they know how long it takes before they can get sustenance. They take the risk of earning a few pounds here and there. Now we have a pool of unemployed in this country. Many people in business circles are happy that there is such a pool

of unemployed. In my recent travels business men have told me that they regard their employees as merchandise or commodities. They say, "Why worry about them? There are plenty outside to take their place." There are men and women in industry who are afraid to complain about award breaches. If it were not for union representatives and union leaders in this State we would be quickly back to a stage equal to the so-called "good old days."

In their argument the Government refer to New South Wales. The position is much better in that State. At election time they do not stump the country asking for the return of the Menzies Government. They realise the necessity for a change of policy in the Federal Government and they do their best to remove that Government. It is the Menzies-Nicklin combination that is strangling development in Queensland. They work hand in glove. They support each other at all times. At election time, which is the testing time, they do everything possible to see that each respective Government is returned. Both Governments must accept responsibility for what the hon. member for Logan, Mr. R. L. Harrison, said in his recent report, when, with Mr. Savage, he complained about the sluggish rate of development in this country. We must charge them with responsibility for the shocking percentage of unemployed. Both Menzies and Nicklin must go. Unemployment cannot be tolerated. This young country's future welfare depends upon over-employment. We should be able to employ every available man and every worth-while man that it is possible to bring into this country. Until we reach that stage we cannot be considered worthy of owning Australia. We cannot afford to drift. Unemployment is bad for the morale of the people. To appoint a committee to inquire into child delinquency and at the same time to support a pool of unemployed is ludicrous in the extreme. The unemployment figures in this State indicate weak, incapable administration. That is borne out by Mr. Bolte, the Premier of Victoria, who, on 21 February this year, said—

"Queensland's high unemployment percentage reflected inefficient administration of its affairs by the State Government."

Mr. Armstrong interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Mulgrave, who has been interjecting, is quite disorderly.

Mr. DAVIES: It is quite clear that there is a cunning campaign to condition our thinking on unemployment to an acceptance of from 80,000 to 100,000 unemployed in this country as a standard and as being a state of stability. Then we are told that with a decrease in the number the situation is brightening, and that with an increase there is just a slight deterioration. That is Tory strategy and is dangerous to the welfare of the country.

The Australian Financial Review of 21 August, 1962, dealt with this question and said—

“This 17 per cent. reduction to a total of 89,000 unemployed in July from January’s 109,000 may be ‘magnificent’ to Mr. Menzies—”

and might be I add for the benefit of the Premier and the Minister for Justice—

“... but it is pitifully poor to those affected by it, whether of the management or labour side of industry and commerce.”

The same critic says—

“Yet the recovery is apparently going fast enough for the Government—it refused to take the opportunity to hasten this dismal rate of progress in the Budget.”

Those sentiments are sound. Unemployment benefits, while preventing starvation, mean malnutrition in the home. The denial of fundamental human rights as laid down in famous charters, including that of the United Nations, is not right.

The improvement mentioned above, if correct and continued, will do nought to reduce present levels of unemployment because during the next 12 months an increase in the work force of approximately 85,000 can be expected from migration and natural increase. On humanitarian grounds the Nicklin-Menzies combination stand condemned, but on simple economic grounds the situation is indefensible. The 90,000 unemployed and their dependants mean 360,000 consumers for Australian industry. With a full earning capacity they represent a solid home market for the manufacturers and the farmers of the community. One should have thought that Country Party representatives in the House might have raised their voices on behalf of the farmer and condemned unemployment, if only on the ground of the loss of markets.

We are labelled as knockers because we protest against this evil, for unemployment is an evil. We will continue to knock on the door of employment and demand admittance for the unemployed who are outside. No wrong was ever righted by silence, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has addressed me as “Mr. Chairman” six times. I remind him that he is in the House and that I am Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DAVIES: I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I repeat that no wrong was ever righted by silence. Every reform has been the result of constant agitation and the raising of voices in protest by those who in their day were called knockers. Women and children were employed in the coal-mining industry in England, and Lord Shaftesbury and others fought for them. It was said that the mine-owners could not do without them because of the nation’s economy. They

said that their hearts bled for them, but because of foreign competition they could not afford to do without them. However, the reformers persisted with their agitation and finally got the women and children out of the mines. So it was with Clarkson and Wilberforce in the abolition of slavery. They were told that it was not possible. The same objection was raised that unless cheap slave labour was available competition was impossible. So it is with every reform.

Used in the sense intended by the Government, knockers would be those who do not appreciate the privileges and rights already won over the centuries. Where there is injustice, or a wrong, or evil conditions, one must be discontented, and only a coward would refrain from raising his voice loud and clear. Such discontent could be referred to as “divine” discontent. The grumbler, the selfish, and the lazy, in whatever stratum of society they may be, express the discontent that is to be discouraged.

The Country Party is but a shadow of its former self. We were told that by the former Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation. Its troubles were fully diagnosed by him. He said that the Country Party organisation was being taken right away from what it was in years gone by. What was the result? He was attacked by Government members in a way that I never imagined any citizen would be attacked in this House. In an effort to silence him he was referred to by a Cabinet Minister as a decrepit old hulk. Imagine a man of his energy being so described! The Country Party has lost touch with the farmer. City interests, the grazier and the maintenance of office are their main concern today. The Labour Party is, and always has been, the only party with the interests of the working farmer at heart. Its record proves that this claim is true. Under the Government of the Menzies-Nicklin combination—Menzies since 1949, when he said he was going to put value back into the pound, and Nicklin since 1957—the plight of the farmer has seriously deteriorated.

In the annual report of the Executive Committee of the Council of Agriculture, submitted to the annual conference in August this year by the chairman, Mr. R. L. Harrison, who is also the hon. member for Logan, and Mr. P. J. Savage, who was written up as an authority in a letter I received mentioning a function at which he is to be the speaker, it was stated: “The Australian economy is moving at a sluggish speed but the farm sector has greater problems than theirs in respect of income and costs.

In the 12 years from 1949 to 1961” (that is, the period of the Menzies administration) “company income rose 188 per cent. and wages and salaries 198 per cent. Farm income rose a mere 4 per cent. despite substantial increases in production for almost all rural commodities. Prices paid by farmers, on the other hand, are up 87 per cent. overall.”

The report continues—

"In general the margin between prices and costs was emphasised as the main reason for the decline in incomes of farmers."

I thought one of the Country Party members might have spent part of his time in this debate dealing with the excessive prices of spare parts of farm machinery. But not one of them raised his voice in protest.

The report went on to say—

"More gains had been obtained in yields and production in other States than in Queensland over the past years. This seems to be largely due to the considerable amount of research undertaken there and the improvement in both cropping and pastures (following upon irrigation). Queensland needs intense basic research and substantially more funds with which to undertake it."

A Government Member: Who wrote that?

Mr. DAVIES: That report was written by the hon. member for Logan (Mr. R. L. Harrison) and Mr. P. J. Savage.

The specialist advisers of the Department of Agriculture and Stock and the Department of Public Lands are doing wonderful work as I have seen in my years of experience in country areas. Great credit goes to them. But their work is restricted by lack of finance, and these departments are short-staffed. There is not enough research work, and the quality and quantity of our products are suffering.

Mr. Wharton: What did you do about it when you were the Government?

Mr. DAVIES: That is no excuse for the Government. What kind of a Government are they who seek to hide behind the faults of another Government, if they were faults and if they did exist? Shame on them! Hon. members opposite claim to represent farmers, yet they remain silent on these matters. It is left to the Labour Party Opposition to raise them in the House.

Sir William Gunn, Chairman of the Australian Wool Bureau, recently issued a statement. While dealing with him let me say that he would do well to pay more attention to advertising his wares. He came to Maryborough and urged us to take part in the celebration of Wool Week. We did very well—the people of Maryborough, not me. We gained second place to Toowoomba in the contest organised by the Bureau. However, when I visited the Queensland Industries Fair in Brisbane I particularly walked through looking for an exhibit by the Australian Wool Bureau but I could not find one. I certainly expected to find there a demonstration of what the wool industry was doing to counter the tremendous campaign being conducted by the synthetics group. I saw nothing.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members will please allow the hon. member to be heard.

Mr. DAVIES: Usually I am not concerned about them, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I have a cold and I am having some difficulty speaking. Sir William Gunn recently said:

"Departments have not finance necessary to do the job and have not been able to offer attractive terms and conditions of employment to attract and hold qualified people. It is essential that finance be made available for extension services and that the terms and conditions of employment be attractive so that most highly qualified people can be employed."

It is distressing to note that more money is being spent on research by producers of synthetics than on production from our raw products. The Country Party have the upper hand. They could say to the Commonwealth Government, "We won't support you unless you do this." That would prove their sincerity in their advocacy of the interests of the farming community, not only the big graziers.

An example of the effect of substitutes is found in the soap industry. Twenty years ago the soap industry took more than two billion pounds of inedible fats and oils annually. Detergents developed from crude oil, which is imported and uses up our overseas exchange, and only 800,000,000 lb. of agricultural fats and oils now go into soap manufacture.

Perhaps the Attorney-General can explain what is meant by the statement, "Buy this detergent powder at such-and-such a price and save 8½d." Ask grocers to explain it, and they cannot. Travellers cannot. I think it is straightout roguery, particularly when it is a powder in a box that, possibly, would cost no more than 6d. to produce at the factory. The amount going into the manufacture of soap today represents a drop of 60 per cent., despite an increase in the population of more than 2,000,000 over that period.

Twenty years ago 80 per cent. of the fibre used in clothes, our home, and our tyres, came from cotton. Now the figure is 65 per cent. In 1940 synthetics supplied less than 10 per cent of the demand for fibre; in 1961 the figure was 30 per cent. Other States spend many times the amount of money that we do on industrial research, and employ a much greater number of men. Despite the fact that we have a tremendous area in the 20-inch plus rainfall belt compared with that of Victoria, that State, with its much smaller area, has 1.3 times the number of staff employed in Queensland on both extension and research work in the Department of Agriculture and Stock. New South Wales has 3.3 times the staff employed in Queensland.

This is something of interest to the Country Party. In a State needing all the research work possible, only 6 per cent. of the staff of the C.S.I.R.O. are located north

of the latitude of the southern border of Queensland. With the Country Party controlling the Federal and Queensland Parliaments for such a long period, why has something not been done? Our farmers are being neglected, and they are realising it. Their share of the national income has been stationary since 1949. I would be prepared to say that it is now slightly less than their share of the national income in 1949. The Country Party could demand action if they so desired and force the Liberal Party to see that the farmer receives a fair deal.

The Department of Irrigation and Water Supply is starved for funds. So the story goes on. Nicklin, Menzies, and company are starving the State and preventing development, and both must accept responsibility for it. Hon. members opposite, when they first became the Government, used to speak of the Tinaroo Falls Dam as a grandiose scheme. They said it was a white elephant and a waste of money. But what has been the result? They have now learnt its value. As a result of the Australian Labour Party's magnificent developmental work there, since 1953 there has been an increase of £5,000,000 in tobacco production, which has provided additional permanent employment for 900 new producers and 300 urban workers in Mareeba alone. There has been seasonal work for 1,500 from November to April. The local business turnover has been doubled. There has been an annual increase of £100,000 in railway revenue.

Even the Labour Government's weir at Mundubbera was ridiculed. A responsible Minister went up there and said that it was a white elephant. That was a shameful statement, and the incensed feeling among the people in that area has not yet died down. The hon. member for that area knows that only too well.

I know that you are interested in irrigation, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Our irrigated area is comparatively small compared with similar areas in other States. We must have water storage and we must have every penny spent on development. We have in this State $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the amount of water that is in any southern State.

Government members speak about what they are doing in the field of education. What they have done has been essential to keep the children off the streets. In other departments they have sacked men and restricted the development that is essential in the interests of the very children for whom they claim that they are providing schoolrooms.

What did Mr. Haigh say? He said—

"Queensland Loan Fund expenditure for 1961-1962 is virtually nil on dry land settlement, and £2.1 million on irrigation. Reasonable progress could be obtained with £1.5 million and £3.5 million respectively, but for really satisfactory progress programmes of £3 million and £5 million would be needed."

I want to know why the money has not been made available by the Nicklin-Menzies combination. Why is no Country Party voice raised in this Chamber in protest? Millions can be found for rockets and war expenditure—I am not questioning the need for it or otherwise at the moment—but we cannot find money for the conservation of water, and irrigation is a vital factor in defence. It is doubtful whether the Coral Sea battle could have been won without the development of primary industries in the North and the development of coastal towns, harbours, food supplies, roads, and so on. Why is it left to the Australian Labour Party to raise this matter?

Mr. Haigh did not think it would be over-ambitious to provide a total of £5,000,000 for positive rural development from a total State budget of over £230,000,000, or even the Loan funds available for direct allocations of £31,000,000, when the total Government spending on works includes such figures as—

	£
Roads	22,000,000
Railways	12,000,000
Housing	11,000,000
Public Buildings	8,000,000

In the "Burnett Advocate" of 16 August, 1962, Mr. Haigh is reported as saying—

"... allocated £1.8 million, of which a certain amount went into routine works, leaving about £1.3 million to use on conservation schemes. We get very little progress with that. Last year the department had less work to do and couldn't keep its staff intact, losing 35. His department had under way projects costing a total of £8.2 millions and was getting towards them about £1.3 million a year."

There are the facts. The farmers of Queensland must be told those facts.

I notice that the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, Hon. A. R. Fletcher, said that Queensland should have more irrigation as well as more research stations. Why have we not got them? The Government have had control of the State for five years, and they have had no Upper House to contend with. The Liberal-Country Party Government have had control of the Treasury benches in the Federal sphere since 1949. Why have they not done these things? Hon. members opposite are hiding behind what they call the faults of former Governments. I am ashamed of them for not doing something for the development of a State such as this. The Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation has shown some courage in making this statement. He went on to say—

"The cost of irrigation, however, is high and the community, not the irrigator, is called upon to pay."

He instanced Tinaroo and went on bluntly to give the figures that I have mentioned already. He said—

"The Commonwealth Government receives the taxation from the producers and business men but all the Queensland Government gets is the bill for the capital and working costs of the irrigation scheme."

He hopes for something better from the Commonwealth Government and says that we need more capital expenditure, research, and irrigation. The only way in which we will get more capital, research, and irrigation is to change the Commonwealth and State Governments. What amused me was that he then went on to praise the Commonwealth Government for the moneys that had been advanced to Queensland. I invite hon. members to read the private member's motion that praises Mr. Menzies for the co-operative help and assistance rendered to this Government in their effort to promote the development of Queensland. How the Rt. Hon. Robert Gordon Menzies must smile when he reads that the Queensland Government are happy and perfectly satisfied with the financial support they receive from the Commonwealth Government! How can members of this Country Party face the people in country areas?

I did intend to quote Dr. Summerville, who said that the advisory services available to primary producers in this State are hopelessly inadequate to give the man on the land the information he needs. Yet hon. members opposite call themselves a Country Party!

As I have only a few minutes left I shall conclude by quoting from a statement I have here, and then sum it up, if I can. I have a record prepared in answer to the hon. member for Mulgrave, who said that he could tell us what the Labour Party did for the sugar industry and the primary producer. The Hon. A. R. Fletcher, Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, in opening the annual conference of the Council of Agriculture in August, 1962, said—

"Not enough publicity has been given to the reasons which inspired primary producers' forefathers to set up marketing organisations."

Who first set up the marketing organisations in this State? When the Labour Party first came to power they passed legislation on behalf of the workers, and, in the same year, they passed legislation for the control of the sugar industry and took over the whole of the sugar crop in the State. Does the farmer realise that the excellent controls and organisation of the sugar industry were introduced by a Labour Government? I wish to place on record what T. J. Ryan did in putting this industry on its feet and saving its future. Action was first taken under the Sugar Acquisition Act of 1915. That was followed by the Primary Producers' Co-operative Association Bill and the Primary

Producers' Pools Act Amendment Bill. It was a Labour Minister who introduced that legislation and I have here a note for one interjector. The Minister in those days, Mr. W. N. Gillies, Minister for Agriculture, said—

"In connection with the organisation of the agricultural industry by the Government, there has been a general attitude of hostility adopted by hon. members opposite; first of all, because Labour must not get the credit of doing anything good for the farmers; and second, because of the section opposite who represent middlemen and who have got into the House with the votes and financial assistance of the middle-men."

So we go on and discover that the primary producers' organisation was brought in by a Labour Government as justification for doing something to organise the rural community on non-party lines. The Minister said—

"He should not be left to struggle along in the old way. So, I say that organisation is the first step in a scheme whereby we seek to emancipate the rural community of the State."

Yet we have these vicious attacks, Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I again remind the hon. member that we are not in Committee.

Mr. DAVIES: I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Nott (Stanley) came in and said—

"Personally, I think the present administration are bringing this measure forward in the hope that it will be able to assist them to attain their socialistic objective. If the Bill goes through in its present form they have a good chance of doing that."

Mr. Warren (Murrumba) said—

"The Government will go to some electorates and say, 'This is the Soviet system. It should not be foisted on the people'."

Mr. Harrison: There is a story in that.

Mr. DAVIES: There is a story in it and the hon. member cannot deny it. The hon. member for Logan and other hon. members of his party say that the Labour Party as a Government would fear to introduce legislation in the interests of the farmers of the State. How absurd! All worth-while legislation on the statute books of this State and the Commonwealth that is of benefit to the farmer has been placed there by A.L.P. Governments or is legislation based on laws passed by a Labour Government.

I have here an extract from "The Courier-Mail," but I have not time to quote it now. Primary producers' organisations and their papers, and other worth-while groups in this State, have congratulated the Labour movement on what it has done, but the Minister tends to cover up. I think it was just a lapse on his part. I have spent most of my

life in agricultural centres and I know the problems. At least I will always raise my voice on behalf of the primary producers. I am very proud of what the Labour Party have put on the statute book. It is to be regretted that the Country Party has deviated from the course set for it.

(Time expired.)

Question—That the words proposed to be added (Mr. Duggan's amendment) be so added—put; and the House divided—

NOES, 33

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Low
„ Bjelke-Petersen	„ Madsen
„ Camm	„ Munro
„ Campbell	„ Nicklin
„ Chalk	Dr. Noble
„ Dewar	Mr. Pilbeam
„ Evans	„ Ramsden
„ Fletcher	„ Richter
„ Harrison	„ Row
„ Herbert	„ Smith
„ Hewitt	„ Sullivan
„ Hiley	„ Wharton
„ Hodges	„ Windsor
„ Hooper	
„ Houghton	<i>Tellers:</i>
„ Hughes	Mr. Gilmore
„ Knox	„ Tooth
„ Loneragan	

AYES, 21

Mr. Baxter	Mr. Mann
„ Bromley	„ Melloy
„ Burrows	„ Newton
„ Byrne	„ O'Donnell
„ Davies	„ Sherrington
„ Dean	„ Thackeray
„ Dufficy	„ Wallace
„ Duggan	
„ Gunn	<i>Tellers:</i>
„ Hanlon	Mr. Bennett
„ Houston	„ Tucker
„ Inch	

PAIRS

Mr. Donald	Mr. Pizzey
„ Graham	„ Morris
„ Lloyd	„ Beardmore
„ Marsden	„ Ewan

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. HERBERT (Sherwood) (8.23 p.m.): I rise to speak on this debate to indicate to the House and to the public of Queensland that my colleague, the hon. member for Greenslopes, has the support of Government members in his comments on certain happenings at the City Hall. Although the hon. member for Greenslopes accepts the responsibility for the initial comments, we do not believe that the impression should be created that he is a lone voice in this matter. Much has been said since that speech was made, but some of the original points seem to have been lost. The Lord Mayor admits the hon. member's statement that Mr. Molloy was present at a meeting of the Town Planning Committee on Monday 20 August. As reported in "The Courier-Mail" of 5 September, Mr. Jones introduced Mr. Molloy as a resident who had just come to live in Brisbane. If he had no ulterior motive why did he neglect to inform the meeting of the following facts:—

1. That Mr. Molloy was manager-elect of Mobil Oil Pty. Ltd.

2. That Mr. Molloy was a partner with him and others in a firm known as R.M.J. Lands.

3. That Mr. Molloy was an old friend of 20 years' standing.

Mr. Jones claimed on "Meet the Press" that he promised in his policy speech to "remove the mystery that surrounded the Town Planning Committee." Those were his words. How the admission of a business partner removes this mystery has not been explained, particularly as this man was manager-elect of Mobil Oil Pty. Ltd. It is up to the Lord Mayor, to Mr. Molloy, and to Mobil Oil Pty. Ltd. to make public the terms of the partnership between Mr. Jones and Mr. Molloy.

Mr. Molloy admits that he bought land on Mr. Jones's recommendation and, further, that Mr. Jones lent him money to make the purchase, but neither Mr. Jones nor Mr. Molloy has stated if the money has been repaid and, if so, when, or why the Lord Mayor recommended the purchase by Mr. Molloy of this particular land.

Mr. Jones claims that R.M.J. Lands does not own any land in Brisbane. No doubt this is technically correct, but the point is that members of the firm own land in the Wynnum area that is believed to be contiguous to the proposed Wynnum sewerage area. The Lord Mayor admitted on "Meet the Press" that his personal holding was only a half-mile from the area to be seweraged.

Mr. Molloy says that the firm of R.M.J. Lands was registered in November, 1960. Mr. Jones has claimed that the firm never operated and he implied that it was moribund. If that is so, why were two new members admitted in July this year, only a month before Mr. Molloy attended the meeting of the Town Planning Committee?

Mr. Jones gave the impression on "Meet the Press" that the Town Planning Committee meetings were not of a confidential nature and that there was nothing wrong in outsiders being present. In fact, he said he would even admit a member of the panel, and extended an invitation to one. If that is correct, the following questions have to be answered by Mr. Jones:—

(1) Why had not the public been advised of this practice?

(2) What people other than the bank managers indicated by Mr. Jones in "Meet the Press" had attended the meetings?

(3) Why were elected C.M.O. aldermen denied the right to attend these so-called open meetings for a considerable time? (In fact, they were admitted only two months ago.)

Will the Lord Mayor make public a complete list of outsiders admitted to the Town Planning Committee meetings, together with

their business associations, to allow the citizens of Brisbane to decide whether or not the admission of Mr. Molloy was an unusual procedure?

The Lord Mayor and Mr. Molloy have both tried to pass this off as a social gathering—having a few drinks with the boys. However, in "The Courier-Mail" of 5 September, Alderman Orme Olsen of Chatsworth, who was present, said that "contentious and confidential matters were discussed. They included subdivisions, service stations and ring roads." Interesting advance information for an oil company manager who is, with the help of the Lord Mayor, dabbling in real estate! And, as the hon. member for Greenslopes has pointed out, this would confer on him an unfair advantage over his business competitors.

What would the people of Queensland, and the A.L.P. who are so vociferous tonight, have to say if the Premier invited interested outsiders to Cabinet meetings? Irrespective of what the Lord Mayor says, these meetings of the Town Planning Committee are and should be confidential.

The Lord Mayor's list of his Brisbane holdings, as published in the local Press on 6 September, makes interesting reading. He claims to have made a full disclosure of the land that he holds, but he has not told us whether Garden Estates Pty. Ltd., Modern Research Pty. Ltd. or other firms mentioned own land in the metropolitan area. Maybe they do not, but he should have revealed whether they do or not.

I think I have amply illustrated the need for the Lord Mayor to give more specific answers to the original points raised by my colleague, Mr. Hooper, and supported by members on this side of the House.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (8.29 p.m.): I am rather amazed at the stage the debate has reached when the amendment moved by our Leader was not adequately dealt with by previous speakers and he, the Leader of the Opposition, had, of course, exhausted his right to enter the debate to make any comment or to rise in defence of a fellow member of the Australian Labour Party. It seems to me that such tactics would stink in the nostrils of all fair-minded men. I was rather amazed that the Premier and the Deputy Premier did not see fit to enter this controversy at any stage of the debate. The issue was raised last Thursday. I had no intention of harking back to what did happen but, seeing that it has been raised again, I must refer to certain things that were misconstrued by the Press and by certain unfair members of the Liberal Party, though certainly not all, when I referred to the hon. member for Greenslopes as hurrying out of the Chamber and scurrying back. It was perfectly obvious that I was referring to his going and coming, not to his method of gait. That was quite obvious to every fair-minded man in

the Chamber. As a matter of fact, on one occasion when the then Deputy Premier left the Chamber after having made an attack upon us and I was replying to his allegations, I used exactly the same expression, to which hon. members may refer in "Hansard," when he left the Chamber. I referred to his going during the course of my speech, and he hurriedly returned. It is only indecent, improper, foul-minded men who would put any other interpretation on it.

As for war service, I do not want to enter into that, but I suffered my privations, too.

So far as these scurrilous allegations that have been made are concerned, I, for one, and I know my Leader and my other colleagues on this side of the House would not tolerate them for a moment in any public man, whether he be a member of the Australian Labour Party or not. I—and, I am sure, the Lord Mayor—would welcome any fair investigation if the Government have the guts to make any. I challenge the Premier to do that.

I had certain information prior to the beginning of this session that reflected very badly on a certain top-level man in this State. In order to be fair to his character, and in order not to blacken his name if the allegations proved to be incorrect, I was sufficiently fair-minded to take the information to the Premier and say to him, "In order to be fair to this man, I ask you and the Cabinet to have the matter investigated before I might tarnish his reputation in the eyes of the public on untested evidence." I was fair enough to the Government to do that.

Now we have an allegation that was made last Thursday about a man in his absence. I repeat that it could have been made in his presence, and it could have been made today even in the council chamber when no doubt he would have taken the opportunity of defending himself. Now, in cowardly fashion, when the Council meeting is over and when the Lord Mayor cannot defend himself, and at a period in the debate when the Leader of the Opposition had exhausted his right to say anything, the hon. member for Sherwood, who contributes very little to debates, sneaks in and makes these cheap, snide allegations, in my opinion not believing them to be true but fearful that he might not win his seat at the next election.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the word "snide" has previously been described as an unparliamentary expression, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. BENNETT: I withdraw that word.

Mr. Duggan: What authority has he to say it on behalf of the Government parties? Why does not the Minister or the Premier say it on behalf of the Government?

Mr. BENNETT: I suggested that if it is conscientiously believed that there is any truth in this scurrilous allegation, my speech invited the Minister for Justice, who is now Deputy Premier, the Minister for Public Works and Local Government, and the Minister for Education and Migration, who is in charge of police, to have the matter properly investigated, but all of them sit there in silence. They are not prepared to have an investigation. They will leave a man's name blackened and his character thrown to the wolves rather than use the facilities at their disposal to test the scurrilous allegations made in this way by the hon. member for Sherwood, who has not the evidence to back them up.

I am not here to defend any particular person. I am here to see that the improper practice will not be indulged in of endeavouring to win an election by sneering at a person's character, and that is what these two backbenchers are doing. None of the Ministers has made himself a party to the allegation. If it is true, it calls for a statement from the Premier, who, when the matter was raised by the hon. member for Sherwood, left the Chamber because he does not want to be a party to it, or so it would appear. If there is any suggestion of truth in the allegation, let it be investigated. Let the respective Ministers whom I have mentioned, whose obligation and duty it is to have these matters investigated, stand on their feet and say that they have the guts to investigate it, or, alternatively, let them be fair enough to say, "We do not think that there is one scintilla of truth in the allegation and we shall not waste the time of our officers in having it investigated."

If we liked to engage in a heresy hunt about the private affairs of various persons, we could well challenge the Ministers sitting on the front bench, for example, to disclose publicly their private affairs in relation to their land dealings.

Mr. Hanlon: And others.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, and land up at Cairns, if we liked to get a bit dirty about it, and their share-dealings. If we liked to engage in this sort of activity, we could well ask each and every Minister whether he is prepared, as was the Lord Mayor, to disclose a full account of his dealings, of his assets and of his liabilities, on the front page of "The Courier-Mail" and the "Telegraph." As a matter of fact, "The Courier-Mail" and the "Telegraph" saw fit to invite the Lord Mayor to publish a full account of his private land-dealings and his affairs and shareholdings. I also challenge "The Courier-Mail" and the "Telegraph" to call on each Minister of the Government and invite him to do the self-same thing. I guarantee that not one Minister in the Cabinet will be prepared to do it.

Mr. Dewar: It would not be hard to do. He did not give any asset value.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member has been too busy—

Mr. Dewar: Perhaps you don't know what I mean.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: If we liked to pursue the argument about local-authority men engaging in land transactions in areas into which local authorities are introducing sewerage, there may be one or two members on the Government benches who would be horribly embarrassed about the part they have played, and are playing, in that matter. I should like all hon. members on the Government benches who still have some say in local-authority affairs to get up and declare their land dealings in the last 18 months, particularly in those local-authority areas in which sewerage is about to be introduced or is now being introduced, and tell the public whether or not they told the persons from whom that land was purchased that it was being purchased for council purposes when in fact, according to the contract that was signed, it was purchased for them for private purposes by those allegedly operating in the interests of local authorities outside the Greater Brisbane area. Let them get up and tell us about their land dealings. If we like to disclose certain allegations that have been made there will be many embarrassed members on the Government benches. I should say that if the Minister for Public Works and Local Government is to act in a fair, frank, and courageous way he will either declare that he believes these allegations to be untrue or, alternatively, with courage, honesty, and integrity he will have the matter properly investigated so that the man whose name has been besmirched in this Chamber can be dealt with in a fair and proper way and have his name cleared, or alternatively, so that the allegations may be proved correct.

I feel that an attempt will be made to maintain this veiled secrecy over the head of the A.L.P. Lord Mayor of Brisbane, not because he is Clem Jones, not because he owns land and shares in Brisbane, but because he is A.L.P. and there is an election coming on. An attempt will be made to hold that veiled suspicion over the heads of the Australian Labour Party, collectively and individually, until next year when, after the election, it will be promptly forgotten. It is cheap and nasty, and not in keeping with fair business methods. It is not in keeping with a sense of integrity, principle or honesty, and I am shocked and amazed.

I remind the Premier, who left the Chamber as soon as this matter was raised, that I was fair enough to submit to him certain evidence which I had in my possession and which I wanted tested before there was any assassination of character. If he wants to live up to the claim made by his followers on the Government side, that is, of being "honest" Frank Nicklin, let honest Frank Nicklin test the allegations to see whether there is any honesty or dishonesty

in this political chicanery in which the hon. member for Greenslopes, supported by the hon. member for Sherwood, has engaged, and see wherein honesty resides and who is guilty of making dishonest allegations. Alternatively, will the Premier or his Deputy now stand up and honestly say that the Premier walked out on the debate immediately the matter was raised by the small-mindedness of the hon. member for Sherwood as an indication to this Parliament and to the electors of Queensland that he, the Premier, believes him to be making irresponsible allegations?

I fully believe, and I feel quite confident, that that is the real reason why the Premier did leave this Chamber immediately the matter was raised. I think he did it in fairness because he did not wish to hear anybody's character assassinated in his absence before the truth of the allegations was tested. In fact, he did not want to see some of his junior colleagues in the Liberal Party making absolute fools and idiots of themselves. Whilst he is to be commended for adopting that attitude, for his reaction to the cheap tactics of the hon. member for Sherwood, and for going as far as he did, that, in itself, is not good enough. There is an obligation on the leaders of this State to pursue any allegation of corruption, dishonesty, or sharp practice.

Had my leader the opportunity of entering the debate he could express himself much more effectively and efficiently than I can. I believe that, speaking on behalf of the Australian Labour Party, he would say that we do not wish to hide behind any question of privilege; we do not wish to conceal or cloak any dishonesty; we do not believe there is any dishonesty, but we welcome any investigation and we challenge the Government to make it. Let them be fair and decent enough to deny the allegation if they are not prepared to investigate it. Let us be fair to the man. As everybody knows, I have no particular personal friendship with him. I respect him as the Lord Mayor of Brisbane and as a member of the great Australian Labour Party. I certainly admire the fact that he challenged those two to go outside Parliament and say what they were prepared to say in the House. You have to admire a man who has as much guts as that. You despise the man who scurries away—I use the word again in the metaphorical sense—the man who shelters behind the privilege of Parliament to say what he is afraid to say outside. We are obliged to say things in here because we cannot all meet in George Street, or West End, or in other parts of Brisbane. But if a man says something in this Chamber that he believes it is his obligation to say, at least he should have guts enough to repeat it outside if somebody asks him to. I am always prepared to back up my statements outside. I guarantee that the hon. members for Sherwood and Greenslopes would not have the intestinal fortitude to

repeat outside what they have said in the House. I despise those weak, lily-livered loons who rush into Parliament and make grave allegations.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to be a little more explicit. If he is referring in those terms to any hon. member of the House I inform him that it is unparliamentary and disorderly, and I ask him to withdraw the remark. If he is not referring to hon. members of this House he is as liberty to use it.

Mr. BENNETT: I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I readily withdraw.

The Government have seen fit to come to the defence of men in public positions whose characters have been attacked. That has happened in the last two years—in fact, in the last 12 months. A man whose character I have never queried or whose honesty I would never doubt—

Mr. Duggan: Nor did we.

Mr. BENNETT: Nor did we. I am referring to Mr. Jack Kelly, the Chairman of the Licensing Commission. A decision that was made by the Licensing Commission was attacked in the House, and certainly attacked by me, but none of us on this side cast any reflections on the character of John Kelly. As a matter of fact, we made it perfectly obvious that we respected his personal integrity and that he was a decent man. It was the judgment that was attacked. Because the judgment was attacked the Premier and his Cabinet decided that in case there should be the remotest suggestion that the propriety of Mr. Kelly or his Commission colleagues might be impaired in the eyes of public opinion, there should be an immediate investigation. A statement was made in the House. If there was any suggestion of unjust assassination of character they were perfectly entitled to do what they did. A report was given by the Minister in charge of that department—and rightly so—clearly exonerating John Kelly and his colleagues from any suggestion of impropriety, dishonesty, or lack of integrity in their decision on the Inala hotel licence.

That is all very well, but if the Government protect certain people's characters, why do they not see that others are properly and adequately investigated? It amazes me that this matter was raised again this evening after almost a week had elapsed since it was first referred to by the hon. member for Greenslopes. Apparently no investigation has been made, and no responsible Minister has conferred with the hon. member for Greenslopes, because no Minister has taken it on his shoulders to support his submissions. Apparently the hon. member for Greenslopes has conferred only with one whose ability for intellectual understanding may be questioned, that is, the hon. member for Sherwood. He has seen fit to

take it upon himself to endorse the submissions of his colleague. This Government will be the laughing stock of Australia. Again it will be a joke so far as R. G. Menzies is concerned. To use his terms, he will say, "There are a couple of no-hoper back-benchers up there running the Government." They are pushing the Government into all this inflammatory publicity. The Government are not saying anything themselves; they accept the submissions in silence. They do nothing about investigating the allegations. Apparently they have decided, so far as political technique is concerned, that these two back-benchers can try, by manoeuvring, to engineer the winning of the election. Cabinet members are not prepared to say yea or nay, or get on the offensive.

Mr. Duggan: They want to use the back-benchers to assassinate the reputation of Labour men and escape their responsibility as Cabinet Ministers.

Mr. BENNETT: That is right.

Let us be fair in this matter. We have in the Lord Mayor a public man who is prepared to have all his affairs investigated. He cannot go to court himself as the result of anything that is said or done in Parliament. He cannot issue any legal proceedings to take the matter to the Supreme Court, or some other court, to have it properly ventilated. The only body that can initiate any proceedings to ventilate the allegations made by the two hon. members is the Cabinet and so far its members have remained silent.

If Cabinet will not act on the submissions of these two back-benchers and accept their statements as irresponsible, what course can be taken to have the matter exposed? The Lord Mayor can do nothing. He is impotent to do more than he has done in having his affairs completely disclosed to the Press. It may be ventilated by either one of these two back-benchers who made the allegations, or both of them, going outside the House and repeating them in a public place, or alternatively, they may ask that the matter be investigated. By making an accusation outside the House they will get the investigation they want. If their allegations are true and the documents they are supposed to have are truthful, they have nothing to hide. They have nothing to fear because it is always a perfect defence in defamation actions to plead truth and public benefit.

Mr. Duggan: They will have the benefit of the hon. member for Windsor to defend them, but that would be a bit of a risk.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, they would be disadvantaged before they started.

I repeat, their perfect defence would be truth and public benefit. There is no doubt that this matter would be of public importance. Therefore, in order to protect themselves from any consequences they would only have to prove that what they have said is true, and for the public benefit. It is perfectly obvious that they are not confident of being able to prove the truth of their allegations. They are men who, if they believe they have some public obligation, should be only too happy to go elsewhere to substantiate by way of truthful evidence what might be termed the accusations or the innuendoes they have raised here. I think it is rather unfortunate that these two are obviously not prepared to do so because they persist in raising the matter in the House at a time when we should be discussing unemployment and other major issues that are proving insoluble for this Government. They raise the matter knowing that it will continue to be only a talking point because the Lord Mayor, Clem Jones, cannot himself institute any legal proceedings; he cannot initiate any investigation. He has issued an invitation to the Government. So there are only two ways of having the matter clearly brought to a fair and final conclusion. They are: (1) for this lack-lustre Government to conduct a proper investigation; or, alternatively, (2) for the two people who rushed into the Chamber as a coward's castle to make these allegations to have the intestinal fortitude to say outside the Chamber what they have said here—and I can assure the Government and those two gentlemen that they will quickly get proceedings that will result in a proper, fair, and impartial investigation by the Supreme Court.

Motion—That the Address in Reply be adopted (Mr. Lonergan)—agreed to.

SUPPLY

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

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

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty."

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

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

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty."

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 8.58 p.m.