

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 23 OCTOBER 1962

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 23 OCTOBER, 1962

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

QUESTIONS

CONVEYANCING FEES, PUBLIC CURATOR

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin), for Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South), asked the Minister for Justice—

“Are fees for conveyancing as performed by the Public Curator fixed by law or are they charged in conformity with other legal men doing the same work?”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

“The fees for conveyancing work carried out by the Public Curator are fixed by him by virtue of the authority given to him by Regulation 43 made in pursuance of the provisions of the Public Curator Acts, 1915 to 1957. In fixing such fees the Public Curator bears in mind a number of factors, the principal of which are the nature of the transaction, and the recognised principles generally accepted by the Court as forming a basis for the amount of costs to be charged. Solicitors and conveyancers in private practice, in charging fees for conveyancing work, as a general rule, act upon a scale of fees suggested by the Queensland Law Society Incorporated as being fair and reasonable remuneration for the work to be performed.”

STATE-WIDE HOLIDAY ON NEW YEAR'S EVE

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) asked the Minister for Labour and Industry—

“As State Cabinet has decided to grant Monday, December 31, 1962, as a holiday under the Holidays Acts in the southern division of the State, will he and his Government take the required action to have this day made a paid holiday for all employees throughout the whole State? If not, why not?”

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

“Holidays which are paid holidays for all employees are specifically set out in legislation in Section 14 (3) of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1961 and December 31 is not included. The holidays set out in this section are exactly the same as those provided for in the previous Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts which operated during many years of Labour Governments. The decision to grant a public holiday under the Holidays Acts for December 31, 1962, and which will be applicable only to the Public Service,

banks and insurance offices, provides that shops and the relevant unions must mutually agree in the first place to close their shops on that day. The decision reached in regard to December 31, 1962, is exactly the same as the decision made by the previous Labour Government in regard to December 31, 1956, when a similar position existed.”

PROSECUTIONS UNDER STATE TRANSPORT ACT

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) asked the Minister for Transport—

“(1) How many prosecutions have been initiated for breaches of the State Transport Act?”

“(2) In how many of these cases has the driver of the vehicle been prosecuted as distinct from the owner of the vehicle?”

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

“(1) Three hundred and thirty-eight.”

“(2) Twenty-two. I would point out that action is taken against drivers only when the owners of the vehicles avoid their responsibilities by claiming that the drivers concerned have not carried out the owner's instructions or directions or where the driver carries passengers or goods without the knowledge or consent of the owner. Eleven of the cases included in the twenty-two stated are against drivers of one particular pseudo interstate passenger operator.”

RECEIPTS FROM FINES FOR MINOR TRAFFIC OFFENCES

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

“(1) How much money has been paid in fines for minor traffic offences during the last twelve months?”

“(2) What is the average daily amount received?”

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

“(1 and 2) The answer to question of the Honourable Member in regard to the period October 1, 1961, to September 30, 1962, is as follows:—(1), £35,112; (2), £150.”

PAPERS

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

Report of the Commissioner of Police for the year 1961-1962.

Report of the Minister for Education and Migration for the year 1961.

Report of the Queensland Health Education Council for the year 1961-1962.

Report of the Health and Medical Services of the State of Queensland for the year 1961-1962.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under the Companies Act of 1961.

Ordinance under the City of Brisbane Acts, 1924 to 1960.

REPORT ON PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY

Mr. **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report of the Parliamentary Librarian on the activities of the Parliamentary Library for the year 1961-1962.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT— RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 18 October (see p. 901) on Mr. Hiley's motion—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1962-1963, a sum not exceeding £1,594 to defray the salary of Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor."

Mr. **MELLOY** (Nudgee) (11.12 a.m.): I propose to deal with the Budget in general, and, in particular, with other matters that concern the people of Queensland. It has been said that this is an election Budget designed to curry favour with the electors of the State but, after all, will not there be pictured in the minds of the public a parade of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, the Racing and Betting Act, the Liquor Act, and the Transport Act? No amount of talking will impress the people of the State and convince them that this has not been one of the greatest amateur Governments we have had in Queensland, and they will demonstrate their reaction at the State election next year.

The Financial Statement shows that there was a surplus of £109,000 last year, but how was this surplus achieved? It was not achieved by good planning; it was not achieved by good government, and it was not the result of the much-boasted industrial development of the State. How, then, was it achieved? It was achieved with the assistance of a very frightened Federal Government, which certainly received a shock at the last Federal elections.

Mr. **Sullivan**: Don't you like to see us getting the extra grants?

Mr. **MELLOY**: Yes, of course, but the members of this Government are trying to take credit for it instead of viewing the

matter in the correct perspective and regarding it as an attempt by the Federal Government to regain favour in Queensland. In the last 12 months the Federal Government increased the grant to Queensland by over £1,000,000, it gave a further housing allocation of £900,000, and it made a special unemployment relief grant of £3,340,000. The State's estimated deficit for 1961-1962, was £643,574, but had it not been for the Federal Government's special handouts, amounting to £5,240,000, under pressure of voting at the election, the deficit in Queensland would have exceeded £5,000,000. This Government had the chestnuts pulled out of the fire for it by the Federal Government purely as a result of the Queensland voting in the 1961 Federal election.

Following this year's operations, we have, with the addition of £21,000,000-odd, the staggering figure of £363,820,873 of public debt in Queensland. The Government can thank the rap over the knuckles given by the people of Queensland to Mr. Menzies at the Federal election for the satisfactory position that Queensland is now in.

I wish now to refer to the infamous speech made in this Chamber last week by the hon. member for Sherwood. Public reaction to it can best be gauged by this paragraph which appeared in the "Topic" column of the "Telegraph" on Friday, 19 October—

"Smear technique

"There will be many fair-minded people to agree that the smelly technique of the smear is being practised too widely in Australian Parliaments—Federal and State.

"The rules of privilege allow politicians to say anything they like about anyone while they are in session. It matters not how inaccurate, false, spiteful or slanderous the accusation may be, the victim has no legal remedy whatever.

"Often, decent citizens are subjected to this grimy treatment, but there is nothing they can do about it, and almost invariably invitations to repeat outside Parliament what has been said under the protective cloak of privilege meet with faint-hearted refusal."

That applies to the hon. member for Sherwood.

The paragraph continues—

"Parliamentary authorities should examine the prospect of giving greater protection—or at least some means of redress—for the victims of unsubstantiated generalities or irresponsible charges."

That has been the reaction in the Press to his speech. I am not usually given to speaking in this vein, but I consider that the hon. member's speech was particularly disgraceful and rotten. The hon. member, for Sherwood, who apparently was held previously in some regard by his party, has attempted, by inference

and innuendo, to cast smears on the political reputations of every hon. member on this side of the Chamber. All members of my party have been subjected to the greatest degree of provocation by his speech. Here we have a man from whom we could reasonably expect to hear at least some semblance of a constructive speech, particularly in view of the approaching election and the fact that he represented this State overseas at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference. However, we now find him descending into the gutter and wallowing in the waste of filthy smear tactics. I do not know whether I should say this, but I feel constrained to remark that he has placed himself in the same category as the hon. member for Townsville South. The public has little time for men whose standards are so low. I should say that he has strained the fellowship and friendship of even his own parliamentary colleagues and done a great disservice to his party. If his speech reflects the views and attitude of his party and of the Government, as I suppose it does to some degree, and if this is the election line that is to be followed by the coalition parties in the next State election, the result of the election is a foregone conclusion. The people of Queensland demonstrated in no uncertain way at the last Federal election that they expect more than filthy smears and disgusting speeches from their parliamentary representatives, and I have no doubt that the filthy, smearing speech delivered by the hon. member for Sherwood will lose many supporters for him and for his party.

Mr. Armstrong: Why are you so worried about it, then?

Mr. Melloy: We are bringing to the notice of the public our views on a speech of that type made in this Chamber. It was absolutely disgusting, and I think that our condemnation of it bears repeating as often as any hon. member on this side of the Chamber gets to his feet in this Assembly.

As I said earlier, I do not usually make speeches of this type, but I believe that members of the Opposition have been provoked by the speech of the hon. member for Sherwood. Not only will it lose him the support of many members of his own party, but it will also lose him the support of every decent-thinking person in his electorate. By all means let us fight our political battles hard and use our full powers of rhetoric in political debate; but let us also fight cleanly and honourably, as we on the Opposition benches are always prepared to fight, and, indeed, as we always do. The hon. member for Sherwood has not done that. I do not want to go on at any great length in this strain, but I have expressed my opinion, which is a sincere opinion. The hon. member for Sherwood has exposed himself in all his weakness as a political entity, as a politician, and as a

representative of the people in this Assembly. He has shown himself to be cowardly by getting to the public what he has in mind under the cloak of parliamentary privilege. I should say that he has grossly prostituted parliamentary privilege in the Chamber and shown himself to be nothing more than a political pervert.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member that every member in this Committee is described as "honourable." Consequently, a reference such as a "political pervert" is offensive to the Committee and to all hon. members. I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark.

Mr. Melloy: May I explain that term? I have checked it in the dictionary.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will withdraw the remark, at the request of the Chair.

Mr. Melloy: At your request, Mr. Taylor, I do withdraw the final statement that I made. I now wish to deal with a—

Mr. Herbert interjected.

Mr. Duggan: Fancy you, of all people, saying that. You said it would close your mouth.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member for Nudge please begin the sentence again? I did not hear anything.

Mr. Melloy: I now wish to deal with a very serious current problem facing the State, namely the problem of traffic control and the prevention of road fatalities. We have had a number of cure-alls for this menace, which is cutting short many young lives and maiming thousands of people in this State. On 4 April, 1961, Hon. K. J. Morris, Minister for Labour and Industry, commenting on the absence of road fatalities over the previous week-end, stated in the "Telegraph" that he attributed this to the Press publicity on road safety, better road courtesy, and the recognition of the need for greater care on the part of motorists using the roads in this State. On the other hand, Police Inspector Risch said that the improved position at the week-end was a direct result of intensified police patrols.

I am inclined to agree, to some extent, with both of those viewpoints. The position as it exists at present seems to deny Mr. Morris's contention because, despite continued Press publicity, fatalities have reached their highest level and the only restraining factor has been the presence of police patrols on the roads. My opinion is that we need an extension of both methods of prevention.

Some four or five years ago the Road Safety Council mooted a scheme for the establishment of an off-the-road centre for testing cars and training drivers, with a provision that when trainees passed their tests they would be allowed to apply for drivers'

licences. I consider that this scheme would be rather unwieldy, but I do think that road education should be a compulsory subject in primary schools with a provision for driver education at secondary-school level. Young people must have impressed upon their minds the need for full knowledge of vehicle control in prevailing road conditions, the dangers of speed, driver reactions in emergencies, a thorough knowledge of traffic regulations and road signs, and a sense of responsibility to other drivers and to the community.

In dealing with the problem we have to remember that those factors mean absolutely nothing to the careless driver, the "lair," and the drunken driver. The only factor that these menaces of the road will react or respond to is a uniformed police patrol officer. The drunken driver, of course, does not react to anybody or anything. He cannot be dealt with by education or Press publicity, and probably would not even see a police patrol officer if one was on the road. This menace has to be dealt with by other means.

No convicted drunken driver should be dealt with by only a gaol sentence or a fine; he should be removed completely from the road. His licence should be cancelled for 12 months as a minimum penalty.

Under the Californian traffic code a person convicted of driving a car whilst under the influence of alcoholic liquor and causing bodily injury to some person other than himself is liable to maximum gaoling for five years, with a minimum of 90 days and maximum and minimum fines of 5,000 dollars and 250 dollars respectively. In addition, his driving licence can be suspended for a maximum period of six months, and in certain circumstances licences can be suspended for a year, and, on a second offence, may be permanently revoked.

Under the road regulations police patrols have little bearing on the problem of drunken drivers; they must be dealt with before they even put a foot into a car. That is where this Government must hang its head in shame. It is a distressing sight to see the hon. member for Wavell shedding crocodile tears over the problem of drunken drivers when his Government, by its introduction of the Liquor Acts Amendment Act last year, made a major contribution to it in the provision of increased facilities for the consumption of alcohol. That Bill was supported and condoned by the hon. member for Wavell. The Government has sold the lives of many Queensland pedestrians down the line to rake in further revenue in an endeavour to get itself out of the financial mire in which it found itself.

The only sensible course open to the Government in the present serious traffic situation is to build up the Police Force to a strength that will enable it to carry out the duties that have been assigned to it. In an article in "The Courier-Mail" of

9 October, 1962, Mr. M. Callaghan, Queensland Police Union Secretary, is reported as follows:—

"Queensland Police Union Secretary (Mr. M. Callaghan) said last night that the State Police Force had a crying need for 220 more policemen 'as a matter of urgency'.

"We are short in all sections of the Police Department, but split 220 men between the Criminal Investigation and the Traffic Branches and you will reduce crime—juvenile crime particularly—and the shocking road toll,' he said.

"Police Union Secretary Mr. Callaghan promised Queensland yesterday: 'Give us more policemen and we will cut down the road death toll'.

"Mr. Callaghan said traffic police should be doubled in Brisbane, and trebled in the country.

"We are not concerned with increased convictions for traffic offences, but we are concerned with the truth that if a motorist sees a policeman often enough he will be wary of traffic offences that could cost him, or someone else, their lives'."

The following article appeared in "The Courier-Mail" the next day:—

"The Police Traffic Branch has been left behind numerically by the increase in traffic density in Queensland over the last few years. Of the metropolitan traffic police between 40 and 45 are men assigned to road patrols. The remainder are on street and other duties. With reductions by men on leave, on days off, and sick, the 'work-force' of patrolmen averages about 25 a day. These are divided into two shifts—resulting in about 12 patrolmen on duty at any given time throughout the metropolitan area."

That article will demonstrate to the Committee the dire need for an increase not only in the whole Police Force, but in particular in the number of members engaged on traffic control as well. When I refer to the duties assigned to the Police Force I include all the extraneous duties that police officers are now called upon to perform, such as checking electoral rolls, evicting house tenants, acting as inquiry agents for the Taxation Department, and many other fiddling matters that are not included in the basic duties and responsibilities of the Police Force. At least 250 men must be added to the strength of the force to enable it to carry out its required duties.

At the present time road patrols are able to spend only a little more than half of their eight-hour shifts on actual traffic control. They are saddled with other investigation duties which take up most of their time. The number of patrols on actual traffic-control work is entirely inadequate. The deliberate traffic-law violator outside the city limits knows this. He knows that having passed a patrol vehicle he is safe for another

30 or 40 miles, and thereafter makes his own decision as to how he will drive. The Minister in charge of police has emphasised that it would be impossible to cover every road with patrols. He said that thousands of policemen controlling the roads could not have prevented accidents on remote stretches. Perhaps that is true. If thousands of men could not have had that effect, 50 men could have had a marked effect on the traffic situation throughout the State.

It has been said by the Minister that there have been calls for firmer action by the police on traffic. I do not think that is necessary. I do not think we need firmer action by police patrols. We need more action. We will achieve nothing by policemen wasting much of their time in issuing summonses if they have not enough strength to control the traffic.

Mr. Lloyd: They should be a deterrent.

Mr. MELLOY: That is so. If there were sufficient police they would be a deterrent to the hit-and-run drivers and those who have absolutely no regard for the traffic laws of the State.

I should now like to refer to the reduction of the speed limit in built-up areas from 40 miles an hour to 35 miles an hour. I do not think that that reduction will have any effect on traffic problems. The motorist who abides by the law drives just as safely at 40 miles an hour as at 35 miles an hour. It matters nothing to the reckless speedster who violates the law whether the limit in built-up areas is 35 or 40 miles an hour. Whatever the speed limit, he has an utter disregard for it. He drives at 50 miles an hour, whatever it is.

The former Deputy Premier, Hon. K. J. Morris, is reported in "The Courier-Mail" of Tuesday, 19 June, as saying that he would regret a limit of 35 miles an hour in built-up areas but he would not oppose uniformity throughout Australia. The article says—

"Mr. Morris said he believed that 40 miles an hour was the speed most suited to Queensland, but he would not stand in the way of uniformity."

On this occasion I agree with the Minister. I think he was correct, but I believe he was prevailed upon to introduce the reduced speed limit in this State. I believe he was right when he said that 40 miles an hour was an adequate limit for Queensland.

It is my firm belief that increased road patrols are the only solution to our traffic problem. This opinion is held also by the manager of the R.A.C.Q., Mr. King, who was reported recently as follows:—

"The R.A.C.Q. believed increased traffic police patrols would be a telling deterrent to reckless use of the roads, the general manager, Mr. L. King, said today.

"Mr. King said the Club believed increased patrols would remarkably reduce accidents.

"The R.A.C.Q. has been pressing for more police patrols for years," Mr. King said."

I sincerely hope that the Government will be guided by the reaction of the public on our traffic problems. The public is almost unanimous in its opinion that increased road patrols are the answer to them.

Before concluding, I should like to make brief reference to the traffic situation in my own electorate. In Nudgee there are two main highways, namely, Sandgate Road, from Virginia to Sandgate, and Toombul Road, from Nudgee to Virginia. Both these roads carry a great volume of traffic and I am particularly concerned because on them we have State schools and the pupils are in constant danger of road accidents at the entrances to the schools. Over 300 children in each school cross the road to reach school.

We are having half-a-mile or so of four-lane highway constructed at Virginia and I think it is essential to have a four-lane highway even from Nundah, but certainly from Virginia, to Sandgate to clear the traffic from the city in the evening. It comes by way of Sandgate Road and Toombul Road and converges in the vicinity of the Virginia overbridge. It is a problem that we in the area are greatly concerned about. In the mornings, when the children are going to school, the traffic on Sandgate Road is tremendous; there is a flow of about 1,200 vehicles an hour. The children of the area have to contend with that and I hope the Government is fully aware of it. I have approached the Minister for the installation of pedestrian-actuated lights, such as those he intends to install in the city, at Toombul Road and Sandgate Road in the vicinity of the Boondall State School, and I hope he will give special consideration to the area in the allocation of those lights.

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (11.42 a.m.): May I begin by quoting the first paragraph of the summary of the Treasurer's Financial Statement? In it he said—

"Under every heading, by every possible test, it is a record Budget. It predicts record revenue. It proposes record expenditure. It contains more concessions and benefits to the taxpayers of this State than any Budget in the post-war period."

I have deliberately quoted that paragraph to remind the Committee of those words because, from the words of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Baroona, there has been an attempt to belittle the Treasurer's Budget speech by describing it as a "vote-catching" Budget.

Mr. Davies: There is no need to belittle it; it speaks for itself.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Now we are joined by the hon. member for Maryborough, who puts himself on side.

Let me say at the outset that the admission that this is a vote-catching Budget is also an admission by the A.L.P. that it is a Budget that they fear. The Treasurer has produced a Budget of such considerable merit that the Opposition and the people of Queensland are prepared to accept it as one that will attract votes. If the hon. member for Kedron is correct, his colleagues who criticise the Treasurer and his Budget must obviously be wrong. They cannot have it both ways. Either it is a good Budget or it is a bad Budget; it cannot be both. Of course, throughout the five years that this Government has been in office, the members of the Opposition have been prophets of gloom. In fact, the only public works job they have ever supported has been a wailing wall, and that, unfortunately for them, is about the only public works job that has not yet been completed.

Hon. members of the Opposition, feasting and waxing fat on misery, unemployment, and distress, not unnaturally have been waiting and hoping for the Treasurer to produce a Budget of despair, so that they could rub their hands in glee and, to borrow a phrase from the hon. member for Townsville South, pour their unctious words of "snivelling hypocrisy" over the unfortunate and distressed.

But what has happened? In the first place, to use the words of the Treasurer, the Budget points to the year ahead as one of real stimulation in the economy and the level of employment. With the indulgence of the Committee, I quote from the actual words of the Treasurer at page 26 of his Budget speech—

"The carefully prepared plans are now bearing fruit. Oil, bauxite, coal, grain, meat and metals—these are the foundations of a real expansion in the economy of the State which will make the next few years a period of decentralised growth, unparalleled in recent history."

The Treasurer's speech was the culmination of five years' unprecedented development in the State sphere. There has been unprecedented development in the field of education, which will be continued in 1962-1963 by a further heavy school-construction programme that will bring the number of high schools to 73 and high-tops to 56, catering for some 40,600 pupils. These are increases of 37 high schools and 22 high-tops, to cater for an increase of 26,300 pupils, compared with the position when we took over responsibility from the disrupted and broken Australian Labour Party.

Mr. Tucker: Do you reckon you can read the Budget better than the Treasurer can?

Mr. RAMSDEN: In answer to that interjection, I do not say that I can read it better than the Treasurer can, but I am hopeful that by constant repetition it will sink in, whereas casual words may be overlooked.

Not only has there been unprecedented development in that field, but in addition the allocation for tertiary education at the University is at its highest level ever.

The Treasurer's speech is the culmination of five years' work in the field of mental and physical health, which is another development to be continued with the construction of new hospitals at Tara, Taroom, and Point Vernon, as well as new buildings and additions in almost every hospitals-board area of the State. This includes a new diagnostic X-ray block and radium treatment unit, as well as a new outpatients' block, operating theatre, and administration block, at Bundaberg.

I might say again that the Treasurer's speech is the culmination of five years' striving, in spite of deficit Budgets in the past, to grant relief in State taxation. Since the Country Party-Liberal Government came to office, it has progressively reduced land tax and other State taxes, and this latest Budget provides further concessions in land tax and a new principle of exemption for dwelling areas up to 48 perches. This amendment, of course, will give relief to home-owners dwelling in their own homes who have been caught up with the consequences of inflationary land sales caused by steep valuation rises. In addition, provision is made for additional concessions in stamp and succession duties, as well as improved workers' compensation benefits.

For the record, let me compare this Budget with the one presented by the Labour Government in New South Wales. I have here a photostat of an extract from the "Telegraph" of 26 September, 1962, the day before our Budget was introduced. The headlines are "'Tough' New South Wales Budget will hit many people." The report goes on to say that additional revenue will come from increased taxes on poker machines, higher car-licence fees, and higher stamp and gift duties. The poker-machine tax will be doubled, and it is pointed out that last year the tax on these machines was £1,700,000. Licence fees of £1 on cars and 15s. on motor cycles will be doubled, there will be a tax on speed-boats, and increases in rail fares and freights are certain. Examine that Budget under a Labour administration in New South Wales and ask whether or not the Budget that the Treasurer has produced is deficient.

Mr. Windsor: £5,500,000 extra taxation down there.

Mr. RAMSDEN: That is quite correct.

Again, the Treasurer's speech is a culmination of five years' planning for construction of roads. The road programme under the 1962-1963 Budget will continue with a record expenditure on beef roads and a commencement of sealing of those roads. But in addition, apart from beef roads, the Department of Main Roads will carry out in this financial year the greatest road-building programme in the history of Queensland.

Again, long-range planning is now ready, under the new Budget, to commence the great swelling tide of development in this State. To cite a few of the elements that are combining to make that swelling tide, let me point to the beginning of the brigalow-lands scheme; the commencement of the improved coal-handling facilities at Gladstone; the commencement of construction of power stations at Swanbank and Callide; the construction work on the Borumba and Leslie Dams; the completion of the reclamation of the Bulwer Island refinery site; the commencement of an oil pipeline from Moonie to Brisbane, and so on.

One could continue for some time dealing in detail with the great tide of development that has at last begun to cover this great State of Queensland, a rising tide which, I might say, has begun because of the great pull being influenced by the exertions in the right direction of this Country Party-Liberal Government, a pull not felt in Queensland for the last 40 years.

Now let me turn my attention to some particular facets of my Government's activities in these matters. Let me speak of my Government's action to help the less fortunate members of the community.

I should like to explore for a few moments some of the avenues by which the Minister for Health and Home Affairs and his department assist in promoting the welfare of handicapped and other less fortunate children. Most hon. members are probably aware of the Queensland Sub-Normal Children's Welfare Association, which has its headquarters at Bowen Hills in the electorate of Merthyr; but probably few have much conception either of the wide ramifications of this very worthy organisation or of the extent to which it is assisted in its work by subsidies and grants from the State Government. The fact is that, in recognition of the special nature of the work of the association in providing a programme of training for sub-normal children in various centres throughout the State, the Government provides substantial assistance to enable the association to maintain and extend its services, and this assistance has increased markedly during this Government's term of office.

I well remember the Sub-normal Children's Association when it was nothing but an idea in the minds of one or two mothers who had these afflicted children. I can well remember when the organisation started on the back veranda, or the front veranda, of Mrs. Pribbernow's home at Kangaroo Point. I can well remember, too, besieging the then Labour Government of the day as early as 1951 to come to the aid of these sub-normal children when I was with the Services Canteens Trust Fund, and I remember the inertia that the Labour Government of the day displayed in dealing with these requests. However, the position has now changed. Financial assistance is made firstly by way of a £1-for-£1

subsidy on moneys raised by the Association in the form of subscriptions and donations to a maximum of £50,000 in any one financial year. A point well worth making in this context is that the amount of subsidy provided by the Government under this heading increased from £14,388 in 1957-1958 to £39,000 last year and no less than £50,000 has been included in the Department's Estimates for 1962-1963 for this purpose. The total expenditure by the present Government by way of subsidy since the financial year 1957-1958, when we became the Government, on subscriptions and donations alone to the Queensland Sub-Normal Children's Welfare Association has amounted to £127,973.

For some time and on a number of occasions I have pleaded in this Chamber the cause for an increase in subsidy to meet the cost of salaries of qualified teachers employed by the association. Prior to this Government's accession to office no subsidy was paid in respect of teachers' salaries. As a result, realising the need to encourage the association to maintain a staff of teachers who were qualified to train sub-normal children, our enlightened Minister for Health and Home Affairs, Dr. Noble, recommended to Cabinet a scheme by which the association now receives a subsidy based on a payment of £650 per annum for each qualified female teacher or £900 per annum for each qualified male teacher who has charge of a class of about 12 children. This subsidy was first approved by Cabinet for the financial year 1958-1959, since when expenditure under this heading alone has totalled £49,875. The estimated subsidy for the current financial year is in the vicinity of £22,000. As well as the subsidy paid to the association on subscriptions raised and in respect of teachers' salaries, the Government provides special grants to meet the cost of extensions to buildings or the purchase of new buildings in order to extend the services of the association in established centres. The association has adopted a policy of financing from its own resources the initial expenditure involved in providing premises for the establishment of new centres, but it employs the Government grant when additional accommodation becomes necessary in any particular set-up. Grants by the Government to the association under this heading since the financial year 1957-1958 have totalled £55,940.

The establishment of new centres or the extension of existing centres means that additional furniture and equipment are required and the cost of these items is met in full by the Government. Wherever possible, furniture and equipment is supplied by the Department of Public Works or purchased through the State Stores Board. Since we took office, expenditure by the Government on furniture and equipment for the Sub-Normal Children's Welfare Association has reached a total of £13,094.

Since we took over the reins of Government, the total assistance granted by the Government to the association for the purposes to which I have referred now stands at £246,882.

Encouraged by the Government in the way I have pointed out, the association is now establishing branches in Townsville, Rockhampton, Toowoomba, Ipswich, Bundaberg, Southport, and Mackay. It is expected that new branches will be opened at Cairns and Ayr early next year, and the establishment of branches at Mt. Isa and Maryborough is under consideration.

The buildings of the association are valued at approximately £250,000. The association's phenomenal growth in recent years has been due mainly to the wise counsel and administrative ability of its president, Sir Fred Schonell. In developing the association, Sir Fred has brought to bear his considerable knowledge of the psychology of sub-normal children, his world-wide experience in teaching and training methods, and his capacity for applying his knowledge for the benefit of these handicapped young people. Schonell House, a combined youth centre and parent-child guidance centre, towards the establishment of which the Government has already contributed £4,630, is one of the most modern centres of its type in the Commonwealth. The Minister for Health and Home Affairs can well be proud of the contribution he has made towards the work of the Queensland Sub-Normal Children's Welfare Association, which is undoubtedly one of the outstanding social movements in Queensland in the last decade.

Let us look at another facet, namely, the encouragement being given at the Queensland Industrial Institution for the Blind to people afflicted with blindness. Blind people as well as sighted people, feel the need for a routine of regular employment and the companionship of fellow-workers, without which time would lie very heavily on their hands. Recognising this need, the Government maintains in Brisbane an industrial workshop for the employable blind of Queensland, where work is provided for 98 men and women in the manufacture of brushes, brooms, feather-dusters, coir-mats and matting, baskets, cane furniture, mattresses, and pillows. The quality of workmanship performed by the blind employees is such that despite competition from imported mats, matting and baskets manufactured in Asia, it has not been necessary for the institution to curtail its production in these departments. It will be readily appreciated, however, that such an institution could not be expected to compete on a profit-making basis with outside industrial production, nor is it the intention of this Government that it should attempt to do so.

Mr. Walsh: Which Government are you referring to now?

Mr. RAMSDEN: When I said "this Government" I thought it would be patent to the hon. member for Bundaberg—

Mr. Walsh: You were referring to the Government a while ago as "my Government". Which Government are you referring to? I didn't know you were the Leader of a Government.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am sorry that the hon. member for Bundaberg has suddenly become so much of a purist in English usage.

Thus it is that from a provision of £15,444 for salaries and £74,002 for maintenance of the institution in 1957, the fees grew to £20,664 for salaries and £90,375 for maintenance in 1961-1962. Provision for the current financial year under the same headings is £21,555 for wages and £99,360 for maintenance.

I am sure that all hon. members will applaud the action of the Government in arranging for shark-meshing nets required by the Department of Harbours and Marine to be made by the workers at the Industrial Institution for the Blind. With a production target of 72,000 feet of net for meshing operations to commence on 1 November, work on this project began at the institution on 22 August. As may have been expected, at the beginning of operations the average production per employee was less than 8 feet of net per hour. But with familiarity in the operation the hourly average production has increased to a little over 14 feet. Some workers are capable of producing a higher figure by their own individual efforts. At the start of the job the overall daily production of netting was 755 feet, but that figure has since grown to more than 1,800 feet. The management and the employees of the institution are justifiably proud of the results accomplished in this operation, and they deserve the congratulations of every hon. member of the Committee. When experimental nets were made at the institution some months ago, the work was restricted in the first place to partially-sighted employees. However, with the placing of the order for 72,000 feet a programme of training was embarked upon under which six totally-blind men and five other men who could barely distinguish dark from light were trained in the work of making the nets. The total number of employees of the institution trained in this type of work is now 18 men and one girl, who are engaged on the meshing net, while four girls and one man are responsible for the winding of the bobbins for the use of the productive workers. After the initial target of 72,000 feet of meshing net has been reached, production of the initial large order will cease but the institution will continue to make replacement nets as and when required by the Department of Harbours and Marine.

Let me now turn to a facet of Queensland development that is often overlooked by the public, because as an industry its full effects are so spread through the community that

it is almost impossible to measure its full economic value in cold pounds, shillings, and pence. I refer to the tourist industry. If ever there has been a new birth for a department since the advent of the Nicklin-Morris Government, it can be seen in the resurrection of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau. In 1955-1956 the total expenditure on the Tourist Bureau for salaries, incidentals and miscellaneous, and publicity, was £156,999. For the year 1956-1957 the total cost was £161,161. During this Government's regime the finance allocated to it has been progressively increased in order to permit the Bureau to carry out its functions, until in 1961-1962 the total allocation has risen to £297,726.

Let us look at the picture. We have been prone in the past to talk about Queensland's potential and for some 30 or 40 years past Labour Governments of tired inertia have slowly advanced by here a step and there a step, but have done nothing to develop that great so-often discussed potential. Much of this potential could not be capitalised on until a good deal of careful premeditated planning had taken place. Ever since our assumption to office as a Joint Country Party-Liberal Government we have laid these plans step by step until now, after five years of office, a great era has begun and the potential is even now beginning to emerge with power into development. However, there is one asset this State has which, in fact, is ready to be developed within a few short years without awaiting the primary development of heavy industry. It is an asset, a natural asset, in which we are possibly the richest State of any country in the world. I refer to our natural asset and potential as a tourist State. We in Queensland are blessed by Divine Providence with the natural assets, beauty, and diversity of scenery that make us the premier tourist State of the Commonwealth. The Hon. K. J. Morris, Minister for Labour and Industry, has always believed this. I believe that Queensland must tell the Commonwealth, New Zealand, and the rest of the British Commonwealth that we will open our arms with a special welcome to all tourists from any place, whether they be from just over the border, from the most distant point in this vast continent, or from overseas.

We have in Queensland, a State extending for well over 1,000 miles from south to north, a showcase that we can reveal with pride to the sightseer. We have the rain forests of the tropics, the sheer beauty and wonder of the Barrier Reef—unique in this world—the sun-kissed mountains of the Great Dividing Range, the windswept plains of the West, the sweeping beaches of endless white sand and dancing surf of our near North and South Coasts, a paradise for surfers. We have all these natural assets waiting to be shown to the tourist and sightseer.

What did Labour do about trying to sell this, our most salable commodity, Queensland? Here again is the story of Labour's

lethargy and disinterest. In 1957, when we became the Government, 134 people made up the complete staff of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau. Not only in this State but also in all the branches everywhere the staff was totally inadequate to allow the Bureau to carry out the full responsibilities it should rightfully assume. Such was the position not only in the various branches but more particularly in the field of administration. In Labour's day—or rather, shall I say, in the long dark night of Labour's administration—the administration of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau at senior level consisted of a director only. There was no-one to direct publicity, of which there was only £8,000 worth for the Bureau to publicise the State throughout the whole world! No-one to try to sell this wonderful commodity to the people we look to for international understanding and friendship, no organiser of special tours—none of these things or officers, for to Labour, tourism was to Queensland what Queensland was to the rest of Australia for so many years—a Cinderella section. We had assets, to be sure, but we in Queensland were not going to worry about trying to sell them or to show them off. Of course, if by some queer chance people from other States or overseas of their own volition came to Queensland, that was all right by us, but why should we worry about them really?

When we became the Government, the Minister in charge of the tourist industry, Hon. K. J. Morris, saw that, if the Bureau was to take full advantage of the opportunities presented for the growth and development of this weak little Cinderella into a mighty tourist industry, the organisation would have to go through a metamorphosis. So, instead of a lone director, hampered and restricted by insufficient staff, this Government appointed in due course, and as the task increased, a director-general, a director of publicity, a sales-promotion officer, a secretary to the director-general, and, in a part-time capacity, a director of special tours. The staff, which comprised a total of 134 in 1955-1956, has been increased by 37, an increase of 27 per cent.

In order to push this, our most readily available, recurring, non-expendable, and salable commodity to the full, and to make people want to buy it, from spending a mere £8,000 on publicity in 1955-1956 we allocated £35,000 for publicity in 1961-1962.

Not only have we increased our staff but also, in parallel, we have increased our activities and services. In 1957 the only presentable tourist offices we had were in Sydney, Brisbane, Toowoomba, and Cairns. There were inadequate, unsuitable, or sub-standard premises at Adelaide, Melbourne, Coolangatta, Rockhampton, Mackay, and Townsville.

Now look at the picture. In Melbourne a completely new office has been secured, allowing us to increase our staff to provide a proper service for the public. In Adelaide negotiations have been in hand for the taking of a lease of new premises and it is expected that, if Cabinet approves of an Order in Council empowering the Public Curator to enter into a lease, an office of which we can justly be proud will be set up in Adelaide. At Coolangatta an excellent new office has been provided. At Surfers' Paradise renovation work has been done for a new office, and a centre was completed only a few weeks ago. At Rockhampton a new office has been provided. In Townsville the bureau was transferred last year to the State Government Insurance Office building. In Mackay negotiations have been proceeding for the erection of a new office. All plans and estimates of cost have been completed and provision is being made for the necessary expenditure in the Public Works programme for 1962-1963.

What business is the Bureau handling in terms of cold pounds, shillings, and pence? In 1957, branch-office collections of the Tourist Bureau totalled £1,302,408. In the year ended 30 June, 1962, those collections increased by approximately £500,000 to £1,892,958, or an increase of 45.34 per cent. In August 1962 the collections of the Tourist Bureau exceeded by £26,000 those for the previous corresponding month. A considerable increase can be expected in 1962-1963.

There have been other developments since 1957 in agency representation. In 1957 there were only 24 travel agents representing Queensland. At present we are represented in Australia by 142, and we have 120 in New Zealand. In addition, we have established contacts with over 100 travel agencies in other countries of the world that are showing an increase in interest in the tourist attractions of this State. No other State Government Tourist Bureau has such agency representation.

To my knowledge, ours is the only State Government Tourist Bureau that produces a travel manual for use by agencies within Australia, and it is certainly the only one producing one for use by New Zealand agents.

In 1957 our sales promotion efforts to encourage tourist traffic from other States and other parts of the world were weak. In fact, they were almost non-existent. During the term of the present Government, a sales promotion officer has been appointed to be attached to the immediate staff of the Director-General. Earlier, in 1960, a senior officer of the Bureau was sent to North America on a fact-finding mission to determine the needs of the agents in that country, and to report on the best means of attracting traffic from the United States. Subsequent to his appointment, the sales promotion officer travelled throughout Australia making personal contact with our appointed agents.

He also undertook overseas tours which embraced the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, the Far East, and New Zealand. No similar action was taken prior to 1957.

Perhaps the most outstanding change that has occurred since 1957 is in the field of publicity. In the year 1955-1956, the total allocation for publicity was £8,000. This was increased till, in 1961-1962, the figure was £35,000, almost five times the amount provided when this Government took office. This larger Vote has enabled the Bureau to produce a better standard of literature, window displays in other States, and posters, which sell Queensland in the other States as well as overseas.

Probably one of the most important items in tourist promotion has been the production of films. Prior to 1957, the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau had never produced a 35 m.m. film. In 1959, our first 35 m.m. film, "The Sunshine State", produced for us by Cinesound Productions Pty. Limited, was released on the Australian commercial theatre circuits. It was released similarly in New Zealand in the same year. It has been screened in the United Kingdom, South Africa, and a number of continental countries, and it is still on the commercial circuits in Australia and New Zealand. It has been stated that "The Sunshine State" was our most productive effort ever in the publicity field. Our new film in 35 m.m., "Isles of the Sun", is about to be released on the Queensland commercial circuits. Apart from the 35 m.m. production, our film library has been augmented by the addition of 16 m.m. films to meet the constant demand from borrowers.

I could go on for a much longer time about the ways in which the Minister has been selling Queensland through the Tourist Bureau.

Mr. Bennett: The whole Government has sold Queensland. It sold us out.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I notice that the counterpart of Senator Aylett has returned to the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Windsor: He comes in here and says one word, and then disappears.

Mr. Bennett: At least that is one word more than you ever say.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will obey my call to order. The hon. member for Merthyr.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am sorry for the interruption, Mr. Taylor.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I thank the hon. member for apologising for the interruption.

Mr. RAMSDEN: If I may make a comment during the course of my speech, I should like to say that the hon. member for—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member please proceed with his speech?

Mr. RAMSDEN: Yes.

I could go on for a much longer time than I have at my disposal on the improvements that the Minister for Labour and Industry and his Director-General, Mr. Wilson, have brought about in the Tourist Bureau, but I want to make some reference to the first Warana Festival.

The Bureau was very active in the promotion of the first Warana Festival of South-East Queensland, which must become an annual event. Warana, with its wide publicity, generously given through Press and radio and television, brought much publicity to the State. Hon. members may recall the speech that I made in this Chamber when I advocated a festival for South-East Queensland. I pointed out then that a festival should be designed not so much for the locals but primarily to attract tourists from other States and overseas to see a festival which could be seen nowhere in the world but here in Queensland. The executive committee of Warana, under the able chairmanship of Mr. C. A. Edwards, was considerably restricted in this first year's festival because of the poor public response to its appeal for funds to stage a really first-class tourist attraction. I want to say to the people of South-East Queensland, and in particular to the business houses, hotels, motels, and residential, that every man and woman in this city should go all-out to make next year's Warana a festival from which joy and happiness will be radiated to all parts of the Commonwealth.

I said earlier that the tourist industry can become our best industry, and certainly not an industry that has to be painstakingly built up over the decades. He is here now, this tourist of ours. He is just over the border. He is the friend you met in Sydney or Victoria, or in Western Australia; he is your relation in another State. He is every man in every State, and if every man and every woman in Queensland will only realise that, and realise that we have the most wonderful scenic State in Australia, that we have the reputation of being Australia's most hospitable State, and that all that is necessary is for each one of us personally to go out of his way to be friendly when we meet the tourist, for every business house, every hotel, motel, and residential to let the tourist know that he is the most important man in the State from the time he arrives till the moment he leaves, then we will, every one of us individually, firms and companies, be the beneficiaries of the great and growing tourist industry of Queensland.

Let us ask ourselves: why do oil companies, at great expense to themselves, print road-maps of every State and country? Simply because they want to help the motorist to travel, because when he travels he uses petrol and oil. Why then should we go out of our way to encourage every tourist we meet, by our friendliness and our service, to come back again? Simply because it is good business. Every tourist who spends £1 in Queensland helps Queensland's industries and resources. Every £1 the tourist spends here means higher standards, increased services, and fuller employment in Queensland. Tourism is a big industry and is probably worth up to £40,000,000 a year to the State.

I congratulate the Hon. K. J. Morris, who has been Minister for Tourism, on the progress he has made in developing this great industry over the past five years. What Ken Morris has achieved for the tourist industry in Queensland would alone be a most fitting memorial to his activity if he had done not one other thing. Future development seeks even wider vistas for, with the opening of the Bureau's overseas booking office on Monday, 30 November, 1959, we saw a service developed for overseas travellers. In that particular branch of the Bureau the collections in the overseas section in Brisbane between the opening date I mentioned and 31 August, 1962, amounted to £217,749 10s. 11d. The commission earned on that sum was £15,809 14s.

The opening of this section in Brisbane allowed the Bureau to provide better servicing facilities for the overseas requests which are lodged at other branch offices in Queensland, and the collections from the remaining Queensland branches for overseas travel processed by the overseas section in Brisbane in the same period amounted to £88,872 6s. 8d., with commission amounting to £6,549 6s. 10d.

The total collections from the Bureau's activities in arranging reservations for overseas destinations were therefore £306,621 17s. 7d., and commission earned by this particular section in the period from 30 November, 1959, to 31 August, 1962, amounted to £22,359 2s. 10d.

I conclude by saying that tourism can become Queensland's largest industry, and the Government and the Minister are to be commended for the progress they have made in this field. The people of Queensland can be assured that the best interests of the State will be served whilst the present Government controls the Treasury benches.

This Budget is not only a Budget with popular appeal; it is also a Budget of solidity and challenge.

Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) (12.28 p.m.): Perhaps a lack of training and experience in financial matters might prevent me somewhat from analysing the Budget as I should desire to but I am certain, after having heard the contributions to the debate by the Deputy

Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Baroona, that little more need be said to support their contention that this Budget is one that the Government hopes will be an election winner.

I know it is the prerogative of Governments to present Budgets that they consider will demonstrate their own capacity to handle the finances of the State and in a way that they consider beneficial to the State, but their views do not necessarily have to be accepted by the Opposition. Gerrymandering of the many funds that go to constitute a Budget has been steadily and scientifically carried out by the Treasurer who has, with a certain degree of skill, camouflaged many of the financial dealings in such a way that one would need more than a wide knowledge of accountancy to understand the manner of their presentation.

Fortunately, there are members of the Opposition who have this knowledge and who have been able to show—much to the Treasurer's discomfort, which was evident whilst the hon. members for Baroona and Kedron were speaking—despite what the Treasurer and other Government members have said on their handling of State finances since 1957, that it has not been outstanding and that it was a very lucky thing for the Nicklin-Munro Government that the Menzies Government came near to defeat in 1961. We have witnessed a remarkable transformation since the electors of Queensland showed their disapproval of the Menzies Government's attitude towards the needs of Queensland.

Let us look at what the Treasurer has to say about relations with the Commonwealth Government and the Loan Council. In his Financial Statement he said—

"It is pleasing to report to the House that this year has marked the best year ever for Commonwealth Government assistance to, and interest in, Queensland's financial, economic and developmental problems."

Later he said—

"As a result, the Commonwealth has provided direct assistance towards developmental works in Queensland, with emphasis on export production, and in other cases has supported Queensland's submissions to Loan Council."

The first admission by the Treasurer is "that this year has marked the best year ever" for Commonwealth Government assistance to Queensland and for relations between the Commonwealth Government and the Queensland Government. For many years the Menzies-Holt Government treated Queensland with very scant concern. Without protest from the present Queensland Government this State has been deliberately neglected by the Federal Government. Despite many years of approaches and objections by past Labour Governments, the Federal Government continued to treat Queensland with contempt. It was not until its near defeat in 1961 that the Menzies Government

realised that Queensland's demands had to be met. Consequently, the Nicklin Government's claim that the Menzies Government has given outstanding assistance is nothing more or less than political humbug.

The private member's motion on the business sheet standing in the name of the hon. member for Tablelands reads—

"That this House, being of the opinion that the development of Australia and the well-being of her people as a whole are the joint responsibility of the Federal and all States' Governments, appreciates the co-operative help and assistance which the Commonwealth Government is rendering to this State's Government in its efforts to promote the development of Queensland's vast resources and the well-being of its citizens in the national interest."

Did you ever hear so much bally-hoo and eyewash? Did you ever hear such a misstatement of facts? On the Premier's own statement the Government was not happy with the consideration it was getting from the Federal Government. Some months ago we had statements from the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity wherein he said that he was quite prepared to secede from the Commonwealth because of the treatment the Commonwealth Government was handing out to Queensland. Yet the hon. member for Tablelands has moved that private member's motion.

Mr. Gilmore: Don't you agree that we have been getting great benefits from the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. GRAHAM: Since December 1961, yes, we have been getting wonderful assistance from the Federal Government. But only following protest and pressure. The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity said that Queensland was an "outcast," and was very outspoken about the lack of assistance for Queensland from the Federal Government. In every publication in Queensland we find that voices of protest are being raised. Even in the local newspaper published in Mackay voices of protest are raised against the actions of the Menzies Liberal-Country Party Government in its treatment of Queensland.

Mr. Gilmore: What date was that?

Mr. GRAHAM: December 1961. It was before the elections. Consequently, relations between the Commonwealth and State Government are not as the Queensland Country Party-Liberal Government would have us believe.

The following headlines appeared in "The Courier-Mail":—

"Canberra's £6m. to Queensland.

A Challenge—Nicklin."

Indeed it is a challenge to Mr. Nicklin. In that article the hon. gentleman is reported as saying—

"I want to thank the Prime Minister for his great help. He demonstrated at the talks that he was a good friend of Queensland."

He was not such a good friend to Queensland in the years preceding 1961. Had the Prime Minister considered Queensland's needs our development would have been much greater than it is today. Because of the Menzies Government, Queensland's progress has been retarded.

Mr. Gilmore: He has mended his ways.

Mr. GRAHAM: He has mended his ways, and members of the Nicklin-Morris Government, with smiles all over their faces, are now in the happy position of having money available for the coming elections in 1963. The Treasurer has cleverly put away into various trust funds various amounts that the Government will be able to draw upon early in 1963 when the election campaign is launched.

Let us now look at the funds that the Nicklin-Morris Government has at its disposal. It is noticeable that revenue for 1961-1962 amounted to £117,325,027. That was an increase of more than £9,000,000 compared with 1960-1961. If we take the figures shown in the Tables for the years 1952 to 1957, and for the years 1957 to 1962, both of which are five-year periods, we find the comparative amount of money that the Nicklin-Morris Government has had and what it has done with it. In 1957 the amount received by Queensland in Commonwealth grants was £29,415,183, whereas in 1961-1962 it had grown to £52,259,544, an increase of £22,000,000 in five years. Taxation had increased by £5,000,000, territorial revenue had decreased by £548,000, interest payments had increased by £2,745,000, and miscellaneous receipts had increased by £1,300,000. There was a total increase of £32,166,927.

Those figures indicate the amount of money that the Nicklin-Morris Government has had available for the work it has done. We admit that it has increased expenditure in all departments, but it has had the increased money available to do it. The Government wrongly claims credit for what it has spent on hospitals and education, and many other features of its activities.

Mr. Windsor: What about New South Wales?

Mr. GRAHAM: If the hon. member wants the figures for New South Wales I can give them to him. I have here the figures for New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia.

The same can be said of every other State in the Commonwealth. Increased expenditure has taken place because more money has been available. For the Government to deliberately withhold funds for electioneering purposes when those moneys could have been used during the present year to overcome the unemployment problem is nothing more or less than political dishonesty. The Treasurer has admitted withholding certain funds which will be used when unemployment, as the

Treasurer states, is most critical. We know, of course, that the critical unemployment period will be at the commencement of 1963, immediately prior to the election.

The Government has prided itself on its form of honesty and has featured the Premier as "Honest Frank". Yet it has resorted to every known form of political trickery and dishonesty while it has held the reins of Government since 1957 in its endeavour to ingratiate itself with the electors of Queensland. There is not one section of the people of Queensland that the Government could claim to have been honest with, unless of course we sectionalise the few of their own supporters in the Liberal-Country Party who have received from the Government considerable concessions in one way or another.

Could it be said that the introduction of off-course betting with the T.A.B. system was honest? If so, it has not had the approbation of the church authorities or the decent, law-abiding citizens of the State, because all have raised their protest against it. It might be interesting for the Committee to hear one contribution, which appeared as a newspaper report of an editorial in the "Methodist Times", and which read—

"Family Fear on Gambling

"Many parents are fearful of the results that can and will follow the legalising of off-course betting," an editorial in the Methodist Times states.

"We see young people developing the gambling habit through means provided by law," it says.

"The editorial refers to the report of the Totalisator Administration Board that in eight weeks Queenslanders have bet £470,519 at 28 agencies.

"It says: 'We are not proud to live in a State where betting shops are found in our suburban shopping areas, in country towns and villages.

"Hostility is justified.

"The Government may be unconcerned about the issues of the law it has enacted, or it may persuade itself that objections to it are foolish and fears unfounded, but we are sure that the attitude of hostility which we, as a church, take to this pernicious practice is justified.

"The responsibility for it is not ours, but we shall be involved in the duty of rescuing people from the grip of gambling, bringing comfort to distracted parents, and peace to discordant homes."

Those statements are very true. It is regrettable that the Government has had to develop a system of gambling to augment the finances of the State.

Let me say something now on railway matters. The long-looked-for Ford, Bacon and Davis Report has at last come to hand

but, in view of the recommendations incorporated in it, it is very questionable whether the Government has received value for its money. The Minister for Transport has failed to tell the Committee what the actual cost of the report will be and I doubt that he ever will, but it is said that it will cost about £150,000. Even if the ultimate cost falls below that figure, there is no doubt that the American firm of consultants has been well paid for its services. Whether the Government will be repaid for its huge outlay remains to be seen. If it has the courage to carry out the recommendations contained in the report, it is reasonably possible that within a decade the Railway Department will be on a better footing and perhaps paying its way

To my mind the main recommendations in the report come within four categories—management and organisation, curtailment of metropolitan and other services, dieselisation of the means of locomotion, and the re-arrangement of workshops and maintenance depots. The most important of those categories is management and organisation. It is because of ineffectual, and in many cases inefficient, management of the railway system that we have seen the railway finances drift into the abyss that has meant considerable losses for many years.

It is interesting to note what the report has to say about this matter. It reads—

“The present organisation is lacking in planning, systems and methods, and economic control as a major organisational activity. This lack has permitted the occurrence of considerable duplication of effort; the continuance of an unrealistic method of measuring expected performance by past accomplishments with little regard for changing conditions; and the perpetuation of an outdated method of data processing and cost control.”

Let me deal with an aspect of management and organisation that indicates why I regard it as the most important category. For many years the system of appointment to the top positions in the Railway Department has been based mainly on length of service or seniority. Many of those positions have been filled by men who, in my opinion anyhow, would not be considered the best men, but, because of their length of service, they have been able to establish their right to those positions. In other sections of the railway service where competitive examinations are held, seniority is the basis upon which promotions are made. Where no competitive examinations are held, I believe, as is recommended in the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report, that appointments should be made on suitability and capacity to do the jobs. This would mean in effect that younger men would be placed in the higher administrative positions, which would be to the advantage of the department.

Dealing with effective management, the report says—

“A concept of management for effective operation of any enterprise such as the Railways requires a specific policy or plan for organisation which identifies and segregates the principal activities as specific areas for the delegation of responsibilities and provides a foundation for distinct and definite lines of authority corresponding to the responsibilities.”

If that recommendation is put into effect, as I hope it will be, there will be a great increase in efficiency within the Railway Department.

Tremendous losses have been sustained in the Railway Department over many years. The accumulated losses for the years 1959-1960, 1960-1961, and 1961-1962 totalled £5,922,039, and the interest on capital payment for the same years amounted to £11,932,766. The Railway Department has shown a loss of £20,000,000 in the last five years.

Despite frequent increases in rates and fares, losses have continued to increase. In view of these increasing losses, one would have thought that some earlier investigations would have been made by the Government. It is to be remembered that it called for a report from Professor Hytten, but nothing would persuade the Government to table it when it was received. Eventually it was pigeonholed and, if the truth was known, I suppose it has gone into the bin.

When one considers the very great contribution that the railway system makes to the development of the State, the fact that it shows a loss on a year's trading should not be a matter of great concern provided it is managed efficiently and continues to give service to the people. If the department was credited with the finance that it contributes to other departments, the losses would be minimised. The Railway Department is, in many cases, credited with concessional rates when it debits other departments. Consider, for instance, the number of passenger journeys made by thousands of people who are granted concessional passenger rates for rail travel. These people comprise employees of all Government departments, members of religious orders, people in receipt of Social Service payments, and others who are granted concessions, including members of Parliament. These people travel at concessional rates, and the amount of the reduced rates is debited against the department issuing the requisition. If the Railway Department were given credit for the full amount of fares for the journeys travelled, and the issuing departments were debited with the concessional rates, the Railway Department would not have to carry the added expenditure that rightly belongs to the issuing departments, and losses would be much less.

I think it will be accepted that efforts have been made by the department to cut losses, but I am yet to be convinced that the closing of existing lines and the curtailment of services, together with the closing of workshops in various places, will effect the savings listed in the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report. It should be the aim of the Minister and the department generally to endeavour to restore the confidence of the people of Queensland in the Railway Department. This department can, and should, give the people of Queensland a service that will be accepted by them, bringing back into force the old slogan of years ago, "Use the railways. You own them." Other departments can give that service to the public, so why should not the Railway Department, in an endeavour to win back trade that has been lost, especially to air services, give it.

The Railway Department can do much to check the inroads being made into its passenger traffic by air travel and private motor vehicles. To maintain and increase its present passenger patronage, the department will have to continue improving its services. And it must be admitted that there are many ways in which they can be improved. Air-conditioned trains providing improved services to passengers are available but the services must be speeded up if revenue from this source is to increase.

Hon. members of this Assembly who use the airways know the type of service that is provided by airline operators, with a very close personal association between their employees and the passengers. If one compares this with what the Railway Department has to offer, one sees one of the many reasons why air services are expanding and rail services are declining.

Road transport, too, has made a tremendous impact on railway finances. The loss to the Railway Department of the tonnage of freight now being carried by road hauliers must be accepted. The road haulier is here to stay. Consequently, losses that have occurred in the Railway Department because business has been transferred to other forms of transport must be recouped from road-transport fees.

The co-ordination of air, rail, road, and sea transport within the State is the responsibility of the Government, and it is therefore the Government's duty to lay down a policy of co-ordination that will be beneficial to the State as a whole.

Let me now deal briefly with matters that are causing concern to employees of the Railway Department. I shall deal first with the action of the Minister and departmental officers in reducing men to lower grades and forcing them to accept lower wages. As most people realise, classification is the means of promotion within the department, and it seems to me to be wrong that the department,

because of loss of patronage and a reduction in train services, should reduce a classified man to a lower grade when in many cases it would be possible to use him in his own grade in another depot. Various unions are complaining about the practice of reducing a man's classification and paying him lower wages. If the Government is interested in maintaining harmony and a good relationship between the unions and the railway administration, the sooner that practice is stopped, the better.

It is interesting to note the difficulties that the present Government has experienced with road transport during the past three years. Although it seems to have the problem under control at the moment, it has had considerable difficulty because of its biased approach to the road hauliers. No other Government could have run into more trouble than the present Government did in its efforts to control the road-transport system. I believe that it has not solved the problem, nor will it ever solve it.

The subject of unemployment has been dealt with very fully by hon. members in many debates in this Assembly, and it is remarkable that members of the Government should endeavour to treat this matter with so little concern. It has been said that unemployment is the greatest problem with which any Government has to deal, and unfortunately, not only in Queensland, but also throughout Australia and in almost every country in the world, there is an unemployment problem calling for very definite action by Governments. While unemployment in Queensland has eased somewhat in the last few months, it is still with us, and it is unfortunate for the Treasurer, in his desire to build up the prestige of the Government and to make it possible to undertake some pre-election activities next year, that he has had to restrict the spending of certain funds at his disposal this year to solve this problem. Whilst there has been some lessening in the numbers of unemployed since June this year, there is still a vast number of unemployed in Queensland today and it is still Queensland's No. 1 problem. Admittedly, seasonal work has been responsible for an improvement in the employment position, but one must remember that it is only a matter of weeks now until seasonal work will finish and there will be a vast swelling of the ranks of the unemployed.

Mr. Windsor: The money that we put aside will help them, yet you are condemning us for that.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is one of the dishonest actions of this Government. It has allowed this huge body of unemployed to live on Social Service payments. If it had put the money at its disposal to good use, many of those people could have been employed on full-time work.

Mr. Windsor interjected.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member supports the action of his Government in putting money away so that it will be available for the relief of unemployment just prior to the 1963 election.

As I say, unemployment is our No. 1 problem and I ask the Government what it intends doing about it. We have seen many plans put forward in the last three or four years. The Government has been responsible for much talk on the subject, encouraging other people to talk about it also, but doing little or nothing to solve the problem.

Mr. Menzies had this to say on unemployment—

“Secondary industry would be given protection and an attack made on unemployment, the Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) said tonight.

“He added categorically the ‘credit squeeze’ was now over, exports had risen, and imports fallen.”

He then outlined a six-point programme on unemployment.

The “Telegraph” of 15 May this year, had this to say—

“Queenslanders will find little satisfaction with the latest unemployment figures released by the Labour Minister, Mr. McMahon.

“In spite of a small over-all gain in the number of jobs, the outstanding fact in the Minister’s survey is that Queensland remains the State with the greatest proportion of its work force unemployed—”

Despite the fact that the Nicklin-Munro Government had an increase of £32,000,000 over five years by way of grants from the Commonwealth Government, that position remains and they must accept the responsibility for still having a greater proportion of unemployed than any other State in the Commonwealth.

Mr. McMahon, in another statement made only a few days ago, said—

“The Labour and National Service Minister (Mr. McMahon) yesterday warned that there would be an increase in unemployment in Queensland towards the end of this year, when seasonal influences declined.

“Such an increase is customary. Indeed, never has it been otherwise in the post-war years.

“But he also said that the state of the economy would make placing school leavers in jobs next year an easier task than faced this year.”

That is very questionable. I have here a cutting from the Mackay “Daily Mercury” which I will read to hon. members to show how the unemployment problem will grow. This article, which was published in July, reads—

“A work force of about 1,800 men has been absorbed by the sugar industry in Mackay in the last two or three weeks.”

The Government has neglected to accept its responsibility for solving the unemployment problem. Consequently, although there has been some lessening of the number of unemployed in Queensland owing to seasonal conditions, in a short space of time we will again have the acute problem. The Treasurer surprised me when he said that he had withheld certain funds that were available to the Government, so that they could be spent at a time when unemployment was more critical than now. Presumably the Treasurer will release those funds early in 1963. His purpose will not be to make a strong attempt to solve the unemployment problem but to endeavour to consolidate the Government’s position with an election looming in May or June. That is a very wrong principle to adopt.

Now that the Treasurer is in the Chamber I may have to repeat something of what I said earlier. We still have approximately 10,000 unemployed in Queensland. I do not say that they all could have been put into useful employment in this half of 1962, but many of them could have been found work had more money been made available to local authorities. The Treasurer cannot deny that he had the money available, because he received a non-repayable grant of more than £3,000,000 from the Federal Government, the purpose of which was to assist the Queensland Government to relieve unemployment. Having control of the State’s finances, the Treasurer, with the acquiescence of his Government, withheld a great deal of that money with the sole purpose of making it available in the early part of 1963 so that the Government’s position would be more consolidated than had the money been spent now. The Government has done the wrong thing in its use of this non-repayable grant from the Federal Government. The money should have been given to local authorities by way of grant on the same basis as it was given to the State Government. I am not a financier and I may get into deep water if I continue too far along my line of argument, but as the Treasurer got that money from the Commonwealth Government for a specific purpose, had he so desired he could have made it available to local authorities on the same basis of non-repayable grant, which would not have interfered with their loan commitments. But the money has not been made available to local authorities on that basis.

The Minister for Labour and National Service in the national Parliament has predicted that soon more men will be out of jobs. He made that recent prediction because at the end of the sugar and meat seasons a large number of men will be thrown on to the employment market. One has good reason to ask: what can be done about a solution to the problem? I know that Queensland is not the only State that has an unemployment problem. However, the present Queensland Government is doing little or nothing about it. It has tried to

encourage local authorities to put on more men but the Government certainly has not given them the financial assistance that is necessary. Local authorities are strictly limited in raising loan money.

Dr. Delamothe: How much has Mackay been given?

Mr. GRAHAM: I could not give an exact answer to that, any more than the hon. member could give an exact answer for Bowen. Mackay could do with a great deal more money than it has. If more money was made available more men could be employed. I cannot tell the hon. member the amount in pounds, shillings, and pence, but I know that up to a point Mackay has received its share of the public funds. I am not saying it has not. We have an unemployment problem which is not accepted by the Government in its true perspective. If the Government faced it properly it would do much more than it has. I pose this question to the Government: What can we do to solve this important problem? In North Queensland, with a large percentage of unemployed, it is difficult to provide work in the off season, because of the lack of industries and development in that part of the State. Bowen has just as many problems as other local authorities in the area. It is a small centre compared with other places, but it has a major problem.

A short while ago I quoted from a newspaper article which said that 1,800 men had been absorbed in the sugar industry at the beginning of the sugar season. What will happen to them when the season finishes? I again ask the Government: What can we do to solve the problem?

Dr. Delamothe: It has been a good season.

Mr. GRAHAM: Fortunately for the Government, it has been an exceptionally good season and the men in the sugar industry will get an additional three, four, or five weeks' work. That will relieve the Government of the necessity to do something about unemployment for that extra period. Because of the lack of development in the northern part of the State, we are faced with a recurring problem.

Dr. Delamothe: You want to stop development. You tried to stop them developing the sand deposits.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will tell the hon. member something about that. I know the Government is very interested in Japan. I know it will go out of its way, and bend over backwards, to assist in the export of raw materials to Japan. It is right up the Government's alley to ship Queensland materials to Japan to develop Japanese interests. That is what the Government wants. It is not protecting the interests of Queensland. The Government does not want a glass factory in Bowen. It prefers to see thousands of tons of silica sands taken from one of our main islands to develop Japanese industry. The Government says it is

a good thing. It is all for it because it will put money in the hands of a few who have shares in the company that has the franchise to export this sand to Japan, and maybe the hon. member for Bowen is a shareholder in it. I believe that our natural resources should be developed for the benefit of Queensland as a whole, and not for the benefit of a few shareholders, such as the hon. member for Bowen, who have interests in companies such as Thiess Bros. Peabody. The company will send huge quantities of Queensland raw material to Japan to develop Japanese industry, or industries in another foreign country.

Mr. Hiley: Is that why you opposed the proposal of the late Hon. E. M. Hanlon when he wanted to export Blair Athol coal?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not say we did. Times are vastly different in 1962 compared with those days.

An Opposition Member: It is a different sort of coal.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is an entirely different proposition.

True Queenslanders wish to see Queensland develop as a State and have secondary industries. What possible chance have we to develop our secondary industries when most of our raw materials are being exported to other nations? There is a limit to the amount of raw materials in Queensland. It is all right in 1962 to say, as the hon. member for Bowen would say, "There are 100,000 tons of silica sand." But how long will it take to remove that 100,000 tons, and what will be the return to Queensland industry?

A few days ago, when I was speaking on the Thiess-Peabody agreement, I said to the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity that if we shipped 600,000 tons of bauxite to Japan—and that was the proposal—valued at £1,500,000, Queensland would get £15,000. That is a wonderful return, no doubt!

Dr. Delamothe: Do you think we should sell our wool to Japan?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, but we have woollen industries in Queensland whereas we have no glass industry and no iron and steel works. If we could encourage those who have the money to invest their millions in Queensland, we could use our own raw materials and have something to show for them. Hon. members opposite talk of private investment and of the right of private enterprise to develop this part of the State, but they know as well as I do that North Queensland has been starved of secondary industries and it will continue to be starved of them.

Mr. Sullivan: How long has this position existed?

Mr. GRAHAM: Unfortunately, since the beginning of time, because in 1962 we have not those industries in the North where we

should have them. I accuse this Government, and the Commonwealth Government, of doing nothing to develop secondary industries there. Despite all their talk about what should be done to establish industry, we find headlines in the Press reading, "£100m. Plan for Development of North Queensland Drawn Up. Will Go Before State Cabinet." And this statement—

"Seven chambers of commerce, representing the views of Mackay, Bowen, Home Hill, Ayr, Townsville, Charters Towers and Mt. Isa, agreed at the week-end on a £100 million master plan for Northern Queensland development."

That was back in 1960. How far have we progressed since then? We see no evidence of any advance.

Dr. Delamothe: Whose plan was it?

Mr. GRAHAM: I presume it was the work of the conference of the Federated Chambers of Commerce of North Queensland, accepted by the Government.

Dr. Delamothe: Is that so? Was it accepted by the Government?

Mr. GRAHAM: It says, "Premier commended plan." I could present the Committee with 100 Press cuttings about what should be done in North Queensland. Here is another—"Master Plan. Fourteen Items for Submission. Propose Standing Committee to Develop the North." There are 100 committees operating in North Queensland today. We have six in Mackay. We have the regional advisory committee, an A.I.M. committee, a publicity committee, and one fostered by the chamber of commerce. What are we getting out of it all? What is the hon. member for Bowen getting in his area? Nothing, despite the fact that a publicity officer was appointed there and paid a huge salary. He was even sent to Germany. What came out of it? Nothing! And that is all that North Queensland will get if it depends on private enterprise. The other day, at Mareeba, the Premier spoke of the responsibility of private enterprise to undertake this great development. All right, we are quite happy to let private enterprise have it as long as it does something about it. But all that private enterprise wants to do, and all that it is doing, with the acquiescence of this Government, is gouging the guts out of Queensland's raw materials, and no industry is being established. What is the Government asking in the way of royalties from Thiess Peabody? That company is to build a railway line and in return it will export thousands of tons of coal to Japan.

Let me come back to the subject of what I think should be done about the development of that great portion of our State, the North. It has been said that North Queensland's development needs five basic principles. Firstly, it needs first-class roads. And I give the Government credit for undertaking the laying down of first-class roads in some areas

of North Queensland. More money is to be spent on beef roads, and I am not opposed to that because I think it is necessary to have access to those areas. Secondly, it needs freight incentives. The hon. member for Rockhampton South should know of the difficulties that face manufacturers in Rockhampton through the lack of freight incentives.

Cheap power is mentioned. It may be possible to get it in some areas of Queensland, but it is certainly not in Mackay. The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity will verify that Mackay consumers are paying more for electricity than any other users in Queensland. This is caused by a number of things, including the vast area covered, the small population, and the reticulation of power from the Tully and Barron River hydro-electric scheme as far south as Mackay. This makes the cost of electricity in Mackay exceptionally high, and that has to be considered if industry at Mackay is to be encouraged.

Again, we need more water conservation. That is something that we do not have in North Queensland, except in the Far North. There is no water conservation of any great significance in any part of the area. These are not my thoughts; they are the suggestions of the Mackay Harbour Board engineer, Mr. D. Clark, who has made some valuable contributions to the subject of northern development.

Despite all this talk and the work that has been put into organisation and discussion, and the collation of information by various committees, what has been done? I have some regard for the work that has been done by the Mackay Regional Committee in this matter. A lot of research has been done and much information gained on the establishment of certain industries in Mackay, but that is where it stops.

Mr. Tooth: Tell us about the Bowen iron-works while you are at it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot tell the hon. member any more than he can tell me. I have Press cuttings here in which hon. members opposite admit that an iron and steel works is desirable, and even essential, for the development of North Queensland, but who is going to do it? Hon. members opposite have been there for five years and have done little or nothing.

Mr. Tooth: You were there for 40 years.

Mr. GRAHAM: They talk of what they are doing.

Mr. Evans: You did a great job at Collinsville!

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not above admitting that it is possible for Governments to make mistakes.

Mr. Tooth: They didn't make mistakes; they made nothing.

Mr. GRAHAM: Whatever the Labour Government did in those days was no worse than this Government have been, and are, doing. If we cannot look the people of this State in the face with a clearer and more conscious realisation of our responsibilities than the present Government then heaven help us. God help the Labour Party if it ever has to stoop to the low, mean, and despicable methods of the Liberal and Country Parties in keeping face with the electors of Queensland. Unless responsibility for the establishment of industry in North Queensland is accepted by Governments, whether Liberal, Country Party, or Labour, State or Federal, we may have to wait another 50 years for it.

There is ample opportunity for those people with the necessary finance to establish industries in Mackay, Bowen, Townsville, and other parts of the State. Many references are made to beef roads opening up the Far West of Queensland. Recently I read an article in which it was stated that it would have been better for the Government to concentrate more on the development of the coastal areas, where most of the population is. The Premier said that the establishment of secondary industry was the function of private capital. I entirely disagree with him. I believe that if the Government made one move towards the establishment of an iron and steel works in North Queensland it would soon bring the B.H.P. monopoly to heel. It holds huge mining leases in the North, as the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity knows, which it has no intention of developing, and this is restricting development in the area. In Mackay, bagasse, the by-product of sugar-cane, offers potential for development, yet for years it has been used only for fuel. Private enterprise is not prepared to come in and establish an industry there.

The question of refining sugar in the North is somewhat different, I know, because the refineries at Bundaberg and Brisbane are capable of refining enough sugar for Queensland's needs, and the export of raw sugar is desirable to maintain the industry in its present prosperous state.

I know that there are problems related to the development of industry in North Queensland, but until the Government gives a lead with a definite plan of development, instead of delegating to regional committees in various parts of Queensland the responsibility of trying to encourage private enterprise to create new industries, those problems will not be solved. As I said, so many committees are in existence in Mackay that we are going round in a circle and meeting ourselves coming back. The time has arrived for the people of Mackay to sink their differences, if any, on developmental proposals and form one committee to undertake this very important work. I do not know what is happening in Rockhampton,

but I know that in Mackay there are at least five committees and, all in all, we are not making much headway.

The question of juvenile unemployment is a matter of great concern. Because of the large number of children who are leaving secondary schools and who are now looking for employment, we are faced with a problem that is causing a great deal of worry to the parents of children between 16 and 18 years of age. When applications were called for one job in Mackay recently, there were 60 applicants. Because of lack of opportunities for employment, many children are being kept at school longer than they wish to stay there. I do not say that it does them any harm to remain at school, but one of the headmasters said that they were not achieving the desired results because they were simply filling in time. What are we to do about it? Unless the Government shoulders its responsibility for the development of industries in various parts of Queensland, we will be faced with this problem for some time to come. If the Government was prepared to give local authorities more money on a non-repayable basis, Mackay, in common with other local authorities would be able to undertake much more work for the relief of unemployment.

Despite the fact that the Government has been in office for five years, and despite the fact that its members endeavour to show that it has been the most successful Government Queensland has ever had, it has not solved the problems that existed when it took over, and it never will.

I see that the hon. member for Condamine is in the Chamber, so I might as well deal with him and the hon. member for Barambah and the hon. member for Sherwood on the subject of character assassination and smear campaigns.

Mr. Tooth interjected.

Mr. GRAHAM: You are just as bad but you have not got the guts to get up and say it outside.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member please address the Chair.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do you expect the hon. member for Condamine to go outside and make the statement he made here?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member please cease saying "you". When he does so he is in reality addressing the Chair. He should refer to an hon. member as "the hon. member for so-and-so."

Mr. GRAHAM: At your direction, Mr. Taylor, I refer to the hon. member for Condamine, the hon. member for Greenslopes, and the hon. member for Sherwood, who, during this session of Parliament, have used this Chamber, as I have said so often, as a coward's castle. They should have the courage to say outside what they say here. It does not add to the respect that members of the community have for members of this

Assembly if they use this Chamber for such purposes and claim protection because they are members of Parliament. The day must come when we demand from hon. members of this Assembly some sense of decency in these matters. I believe it is only since the advent of this Government that we have seen this sort of thing happening and, unless it is checked, it will continue and will react very much to the detriment of every decent member of the Assembly.

Mr. WINDSOR (Ithaca) (2.42 p.m.): One hon. member opposite has said to me, "I suppose you will speak for 10 minutes?" I told him that I could speak for three minutes and make more sense than he could in 30.

I must congratulate the Treasurer on his fine record of service to this State. I understand it is a record in that he is in his sixth year as Treasurer. He has this year presented the finest Budget ever presented in this Chamber.

Mr. Hanlon: You wouldn't know.

Mr. WINDSOR: It must be extra good because the Opposition have been calling it all sorts of fancy names. It has been called a "ballot-box Budget", an "election Budget", and all sorts of fancy names. It is the natural reward for almost six years of forward and courageous planning by a very good Treasurer, supported by a very good Government, and it has all been done without increasing the cost to the people of Queensland. It is a great pity that the New South Wales Treasurer could not take a leaf from our Treasurer's book. He gave the people of New South Wales a few lollies, but they cost them over £5,500,000, which is a very high price for a few sweets and titbits.

Mr. Houston interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member for Bulimba cease interrupting.

Mr. WINDSOR: Members of the Opposition consistently condemned our Treasurer in previous years for not balancing the Budget; now they are condemning him because he has kept a few pounds aside to relieve unemployment that will result from the termination of seasonal work. Someone said it was dishonest to keep this money back while men are out of employment.

The Treasurer has the Opposition confused; they do not know where they are going. They condemn you, Sir, for putting aside money that will keep men in employment and for good planning. You certainly have Opposition members where you want them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member heard me ask the hon. member for Mackay not to use the term "you" unless he was addressing the Chair. If he is referring to any other hon. member he must describe him by his title or as the hon. member for his particular electorate.

Mr. WINDSOR: Queensland's unemployment figures have fallen consistently over the last few months. Even the small firm with which I am connected hopes to employ another 20 people in the next few weeks. According to the latest unemployment figures published in "The Courier-Mail" as recently as 16 October, New South Wales has 18,835 more unemployed than Queensland. Hon. members opposite should not try to tell us that unemployment is peculiar to Queensland.

In the business world there is an air of excited expectancy about what is happening and what is to happen in this State. In a phase of great development, millions and millions of pounds are being spent.

An Opposition Member: Where?

Mr. WINDSOR: In this city alone. For example, £12,000,000 is being spent at Bulwer Island. There is every reason for great optimism on the future development of this State. We have attracted industry that will embark on an extensive programme of works in Queensland. The various projects covering water conservation, oil exploration, the winning of coal, the building of powerhouses at pithead, and all the other development that is taking place tend to increase the State's employment potential. It is up to members of the Opposition to assist wherever they can, not to be knockers all the time.

It would be a good thing for the nation's economy if a three-year Budget could be introduced in the Federal sphere. Each year, at about the end of April or the beginning of May, there is a slackening in business. People wait for the Federal Budget. They stop spending in case a reduction in sales tax or some other taxation concession is contained in the next Budget. Consequently, from about the end of April until August there are three dead months while the people wait for something to happen. If the people in Queensland knew that for three years income tax, taxation exemptions, and sales tax would remain unchanged, they would go about their business normally. By their own confidence in the future they would protect their economy. More workers would enjoy full-time employment. As it is now, every year, by the end of April or the beginning of May, business falls off and by the end of June the position is even worse. Workers are dismissed. It is a bad thing for the State. I want to see everybody employed throughout the year. A three-year Budget would help both the economy of the State and the nation. The difficulties and disadvantages associated with such a scheme would be more than offset by the confidence in the community and the increased strength of the economy. I am sure it would be better for everyone in the long run. Since I became a member of Parliament I have advocated that, as industry will be one of our points of salvation, the more we have in the State, and the more skilled workers we attract to the State, the better and stronger we will be. A few years ago we

shifted our factory to Meeandah. At that time there were only two other buildings in sight. There are now 58 factories, which have been erected in three years.

Mr. Sullivan: Confidence in the Government.

Mr. WINDSOR: There is no doubt about that.

When the Bulwer Island refinery is started, thousands of tons of materials will be carried on the roads in that area. I am thankful that the Government and the council are combining to build a roadway costing about £200,000. That will satisfy the demand for a few short years, but we must have a tunnel under the river in that vicinity to cater for industry on the south side of the city. What sense is there in bringing thousands of tons of goods through a congested city and then doing a complete U-turn to get to a place that is only one mile from the place of origin? Let us have three or four tunnels under the river! In Paris there is a bridge across the river at every street. It is not a navigable river like ours, but they have had to cope with traffic and that is how they have handled it. In Brisbane, we have only three or four bridges over our big, winding river. We should have a dozen. In my opinion tunnels are preferable to bridges because they are not so vulnerable to air attack. Bridges can be blown to bits in no time, but tunnels can be camouflaged. Even if they are hit, they can still be safely used. (Opposition laughter.) Hon. members opposite can laugh, but it will not be very long before they are hiding in the tunnels.

Industry was greatly encouraged by last year's Federal Budget. It has given industry a tremendous incentive. I refer particularly to the 20-per cent. investment depreciation and the 7½ per cent. that is allowable in the engineering industry. That gave us a wonderful boost of 27½ per cent. for the first year. It is a wonderful incentive to produce, and for people to buy, machinery in their own State. Orders are coming in already in tremendous quantities. People have turned the corner now and believe there is a great future for Queensland. They are all buying and they realise what a wonderful thing it is to buy Australian-made goods and support Australian industry.

The depreciation allowance has given progressive firms an opportunity to buy the latest machinery, and thus keep up-to-date and meet world competition. Competition is getting keener and, although machines may not be worn out in ten years, they are outmoded in three or four years. Where 25 horsepower is fitted to a machine today, in the old days only 5 horsepower would be used. Practical advances in steel techniques have been amazing. With the same type of machine steel can be worked, or cut, five times faster than formerly, because it is so much stronger. Its tensile strength has been quadrupled over the last 30 to 40 years. I could show the Committee a steel that can lift 100 tons and it is only 2 per cent. heavier than steel of the

same quantity that 30 years ago could lift only 30 tons. The quality of the steel has so advanced in the last few years that it is exciting to see what it can do. Years ago the steel used in tools was suitable to work only a few hundred feet of hardwood, but today we can get carbon-tipped tools that will run for weeks.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WINDSOR: I am trying to enlighten hon. members opposite on the advances that have been made in the engineering field. We have a tremendous future in Queensland, and in Australia generally. We must take advantage of every opportunity and have the most up-to-date machinery and plant procurable to enable us to compete against foreign countries. We owe it to the State and the country to do all we can to keep our workers employed. We can do it. We have almost all that we need but we must have encouragement and incentive to develop. This Government is giving that to the people and I am thrilled to be on the Government side and to get its support in all these wonderful things. I am sure that, within 12 months, there will be such a hive and a buzzing of industry that we will be astounded and amazed.

I turn now to the terrific hazards that exist in the city, firstly in the crooked approaches to bridges, narrow bridges, and the like. The authorities should embark immediately on straightening those approaches and widening the roads. Even the William Jolly Bridge has an S bend in its approach. The other day I saw someone from New South Wales hit that bend and almost cause a tremendous accident because the driver did not realise it was there.

Another serious hazard exists for workmen who go to and from work in the back of open utilities that have not a hand-rail on them. Recently, three men were thrown out on the roadway ahead of me when a utility had to swerve suddenly. The men had nothing to hang on to and out they went. If there had been a hand-rail around the top of the utility they would have been saved. It costs the country so much every time a man is hurt. If he breaks an arm or a leg and is put out of action for two or three weeks, it costs us money, because we are not getting the production and the turnover of money and it does not help the economy. The simple remedy is to make it compulsory to put a hand-rail on utilities that convey workmen to work. Crooked approaches to bridges should be straightened at the first opportunity. The elimination of such hazards will save the State thousands of pounds.

In my own electorate, there is the Salvation Army home for delinquent girls, which is a wonderful institution. The Government thinks so much of it that it is granted a 3-to-1 subsidy, and last Thursday, knowing that there was to be an appeal, hon. members contributed £66 to it. That shows that not

only does the Government itself support it, but that hon. members themselves are sufficiently kind-hearted to help where they can.

Since 1957 this Government has paid subsidies totalling £349,725 to religious and charitable organisations towards the cost of establishing 910 beds for aged persons. An additional amount of £46,000 has been approved for payment in the provision of a further 109 beds, and the total provision for the current financial year is expected to be approximately £140,000.

To assist in meeting the cost of establishing or extending homes for the aged, religious and charitable organisations receive financial assistance from both Commonwealth and State Governments. The Commonwealth subsidy is at the rate of £2 for each £1 contributed by the organisation, but is restricted to the construction costs, including professional fees and such things as built-in furniture. The maximum subsidy allowable is two-thirds of the capital cost.

The State Government makes grants under two headings. Firstly, it contributes to the cost of loose furnishings and equipment or other items declared ineligible for Commonwealth subsidy and secondly, towards the capital cost of construction to the extent by which the funds of an organisation, together with Commonwealth subsidy, might fall short of the capital cost. Subsidy is considered on condition that the organisation undertaking the project raises at least 25 per cent. of the total cost of the scheme from its own resources, and a further requirement is that plans, specifications and tenders be submitted for any work or purchases for which application for State subsidy is made. Subject to these conditions, a State subsidy may be payable up to 25 per cent. of the total cost of the scheme.

These generous provisions have led to increasing activity in the care of the aged by religious and charitable bodies which, however, provide mainly for ambulatory old people. The effect of this has been to cause additional beds for infirm and bed-fast cases to be provided at the three homes for old people that are wholly maintained by, and directly under the control of, the Department of Health and Home Affairs. These homes, known as "Eventide", are located at Sandgate, Rockhampton, and Charters Towers, and provide accommodation, respectively, for 1,073, 251, and 340 aged people.

Residents in the Eventide homes have all their needs provided for, and have the benefit of medical, dental, and optical services. Motion pictures are screened regularly, and at Eventide, Sandgate, television sets have been installed. Libraries provide a wide range of reading matter, and at Sandgate and Charters Towers bowling greens have been laid down. For those residents who play bowls, the necessary requirements, including bowls, clothes, and shoes, are provided.

The garden settings in which these departmental homes for the aged have been placed contribute to the happiness of the old folk. The gardens are maintained by full-time gardeners. Apart from the administrative staffs, each home has a matron, trained sisters, nursing assistants, and male attendants. The Director of Geriatrics is available for consultation by those charged with the care of the aged in the Eventide homes.

It is to the credit of the Minister for Health and Home Affairs that the waiting lists of applicants for admission to Eventide homes have now been overtaken, and eligible applicants can be admitted to any of the three homes mentioned without delay.

That is the record of the Government in caring for the aged, and today the hon. member for Merthyr has given us some idea of the outstanding work it is doing to assist sub-normal children. Let us not forget, too, the wonderful job it has done in the field of education.

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) (3.6 p.m.): When we compare the Financial Statement brought down by the Treasurer in 1959 prior to the 1960 State election with the one that he has brought down prior to the 1963 State election, we find that a similar job of covering up is being done. As did the 1959 Financial Statement, this one contains a long preamble to cover up the mismanagement of the Government since it was returned to the Government benches in 1960. I intend to go through the statement as it is set out. No doubt I will touch on some subjects which other hon. members on this side of the Committee have dealt with, but I hope that my remarks will not be mere repetition.

The Treasurer referred to unemployment. Let me say that we on this side of the Chamber are most anxious to see full employment in Queensland, because people are never out of trouble when there is poverty. That has been proved time and time again. The position in 1957-1958 was very similar to that in 1960-1961. When there is unemployment, we, as the representatives of the people, have to deal with many problems that confront them, particularly in paying their rent and saving themselves from being evicted and in endeavouring to earn enough to feed themselves, their wives, and their families.

In this debate, the hon. member for Gregory and other Government members have not treated unemployment as seriously as have hon. members on this side of the Chamber. Since 1960 we have had to move amendments from time to time, either to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply or to this motion, to bring the matter to the Government's attention. I want to make it clear, too, to the hon. member for Gregory that although hon. members on this side of the Chamber may be concerned about unemployment, while we were in government we were just as much concerned about droughts, floods, and

cyclones. No-one knows better than members of the Opposition what effect floods, droughts, and cyclones have on the farmers of Queensland. It is most important, therefore, that we draw the attention of the Government to the serious problem of unemployment, because we believe that it is as important as droughts and floods, which affect the farmers.

The hon. member for Ithaca, who has just resumed his seat, said that unemployment figures have improved greatly in the past few months. That may be the way he feels and the way other members on the Government side feel, but we on this side view the position as still very serious. Figures were produced and quoted by the hon. member for Ithaca. "The Courier-Mail" of 16 October, 1962, stated that 12,000 people were still unemployed in Queensland. In February of this year, 30,000 people were unemployed in this State. A comparison of those two figures discloses that 33½ per cent. of the unemployed in February are still unemployed. The seriousness of this position is that hon. members opposite say, "We have overcome this problem; we have returned everybody to work." That would be all right if it was true, but that position has not been achieved as is evident from the statement I quoted in "The Courier-Mail" of 16 October disclosing that 12,000 people are still unemployed. Those people have been suffering undue hardship for far too long in the view of the Opposition, and we want to see the position quickly rectified.

Those figures would undoubtedly include about 3,600 juniors who have not been able to find work since leaving school last year. But we must not lose sight of the fact that we are again attending speech nights throughout the State, and within six weeks that figure of 3,600 will jump by thousands. That is what is concerning us, and we cannot treat the matter lightly.

Mr. Gilmore: What do you think should be done about it?

Mr. NEWTON: If the hon. member for Tablelands, who is always interjecting while I am speaking, listens he will hear from me what should be done about it. This Government is withholding £3,500,000 that was received for the purpose of relieving unemployment. If that money were used, in conjunction with certain other factors in the Budget with which I will deal, this problem could be overcome. But it will have to be used very quickly. The Government has stated quite openly that it is retaining this £3,500,000 until seasonal work finishes, but I cannot see it being retained until Christmas because, by that time, the position will be back to where it was in February this year. The Government will have to move very quickly in spending this extra amount of money that it got from the Commonwealth Government to provide employment.

The hon. member for Condamine, when speaking in this debate the other day, attacked hon. members on this side. He

challenged us and said we knew nothing about farming or farmers' problems. I tell him now that, since I entered Parliament in 1960, I have frequently listened to speeches by members of the Australian Labour Party on land matters, agricultural matters, and other matters affecting farmers and, having worked on farms prior to enlisting in the last war, I say that their speeches have been very sound. I advise the hon. member for Condamine to listen more closely to what is being said by hon. members on this side. If he does, he will not condemn them for what they say.

Let me refer to his own area. On a number of occasions I have spoken on automation and I have noticed that the hon. members who raised questions as to what it is, what it means and what we intend to do about it, are the very ones who should know something about it. Prior to the war I worked on the Darling Downs, where we ploughed with ten horses in a team and picked corn by hand. Most things were done by hand in those days. Immediately the farm hands enlisted to fight for their country their labour was replaced by machines. I challenge any hon. member opposite to deny that. Within a very short time after we enlisted they changed over to milking machines and tractors, because farm labour was not available.

Mr. Sullivan: Has the hon. member for Condamine ever spoken contrary to that?

Mr. NEWTON: The hon. member for Condamine told us the other day that we knew nothing about it. I should not like to use the whole of my time in telling the hon. member for Condamine and some of his Country Party colleagues of the changes that have taken place in the farming industry since 1939. If I did, I know quite well that I would bring home some truths that would dig deep into their flesh. I do not care what area they want to take. Let them take the Darling Downs area, the Mary Valley area, where I worked on a farm engaged in dairying and pig raising, or the Premier's electorate, with its pineapple industry. As a matter of fact, I have even had a go in the sugar-cane industry. If they want to know something of the problems of farming, I point out to them that nobody knows them better than the person who is working for the farmer. (Government laughter.) The hon. member for Tablelands can laugh all he pleases.

Mr. Gilmore: The farmer would not know, but the person working for him would!

Mr. NEWTON: I did not say that.

Mr. Gilmore: You did.

Mr. NEWTON: I did not. In order to capitalise on something that is said, the hon. member misconstrues it to suit himself. I said: "Who would know better about what has to be done on the farm than the farm-hand who works with the farmer?" At least

I have had my say. I advise the hon. member for Condamine to treat these things much more seriously than he has in the past.

The Treasurer pointed out that the State had received an additional £1,000,000 as a result of increased population. I ask why he and the Premier were not able to convince their counterparts in the Federal sphere that the State should receive the additional revenue that we were entitled to in the past. However, the Treasurer has said that there is no prospect of recovering those past losses. If there has been an error in working out what the State is entitled to from the Federal Government, surely the present occupants of the Treasury benches could state a case for Queensland. Why should we not get compensation for the entitlements we did not receive in past years? In the debates on a private member's motion, the Address in Reply, and the Financial Statement, hon. members opposite have openly stated that never has there been more co-operation between the Queensland and Federal Governments, yet they have the hide and audacity to bring down a Budget wherein they tell us that although an error has occurred there is no hope of recovering past losses! The Treasurer and the Premier have the right at any time to raise these issues at a Premier's Conference or a Loan Council meeting.

This is the third occasion on which the Treasurer has used industrial trouble as an explanation in his Financial Statement for part of the deficit in the Railway Department. The Government has only itself to blame for any portion of the deficit in the Railway Department Estimates that was caused by the Mt. Isa industrial dispute. If the Minister for Transport had acted as quickly against the management of Mount Isa Mines Ltd. as he did against the workers at Commonwealth Engineering Ltd. during their dispute, because of the serious effect that he said it would have on the railways, the problem could have been overcome and no loss would have been occasioned to the Railway Department by the dispute at Mount Isa Mines Ltd.

Thanks to the hon. members for Burke and Townsville North, who invited me, I recently had the pleasure and privilege of visiting Mt. Isa. On my trip to that township I was very concerned over a number of matters that the Government has not attended to. One of the problems raised by the people in the area was the lack of provision of homes by the Queensland Housing Commission. Everywhere I went, where there were people who were not permanent workers at the mines, I found that they were living in sub-standard accommodation, worse than anything I have seen in Brisbane. I saw six families living in one house. That is a shocking state of affairs. The Treasurer controls housing, and it is to be hoped he will try to do something about this problem.

I will deal now with the money that has been saved by the various departments. When we look at the Financial Statement

we see that an amount totalling about £1,000,000 has remained unspent by the various departments. That is not necessarily a very good result when we know what we are confronted with in this State, and what the position was particularly in February of this year. We know that £1,000,000 could have been used by the Government in various departments. That would have helped the Government to employ more young people, especially those who left school last year. I asked the Premier questions about this matter. He replied that he could not indicate very clearly the number of young people who had been employed in Government departments, yet the Treasurer brought down a Financial Statement which showed that an extra £1,000,000 could have been used wisely in placing these young people in Government departments. I do not care whether they are placed in the building industry or any other industry. The Government Printing Office has facilities for training young people and I know that not one young person was put on there this year. That is one avenue of employment for them and there are other Government departments where young people could be employed.

Another interesting thing about the Financial Statement is that while it is a lengthy report—longer than we are accustomed to receiving—we must watch what the Treasurer does on behalf of the Government. If we watch the Press reports from time to time, particularly when the Federal Budget is introduced, and the Queensland Treasurer is beginning to warm up to introduce his Budget, we find that he makes various statements. One such statement appeared in the "Telegraph" of 10 August, 1962. It reads—

"The Treasurer, Mr. Hiley, said today he thought a revision of the Federal Budget might be necessary in the middle of the year. Mr. Hiley said he had some doubt that general provisions of the Budget would lead to as rapid a revival in the commercial and private consumption sector of the economy as might be desirable."

Why did the Treasurer say that? Simply because he is not quite sure that the State will be back on a sound footing six months after the introduction of the Budget in the Federal House or in the State House, so he is making sure of a let-out in case his Budget proposals do not rectify the position. He clearly indicates that he hopes that the position that was available to him in February of this year will be available to him again next February, if necessary. We hope that it will. I remind him, though, that he will not have the effect of the adverse Queensland vote in the Federal election of December, 1961, to support him. That was of course the real cause of the Federal Government's move to help the State. This time the Treasurer and the Premier will have to stand on their own feet.

It is good to see in the Financial Statement provision for necessary developmental works. Nobody objects to them but, as I have pointed out before, they can sometimes be top heavy in favour of one section of the community. If the Government took that fact into consideration when introducing Budgets, the problem that concerns the people in the metropolitan area and provincial cities and towns might be better handled than it has been in the past three years by this Government.

The lengthy summary mentions a number of projects that the Government intends to carry out. Some of them have been before us in the past. I note that there is to be an increase in workers' compensation benefits. That is long overdue. Since this Government took office there has been a general tightening up in allowing claims. Only recently I tried to put before the Treasurer a number of questions on it, but I was ruled out of order. I do not disagree with that—I accept Mr. Speaker's ruling—but when dealing with compensation we should put the position clearly before the people. Today we find something that never happened under an A.L.P. Government. It has to do with opening a new claim on an injury or condition for which there had been an old claim for compensation. In the past, when trouble from an old injury recurred, the normal procedure was to notify the employer. If the employer felt it was warranted, he would advise the worker to see a doctor or to go to the General Hospital. If the doctor agrees that the old complaint has been aggravated by the work that the person is doing, a fresh claim should be made on the old claim.

A very serious position exists at present. Claims arising from former claims admitted by the local or hospital doctor are not met immediately by the State Government Insurance Office. We find that claims are being held up for as long as six or eight weeks. On some occasions claimants have to appear before workers' compensation doctors to see if their claims are genuine and if the decisions of the doctors who sent them along are correct. When the workers' compensation doctor himself is not sure, the claimant is asked to see a specialist.

While all this is going on, the worker and his wife and family are expected to manage the best way they can. If the State Government Insurance Office doubts that a particular claim can be met immediately—in most cases claims are dealt with very quickly and are usually, if not in dispute, met within a week—I feel that the right thing to do is to advise the claimant to make a claim for social service benefits so that he and his family will have something to exist on until his claim is met or rejected. In some of these claims arising from old claims, there have been delays of up to eight weeks.

It is stated in the Financial Statement that these benefits will be increased, but they should have been increased long before this.

Since this Government has been in power, rebates have been paid to the employers each year, yet the employees, along with the employers, are very concerned that a person who meets with an accident has to wait some weeks before being told whether or not he will receive compensation. It is therefore very important that this opinion on the subject of increased compensation rates should be voiced.

I notice in the Financial Statement that, in the case of a person acquiring his own land and home, certain benefits are to be received if the amount is under £4,000, which includes the entire cost of the transaction. I wonder how many people will benefit by this. My area includes a number of Queensland Housing Commission projects. In the Broadwater Road Housing Commission estate, the price for the houses being built is a little over £300 a square. The houses are approximately 10, 11, or 12 squares, which would bring them well up in the £3,000 bracket. Because of the new valuations that will apply, when the houses are sold a value of over £1,000 will be placed on the land. This means that a house in the particular area will bring well over the £4,000 mark and will not come within the provision outlined in the Financial Statement. I am very concerned about this, because when the Government brought a Bill before the House and asked members to agree to the subdivision of land that would be sold to the people to build homes on, I thought it was going to do the right thing.

Mr. Hughes: Aren't they cheaper than any other comparable blocks on the market?

Mr. NEWTON: If the hon. member listens to what I have to say, he might learn something.

No doubt the Queensland Housing Commission has an area of land on hand at present that will be used for house-building. It has bought the land at a particular price, and when allowance is made for the cost of subdivision, the provision of water-channeling, and so on, the same thing will apply. Because of the action of the Government, through the Minister for Public Works and Local Government and the Department of the Valuer-General, the price of the blocks will be very high, and so will the price of other blocks.

Mr. Campbell: You know that is not true.

Mr. NEWTON: I invite the hon. member to come out any time he likes and see for himself. Let him ask the people who are building the homes there. I know what is happening in the area because I travel through it. These are complaints that I receive about what the Government is doing. I merely take the complaints and see whether the Government will do anything about them. It is to be hoped the Government will implement the provisions of the measure that it brought before the House and endeavour to keep the cost down for those who require land on which to build homes. Neither I

nor any other hon. member on this side of the Chamber can see where this will end if exorbitant prices are to be charged for the land and if the cost of building is so high. It is not the cost of labour that makes it high; it is the cost of materials. The Government ordered an investigation into materials used in the building industry, but no results were announced. It decided to let things remain as they were.

Mr. Hughes: The city council is charging another £250. That is not helping.

Mr. NEWTON: Again the hon. member for Kurilpa interjects. With the high cost of building and the high price of land, plus the high rate of interest being charged, there is very little incentive for young people to endeavour to own their own homes. The rate of interest charged by the State is 5½ per cent., and people who build through private building societies that are not controlled by the Government pay as much as 6 or 6½ per cent., and in some instances up to 7 per cent. If a person buys a house for £4,000 and has to pay that rate of interest, it does not need a mathematician or a skilled accountant to work out what the house will cost ultimately. It is to be hoped that the Government will try to overcome the difficulty.

Much has been said in recent months about the work that is being done by the Government on a day-labour basis. As one who has had years of experience in the building industry, I place on record my appreciation of the excellent work done by day-labour workers throughout the State.

Mr. Sherrington: In every department.

Mr. NEWTON: That is true; one could take every department—the building of schools, hospitals, dams, weirs, any project one likes to cite on which men are employed on day labour, and it will be found that they are doing a magnificent job for Queensland. In addition, they are saving thousands of pounds for the various departments, money that can be invested in other projects that benefit the people of this State. That has been proved, and can be proved, quite clearly.

I must mention the recent outburst by the Master Builders' Association in demanding that the Government should give day labour away and hand over all work to contractors. After the war, when Labour was the Government, these people were not even slightly interested in doing Government work. They did not want it at any price. They were interested only in contracts on a cost-plus basis. They would not build houses, or do anything else, for the Government, because the profits outside were too good.

Mr. Hughes: Don't you believe in competitive tendering?

Mr. NEWTON: Of course, but they always have the right to tender. The hon. member for Kurilpa is silly enough to think

that Ministers, irrespective of which party is in Government, simply get a price for day labour and say, "All right, boys, go ahead and do it." That is never done. No matter what party has been in Government, these matters have been handled in exactly the same way as they are with contractors outside. Prices are asked for and if the price quoted is too high it is sent back to the department. Then, if it cannot be brought down, tenders are let outside. The hon. member should not get it into his head that it is an "open slather" for the day-labour workers. They have to keep their prices down to compete with contractors.

Mr. Hughes: They ought to tender for contracts.

Mr. NEWTON: They are already doing that. I know that to be true. I say that this demand by the master builders for the Government to do away with day labour and to give them the whole rights in the field of contracting should not be considered. If master builders and other private employers in other industries—I refer particularly to the building and metal industries—were doing the right thing today they would be apprenticing more young people to the various trades. I notice in today's "Telegraph" that Mr. James, the employers' representative, is appealing to the Government to bring in more migrant tradesmen, yet we have all the facilities here for training our own young people. I have already stated that we have almost 4,000 young people out of work now and we have the facilities to train them as the tradesmen of tomorrow, but employers do not want to do that because they have highly mechanised techniques. Why should they worry about apprenticing young people when they have all these modern techniques—electric drills, electric power-driven saws and tools of that type—with which they can get the job done twice as quickly and with twice as much "cop"? How would it assist us with the grave problems we have had this year if we were to hand over to contractors? It would not assist us in any way because they just would not employ any more workers.

The money that the Government received and used at least has been able to reduce unemployment to some extent, but here again we say, "Not enough." Had the Government opened up its various departments to young people, it would have been possible to absorb more of them in employment.

It is time somebody had something to say about stamping out jerry-builders. No-one is doing more to encourage their activities than the department under the control of the Treasurer. Jerry-builders operate on the labour-only basis of building houses. If the labour costs, without materials, of a reputable builder amount to £61 a square, jerry-builders offer a price as low as £25 a square. Contractors receiving Queensland Housing Commission contracts are letting them out

on a labour-only basis. Reputable builders say that all builders should be registered to stamp out the jerry-builders, yet by their own actions some of the contractors are encouraging them. Something should be done to protect the people. I have seen quite a bit of what is going on—phoney companies and so on. In order to stamp out jerry-builders and to protect the public we should amend the Local Authorities Act by giving more power to the building inspectors employed by local authorities throughout the State. Why should they not have greater powers? After all, in the first instance, plans and specifications have to be submitted to them for approval. Their approval is necessary for the method of building construction and the materials to be used. At the present time they have power to inspect the site plan when the stumps are being put in. Of course, you sometimes get the smart builder who, in reply to the building inspector's question, "How many rounds of steel are there in that stump?" says, "If you are game enough, brother, knock it over and find out." It places the inspector in an embarrassing position. If he pushed the stump over and the steel was in it he would be in an awkward position. To stamp out the practice of jerry-building we should bring down a Bill to amend the Local Authorities Act giving building inspectors employed by local authorities greater powers of inspection. They must have the necessary protection in carrying out their inspections.

Mr. Richter: Haven't they those powers now?

Mr. NEWTON: Not as far as I know. While working for a builder I have heard those challenges thrown out to an inspector. He has walked away saying, "What can I do?" He cannot knock the stump over.

Mr. Richter: I think there is ample power there now.

Mr. NEWTON: If there is, I stand corrected. I do not think there is any harm in examining the point. If there is not sufficient power for the inspectors, let us give it to them so that they can do their job in the interests of the people of the State and stamp out jerry-builders.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Aspley) (3.50 p.m.): I join with other hon. members in congratulating the Treasurer on his very forthright and encouraging Budget. Despite the pessimism of hon. members opposite, we still believe that it is a good Budget giving bright prospects for Queensland's development over the next few years. It also indicates positive action on the part of the Government in every department under its jurisdiction. It is quite obvious, as this debate has developed, that quite a deal of panic is growing in the Opposition ranks because they depend and thrive on adversity. The adverse conditions operating last year resulted in their success in the last Federal election, and I am quite prepared to concede they had

quite a considerable success. Because of their experience they were cock-a-hoop and they said, "Well, this is it. Here is our chance." However, because of the change in the economic climate in the succeeding months they have seen their chances gradually slipping away and, as a consequence, they have become somewhat panic-stricken at the loss of opportunities. As a result, they have tried to curry favour with their people, and with other people, by misrepresentation, at which they are very adept and adroit. Also, they have been prepared to compromise on their previous policy. We on this side of the Chamber have said, in and out of Parliament, that the Labour Party has a policy of socialism. Because of our comments the Leader of the Opposition said that we were indulging in political claptrap. I do not pluck these charges out of the air. For my authority I rely on the present Federal secretary of the A.L.P., Mr. Chamberlain, who after all, I imagine, should be an authority because he was previously the Federal president of the A.L.P. What I am about to read was said by Mr. Chamberlain two years ago. It was recently mentioned by the hon. member for Ashgrove, but I think it is worth repeating.

Mr. Houston: Do you want to get on the band-wagon?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am not on the band-wagon.

The Leader of the Opposition said that our talk about Socialism was an indulgence in political claptrap. If stating what Labour stands for is engaging in political claptrap—that is what the Leader of the Opposition implies. Two years ago, Mr. Chamberlain said—

"While it is true that the task of winning seats and finally the Government is important it should only be secondary to the primary task of formulating policy based on the Socialistic objective."

Mr. Houston: What is wrong with that?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I know what is wrong with it, but I am surprised that the Parliamentary Leader of the A.L.P. does not seem to be very happy about the present situation.

Mr. Bromley: How do you know?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I can be guided only by newspaper reports. I do not have access to the Trades Hall. This is what the Leader of the Opposition said at the recent convention of the Miscellaneous Workers' Union at the Trades Hall. I do not have access to the Trades Hall and, in consequence, I must depend on newspaper reports.

Mr. Houston: Come up some time.

Mr. CAMPBELL: If the hon. member names the day I will accept his invitation. The newspaper report is headed—

"Labour Head Advocates New Policy."

Then it continues—

"The State Labour Leader, Mr. Duggan, today said the A.L.P. had to develop definite and acceptable politics to attract and hold younger members.

"We are living in a new age and we must adjust ourselves," he said. "We must forget the horse-and-buggy days."

I imagine that, when referring to the horse-and-buggy days, he is speaking of Socialism.

Mr. Duggan went on to say—

"Improved education facilities and a better standard of professional occupation tended to lift the younger generation into a higher social group.

"The A.L.P. had to show there was a place in the party for these people."

Apparently he is acknowledging that there is not one at present. He went on to say—

"... and had to concentrate on gaining the continuing support of sons and daughters of present Labor supporters."

Again, digressing for a moment, I should imagine from the context of that statement that Mr. Duggan believes he has not the support of the sons and daughters of present Labour supporters.

He went on to say—

"The party could not be complacent and bask in the glory of the past."

Again, I imagine the reference was to the "glory" of Socialism.

He went on to say—

"Circumstances were changing and the A.L.P. policy must alter with them."

The article continued—

"Mr. Duggan was addressing 20 members of the Federal Council of the Federated Miscellaneous Workers' Union of Australia in Brisbane."

The second matter to which we wish to draw public attention is the involvement of the Labour movement with Communists despite its efforts to disentangle itself from the leech-like grip that they have on it.

Opposition Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dewar): Order! There is far too much interruption.

Mr. CAMPBELL: As I see it, the significance of the recent Trade Union Congress was that the two keynote motions, which were more political than industrial, were moved by Communists, one by Mr. Macdonald and the other by Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Houston: How do you know which were the key motions?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Simply because they were the ones that were given the greatest publicity, and I imagine that would be a release from the Trades Hall organisation. I do not know where the Trades Hall fits into

the Labour movement, but I imagine it fits into the structure of the Labour Party somewhere along the line.

Mr. Bromley: Why don't you talk about egg production? You might know something about that. You don't know anything about the subject you are discussing now.

Mr. CAMPBELL: That could be the opinion of the hon. member for Norman, but when he was talking about the T.A.B. the other day he was not very convincing.

If a section of the trade-union movement is happy with Communist domination, that is its own business; but, as a citizen, I have the right to protest against Communists obtaining their living from the trade-union movement and occupying their time in sabotaging the interests of the country. It is well known in Sydney that the current series of lectures being conducted by the Karl Marx School on the outskirts of Sydney is being devoted to studies of subversive action in New Guinea.

Mr. Houston: How do you know that? Where did you hear that?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Because I have been told. And techniques are being worked out to achieve this end, such as illegal entry, promoting candidates for election to the Legislative Council, infiltration into the co-operative movement, promoting disaffection among the native peoples, and fomenting trouble between East and West New Guinea.

Mr. Bromley: Were you a candidate?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I would have less chance of being a candidate at that school than would the hon. member who has just interjected.

These and other like topics are being concentrated on by the Australian Communist Party, most of whose members earn their livelihoods in the trade-union movement. It is because of these things that we set out to acquaint the people of Queensland with what lies behind the facade of the Labour Party. I repeat that, because the Leader of the Opposition says that we are indulging in political claptrap.

Mr. Sherrington: So you are.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The hon. member for Salisbury apparently agrees with his Leader.

Mr. Sherrington: You don't know anything about it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: A matter that has attracted much consideration in this debate, and even outside Parliament, is traffic control. One might say that it is a matter of great moment to the public. I think that most hon. members will agree that the great majority of motorists are cautious drivers, and that relatively few are trouble-makers. I consider that the recent publicity given to traffic carelessness is a condemnation of the citizenship of the relatively few heedless

drivers. I doubt if the ratio of accidents to vehicles, to which great prominence has been given in the last few weeks, is any greater than it was 30 years ago when we bear in mind the very great increase in the number of motor vehicles on the road now. It is interesting to note from statistics that cars are coming onto the roads in Queensland at the rate of an additional 100 every day. When that is realised, it is no wonder that this problem is being accentuated.

I suppose that there are as many opinions on the solution of this problem as there are cars in Queensland, as everybody seems to have a different idea on the manner in which it should be approached. I think that all fair-minded people will agree that what is required is a greater realisation by motorists of the potential danger inherent in traffic movements. All sections of the community should be bent on achieving this. Hon. members are well aware of the efforts of the Road Safety Council to promote a greater awareness of this problem, which their publicity highlights.

I believe that the petrol-distributing industry has missed a great opportunity to gain public goodwill by not assisting the Road Safety Council to publicise the need for this attitude. Rather than advise motorists to "put a tiger in the tank", and liken its product to rocket fuel, or publish similar advertisements, I believe that its sales-promotion experts would be better employed devising slogans that would highlight the need for a realisation of traffic hazards. For instance, if motorists received a pamphlet saying, "Don't kill before your next fill", I believe that would be one way of bringing home to them the danger associated with the use of motor vehicles. There is no limit to the range of slogans that could be produced by enterprising sales-promotion experts to achieve this end. I think that the oil companies would earn a much greater measure of good will amongst the motoring public than they do by their existing means of advertising.

As hon. members are well aware, the speed limit was recently reduced to 35 miles an hour, as one of a number of amendments to the Traffic Regulations, because it was the consensus of opinion of traffic authorities in Australia, who are expected to know the facts, that this was the most suitable and acceptable maximum speed in built-up areas. Even when the speed limit was 40 miles an hour motorists constantly broke that traffic regulation. I say that the majority of motorists broke that regulation, and are breaking the present speed limit of 35 miles an hour, not deliberately but through sheer inadvertence. I think all hon. members will agree with me that at times it is very difficult to watch both the speedometer and the traffic at the same time. Perhaps the greatest deterrent to speed in built-up areas now is the thought that there might be a radar-equipped vehicle somewhere in the vicinity. I believe

that the motor industry could make a contribution to the problem. If cars were fitted with a speed-limit warning device similar to the warning device now connected to the blinker lights, I think that would be of great assistance to motorists.

Mr. Houston: Do you think it should be a sound device?

Mr. CAMPBELL: In answer to the hon. member for Bulimba, I suggest that it could be a device similar to the present blinker-light warning device, which has a light as well as a sound. In my opinion, its introduction would be a great boon to motorists, because, as I said, I believe that most motorists exceed the speed limit purely through inadvertence.

There are one or two matters of great importance to the people of the Aspley electorate to which I wish to refer to reinforce the statements that I made earlier. On this occasion I shall deal only with matters relating to the Department of Education, because I believe they provide a classic example of the tremendous upsurge of activity that has resulted from the action of this Government.

Firstly, a new high school is being constructed at Zillmere. I suppose when the cost of the building and furnishings and all the ancillary costs are taken into account, the total could be in the vicinity of £100,000. Again, in Aspley East people were thrilled the other day to hear the announcement of the proposed expenditure of £30,000-odd on the erection of a new school in this area.

I should like to thank the Minister for Education and Migration and the Minister for Public Works and Local Government for acceding to my representations in this matter. I suppose every mother in that area who has a young toddler will appreciate the erection of the new school because of the alarm that parents feel at the kiddies having to cross the main Gympie Road to attend the Aspley school.

Approximately £20,000 has been spent in the last year on the extension of classroom facilities at the Aspley school. In addition, the department has purchased approximately four acres as an excellent site for a playground, again a matter that is greatly appreciated by parents and children alike. Playing facilities have been tremendously cramped at that school.

In order to cater for future requirements in this quickly developing area, the department has secured about 25 acres of land fronting Hamilton Road and Maundrell Terrace to provide for a future high school and primary school. Again, on the corner of Webster Road and Kitchener Road, an 11-acre site has been secured for future requirements for a primary school. Further along, in West Chermside another 10 acres has been secured for this rapidly growing area, and, in addition, in the last 12 months the

Stafford Heights State School and the Cherm-side State School have received the benefit of sewerage connection, which is again greatly appreciated by teachers and parents. There has also been an extension of the septic system at the Aspley school.

I mention those matters to illustrate the tremendous activities that are taking place throughout the State in the Education Department, which is typical of all the activities of this Government.

I wish to conclude on the note on which I started. We on this side of the Chamber congratulate the Treasurer on the presentation of a splendid Budget, which shows great promise for this State in the coming 12 months.

Mr. HOOPER (Greenslopes) (4.14 p.m.): Firstly, I should like to join hon. members on this side in congratulating the Treasurer on the introduction of this Budget, which so many speakers on this side of the Chamber have proclaimed as the best post-war Budget that this Parliament has seen.

I should also at this stage like to record my very sincere feelings for the previous Leader of the Liberal Party, Hon. K. J. Morris. I sincerely hope that an early recovery from the illness from which he is suffering will allow him to return to this Chamber to continue the representations that he has given in past years. I am also very pleased to see that the Minister for Education and Migration has returned to the Chamber today. I extend to him my best wishes for a very quick recovery to good health.

My purpose in rising is to bring before the notice of the Committee what I believe to be a matter of importance to the Government. I refer to the story of industrial safety in Queensland.

Prior to 1957 no work in the field of safety promotion had been undertaken in Queensland. Safety promotion must be understood as being distinct from the enforcement of safety legislation. Research in the United States of America in post-war years had indicated that the great majority of industrial accidents occurring could not be prevented merely by the enforcement of safety rules. Whilst it was essential that a safe-work environment should be provided, with at least certain minimum standards of safety, it was found by research that accidents in industry continued to occur in premises where safety legislation had been complied with.

The end result of this United States research indicated that the "human factor" had to be considered. Accidents could result from "unsafe" conditions and "unsafe" acts. Unsafe conditions could be corrected by enforcement; unsafe acts, which were causing by far the great majority of accidents, could be prevented only by a new approach entitled "safety promotion". Safety promotion involves bringing to the notice of both employers and employees the factors that can cause accidents. It seeks to bring about a public awareness of the need to prevent

work injuries. Publicity and education are the means used to achieve these ends. At the 1957 Department of Labour Advisory Committee Conference, which was held in March of that year, plans were discussed whereby officers of State departments could reach a higher level of competence in the field of safety promotion. It was decided to initiate a training course in safety promotion at Sydney during July and August, 1957. Approval was given by the Queensland Government, as one of its first decisions, for the attendance of two officers—one from the Factories and Shops inspectorate of the Department of Labour and Industry and the other from the Machinery inspectorate of the Department of Mines. The two officers duly completed the course. As a result of recommendations on their return, the Minister for Labour and Industry, Hon. K. J. Morris, gave his approval and active support to the setting up of an Industrial Safety Advisory Service. A 16 m.m. film-projector was purchased. Industrial-safety films were acquired from overseas and arrangements were made for the design and printing of safety posters and other literature. As it was felt that two sections of two different departments were both concerned generally with safety in industry, other than the mining industry, State Cabinet in September 1957, decided to transfer the administrative control of the office of the Chief Inspector of Machinery and Scaffolding from the Department of Mines to the Department of Labour and Industry. This allowed closer co-ordination of activities in the field of safety. Subsequent to this, the Minister for Labour and Industry readily gave his approval for departmental officers to attend interstate conferences and conventions on industrial safety, so that the officers were afforded an excellent opportunity to broaden their knowledge and background of the subject. Activities of the Industrial Safety Advisory Service were at first concentrated in the metropolitan area. Discussions were held with management, employers' organisations, and unions, and lectures and film screenings relating to industrial safety were carried out in factories and workshops. Supplies of safety posters were coming forward and these were widely distributed.

On the appointment in 1958 of the first full-time Assistant Under Secretary to the Department of Labour and Industry, arrangements were approved by the Government for this officer to attend the Industrial Labour Conference in Geneva and then to proceed to the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States, to investigate, among other things, the latest developments in industrial safety in those countries.

Plans were also developed in 1957 for holding, during the Queensland Centenary Year of 1959, a National Industrial Safety Convention. The Minister for Labour and Industry approved of setting up a committee comprising representatives of employer organisations, trade unions, and voluntary safety bodies under the chairmanship of a senior departmental officer to sponsor the

convention. The committee was set up under the chairmanship of this officer. That convention had a very successful publicity build-up and, as a result of detailed organisational work, it succeeded in attracting almost 700 delegates, from all States, when it took place in the Brisbane City Hall on 29 and 30 July, 1959.

Much discussion of safety matters eventuated at this convention, which proved to be a powerful means of arousing public interest in industrial safety. Many of the recommendations from joint employer-employee discussion groups were implemented by the Minister. Meanwhile the activities of the Industrial Safety Advisory Service were being extended outside the metropolitan area. Visits were made to Ipswich, Toowoomba, Gympie and Maryborough, and interest in safety promotion was engendered in those centres. The department was also co-operating closely with voluntary bodies interested in occupational-accident prevention.

A Queensland reviewing committee on safety standards of the Standards Association of Australia was set up with a departmental officer as secretary. The Queensland Government also decided to assist the National Safety Council of Australia, Queensland Division, by giving it an annual grant of £500. This organisation had never previously received such an annual grant except one Government donation of £300 in 1948. Active participation during the last few years in the activities of the Standards Association of Australia resulted ultimately in safer working conditions owing to adequately designed and operated machinery.

Consideration also was given during 1959 to securing reliable statistical data relating to occupational accidents. All States of Australia were devoid of comprehensive and reliable statistics of this type. Queensland was fortunately placed, because all workers' compensation claims in the State are handled by the State Government Insurance Office. Research was carried out by officers to formulate a suitable scheme and closer co-operation was achieved, under the provisions of the integrated statistical service, with the Deputy Commonwealth Statistician and the Government Statistician and his officers. It is interesting that the scheme formulated in Queensland, which came into effect on 1 July, 1960, is being copied by other States. Many of the administrative problems that beset this statistical scheme in its early stages could not have been overcome except by Cabinet direction, which was readily forthcoming on advice submitted by the then Minister.

It was also decided during 1959, on the recommendation of the Public Service Commissioner, that a Division of Occupational Safety should be set up within the Department of Labour and Industry. This division would absorb the activities previously carried out by the Industrial Safety Advisory Service and the division would be controlled by a

Chief Safety Engineer who would also be Chief Inspector of Machinery, Scaffolding and Weights and Measures. The Division of Occupational Safety came into effect on 1 January, 1960.

One of the main functions of the division is educating both employers and employees to become more safety-conscious. This has been of direct benefit to employees for not only has it helped to change management's attitude to safety but it has also brought to the notice of a vast number of employees just what occupational accidents can do to their capacity to earn a living, to their families, and to their future happiness. To help in this education, films, lectures and posters are used. During the period from 1957 to 30 June, 1962, some 53,000 employees have viewed the division's safety films, which now number 83. The division's safety posters have been widely distributed throughout Queensland, and, during the period stated, 25,380 posters were distributed.

Following representation from the Transport Workers' Union, a submission has been made to the Standards Association of Australia for amendments to the standard specifications covering the use of pallets in industry. The Health, Welfare and Safety Board, constituted under the Factories and Shops Act of 1960 by this Government has been instrumental in the promulgation of safety rules governing spray-painting, electric welding, construction work, and so on, while a further rule governing the safe use of portable and semi-portable electrical equipment is being finalised.

At the suggestion of the Minister for Labour and Industry, employer and employee organisations in the building industry, together with kindred professional and safety organisations, unanimously agreed to establish a tripartite occupational safety council in the building industry under the chairmanship of the president of the Queensland Division of the National Safety Council of Australia. Much has been accomplished in the almost three years that have passed since then. An increased safety consciousness has been developed within the community and concomitant with this there has been a gradual but not spectacular reduction in the occurrence of work injuries. It is not easy to express in words what this has meant in terms of human enjoyment.

One factor that in the past has been greatly neglected, and yet one that any Government has a distinct moral and social responsibility for, is the safety of its own employees. Before 1957 no Act of the Crown relating to safety, health, or welfare was applied to any government department. Although Governments before 1957 made certain regulations applicable to private enterprise, no attempt was made to provide even the minimum standards required by those regulations in government construction work,

business enterprises, and departments generally. Although this still applies, generally speaking in most cases departments now comply with those regulations.

During 1960 the Minister took to Cabinet a recommendation that a permanent inter-departmental standing committee on occupational safety among Crown employees be set up under the chairmanship of the Public Service Commissioner, with senior officers of various departments on it. That standing committee has done a good job in plans in this regard. Departments are now required to report quarterly to the standing committee on accident experience, and those reports are reviewed regularly by the committee and action is taken to discuss matters of concern to the relative department or instrumentality.

In 1961 approval was given by the Minister for the production of a film dealing with safety in the meat industry. Statistics that have been compiled by the statistical data section indicated that this industry, one of Queensland's and Australia's major export earners, had a very disturbing record of occupational injury. These statistics were subjected to close analysis and a film was produced under the direction of the departmental officers based on the major accident factors in the industry. This film has received wide acclaim throughout Australia as one of the best accident-prevention films ever produced, and the first reports received of the reception given to a copy that was sent overseas are also very favourable.

I should like to refer to an article published in "The Courier-Mail" of 13 October, 1962, dealing with this film and what the State Secretary of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees' Union, Mr. H. Field, said.

It reads—

"Speed-up methods were responsible for many industrial accidents, the Meat Industry Union State secretary (Mr. H. Field) said yesterday.

"He spoke at the State Trade Union Congress on a motion which called on the State Government to enforce the safety and welfare legislation and to prosecute defaulting employers.

"Mr. Field said: 'Employers hate to be told that speed-up methods cause many accidents.'

"He described the safety conference organised by the State Government in Townsville last April as a political stunt. Notwithstanding some interesting contributions to the discussions, employers were timing workers in producing various commodities, and were introducing T.V. to enable an employer to sit in his office and observe the rate at which men worked.

"Mr. Field said all kinds of methods of intimidation were being introduced.

"The bullocks are butchering the men, and not the butchers the bullocks,' he said.

"Figures for May, June, July, and August showed a total 1,581 visits to the first aid centre. The number of wounds was 841, and 621 of the wounds were suffered in the boning room.

"Mr. Field said meat germs—infections which followed cuts or scratches—accounted for 250 visits, bruises and scratches 158, headaches 122, and sprains and other injuries 113. Six of the 12 fractures treated were to boning-room employees.

"Mr. A. Arnell (Waterside Workers' Federation) said that last year first aid men on the Brisbane waterfront treated more than 6,000 cases of injury. This represented three treatments for each of the port's 2,000 workers. Federation members were dying at the rate of 66 a year, mainly from heart complaints.

"The motion moved by Mr. Field asked the State Government to apply all provisions of safety and welfare legislation to all of its departments, that the State Coal Mines Act be amended to remedy inadequacies; that lead salts and red lead be eliminated from all industrial processes; and that employers with more than 100 workers employ a full-time safety officer.

"The motion was carried."

I should like to say that Mr. Field did not keep himself particularly well informed—or he did not want to—on this subject of safety in the meat industry when he referred to the film as something of a political stunt. That opinion must be qualified, because, where speed-up methods exist, without at the same time ensuring that those methods are introduced with due consideration to the safety of employees, some increase may be expected. As a matter of fact, the International Labour Organisation in its publication "Introduction to Work Study" stresses that it is necessary to have good human relations and good, safe working conditions throughout an undertaking before attempting to introduce work studies. That organisation goes on to say—

"Work study, like other things, may be imposed in certain circumstances, but managerial techniques which are accepted by workers unwillingly and without understanding rarely work properly."

There is, however, no knowledge of any major industry that has introduced such methods to increase output in which due regard has not been given to the welfare of employees. The safety engineer's comments at the Townsville Occupational Safety Convention suggested action to be taken, and did mention a suggested safety committee to be formed within the meat industry to investigate allegations made by the A.M.I.E.U. on speed-up methods. Mr. Field may have in mind the method now introduced of dressing carcasses on the rail, which is increasing the production rate in meatworks. This method has been found to be of distinct advantage to the employees in reducing the number of injuries.

The figures quoted by Mr. Field are not official statistics. Their source is not known, and his information seems to refer to minor injuries apart from lost-time accidents. The official statistics for this division of the meat and fish-processing industry for the quarter ended 30 June, 1962, show that there were 1,071 lost-time accidents, of which approximately 48 per cent. were lacerations to the upper limbs, most of which could have been prevented had the A.M.I.E.U. given clear-cut support to the wearing of personal protective equipment by its members. It is interesting to note that Mr. Field does his best to condemn safety in the meat industry. His attack on the meat industry safety film is completely out of line with the opinion of the Federal council of his union, which recently saw the film at its annual meeting in Sydney and congratulated all those associated with its production.

The statement that the Occupational Safety Convention in Townsville in April was held for political purposes is very much at variance with the facts. The planning for this convention was in the hands of a committee which comprised not only State officers but also representatives of employer and employee organisations and independent bodies. The coverage given by the convention and the method of presentation were agreed to unanimously by the committee. Union organisations were asked to nominate the speakers under various subject headings. The speakers listed on the main programme were distributed as evenly as possible, and an analysis shows that they comprised one Commonwealth Government officer, 6 State Government officers, 15 employer representatives, 9 union representatives, and 4 independent organisation representatives. The figure given for employer representatives includes three safety officers who, by the nature of their duties, should actually have been classified as independent persons.

Further to the Occupational Safety Convention held in Townsville, the proceedings and commentary have been examined very closely, and, as you are aware, Mr. Taylor, recommendations based on the address given and the commentary have been made for further action by the Government, or by employer and employee organisations. This point might be emphasised to indicate not only to the A.M.I.E.U., of which Mr. Field is the State secretary, but also to the industrial unions that the information obtained from the convention has not been forgotten and that action is in hand to implement a number of recommendations that were made.

In regard to Mr. Field's motion asking for all safety provisions to be applied to State Government departments, it is pointed out that although none of the Acts now includes any provision to bind the Crown, since the formation of the inter-departmental standing committee, which I have mentioned previously, on occupational safety within the Public Service, there has been a much greater

awareness of the need for safety, and all State Government departments are now following out the health, welfare, and safety provisions of the various Acts on a voluntary basis. Indications are that there has been a decreasing trend in the number of accidents to Crown employees over the last three years.

The section of Mr. Field's motion calling upon the State Government to prosecute defaulting employers is a matter that is watched very closely by the departments concerned, and, where prosecution is justified, I believe that the necessary recommendations are made.

In his suggestion that employers with more than 100 workers should employ a full-time safety officer, Mr. Field is probably not aware of the British and New Zealand Acts, which require a safety officer where more than 20 persons are employed on construction work. As these requirements are a comparatively recent introduction in both New Zealand and Great Britain, the Government is watching very closely the results in those countries. The number of organisations with more than 100 workers that employ a full-time or part-time safety officer is increasing rapidly, and the publicity and educational work performed by the Division of Occupational Safety is aimed at the employment of a safety officer on a voluntary basis rather than under the compulsion of legislation.

The A.M.I.E.U. in this State could give a lead in this regard by delegating to one of its officials responsibility for the safety of its members. In the meat- and fish-processing industry, for the quarter ended 30 June, 1962, the number of man-days lost through temporary disabilities was 19,021. Whilst this was a reduction on the previous quarter's figures of 19,160 man-days, it is still a disturbing figure. It is equivalent to a work force of 292 men in the industry being off work as the result of injuries for the whole of the quarter.

By the production of a widely acclaimed film, the department is making a constructive attempt to reduce pain and suffering and economic loss which must be occurring in the homes of so many meatworkers in this State. Mr. Field's destructive comments can only accentuate the loss of confidence of his members in work-study methods which, if they were accepted, could assist towards a reduction in occupational accidents in industry.

I believe that occupational safety is something that all employers and employees should take to their hearts. I realise that in Queensland they have been educated and are gradually accepting the responsibility to keep down loss of time by injuries at work.

Before resuming my seat, I should like to touch on another department which I believe has done a magnificent job during the term of this Government. I refer to the Department of Public Works and I congratulate the

Minister, who is in the Chamber at the moment, on the fine work he has done since he assumed control of this department.

I think it is very apt that I should make several observations as to what the department has done in the construction of additional schools since this Government assumed office, and to compare its term with the previous five years of Labour rule. I want to be fair about this. I refer to the expenditure by the Department of Public Works on State public buildings during the period from 1 July, 1957, to 30 June, 1962. I will not bore members with a great host of figures, but the total for the five years I have mentioned is £31,886,918. Referring back to the last five years of the previous Labour Government, the amount spent on the same work was £14,767,911. Going a little further, building works financed from Loan Funds included the erection of new buildings, additions to existing buildings, the supply of furniture and equipment at public buildings including State education establishments—primary schools, high schools, and technical colleges, courthouses, police stations and other public buildings throughout the State. Works financed from Loan Funds included hospital, maternal and child welfare including new buildings, additions, &c., at maternity hospitals and maternal and child welfare centres.

For some time emphasis has been on the provision of adequate classroom accommodation for both primary and secondary schools, to meet the demand occasioned by a rapidly increasing population. The number of classrooms provided at primary and secondary schools during the last five years is as follows, and I intend to tabulate the figures because they are very interesting—

Year	Total Classrooms provided
1957-1958	434
1958-1959	483
1959-1960	461
1960-1961	449
1961-1962	316
Grand Total	2,143

Over the previous five years with Labour in office the total was 1,493. They are just one or two aspects of the work of the Department of Public Works in the construction field. I will not go any further into this subject because one or two of my colleagues intend to deal more fully with it. Hon. members opposite do not like the medicine "dished out" to them by hon. members on this side, but we can prove to them the wonderful job done by both the Department of Public Works and the Department of Education in this field.

In the debate on the Financial Statement last year I pointed out that the Department of Public Works was doing an excellent job but that the department would do well to appoint a qualified person on the construction side as a Director of Public Works.

My only criticism is constructive in nature. I suggest that perhaps the supervisors could do a little more than they are now if they were encouraged by a director—a man who could keep the continuity of work going without hold-ups in material or labour. I again emphasise the points that I raised last year. I urge the Minister to consider the appointment of someone in that field so that the work could be better dovetailed.

I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Belmont about builders and building inspectors, although I missed the early part of his speech. I have already spoken to the Minister for Public Works and Local Government about building inspectors in the local-government sphere. In all fairness I point out that the Minister has been carefully looking into the problem for some time. It is not an easy one because in some shires—even close to Brisbane—the inspections are carried out by a person holding the joint positions of health inspector and building inspector. The Minister has given the matter his sympathetic consideration. He is still looking at it because it is a matter that is dear to his heart, as it is dear to the hearts of many in the building industry.

Mr. BAXTER (Hawthorne) (4.48 p.m.): One of the most important subjects that has come before the Committee during the debate on the Financial Statement is the matter of traffic control. In the last three years many regulations dealing with alterations to the law covering traffic in Queensland have been tabled. Throughout the world traffic problems must be dealt with in the parliamentary sphere completely divorced from politics. In England many difficult problems arise; in America many difficult problems arise. Indeed, today America is the world's most motorised unit. We can learn much from the failures of the American approach to the control of traffic, and the accidents that occur in that country. We can gain advantage and knowledge from the special committees that have been set up in England and on the Continent to deal with traffic and the accidents arising from it. We must forget for the moment that we are talking about England or America. This problem is extremely important and it is most imperative that we tackle it properly.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: I wish the hon. member for Condamine would cease interjecting. I wish to put forward my submissions without any unnecessary or stupid interjections.

We must deal with this problem on a national basis, as well as on a State basis. I agree entirely with the remarks of some hon. members on the Government benches, but I retain the right, as a member of the A.L.P., and a member of the rank and file, to express my opinions in this Chamber. We have our people to consider, just as hon. members opposite have theirs to consider.

I should like to refer to "Hansard", Volume 225, for the 1959-1960 session when the Minister for Labour and Industry was introducing a Bill concerning a traffic advisory commission. I want hon. members opposite to remember that I am referring to the "Hansard" of 27 November, 1959. The Traffic Commission was to comprise the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, the Commissioner of Police, the Commissioner of Main Roads and the Town Clerk of the Brisbane City Council. The duties of the Commission were concerned briefly with the desirability of making recommendations on works to improve the flow of traffic over the existing road-transport system of Brisbane and to reduce the economic loss. It is imperative at this stage that we keep that in mind for future reference. We must realise fully that we are fast becoming mechanised or motorised, or whatever we like to term it. We are fast becoming controlled by mechanisation. It was during this period that we departed from the previous policy of the A.L.P. We went from a limit of 35 to 40 miles an hour in built-up areas. The whole of Queensland was put on the basis of 40 miles an hour in built-up areas, but we could travel faster on the open highways. Today we have the same Government in office bringing in an Act to facilitate the passage of transport through the city, but unfortunately it has taken a retrograde step and has reduced the speed limit from 40 to 35 miles an hour.

For 20 years residents in my area—and it is a comparatively small area—have been able to come into the city to their places of employment without striking any bottle-necks, but since 1 October they have had to suffer the inconvenience of bottle-necks involving anything up to 50 cars. If the Minister wants me to give him the periods, I will give them because I think he needs assistance. I say the Government's action is wrong.

We should be moving ahead. Overseas countries have passed through the stage at which we now are; they have solved many of the problems that will confront us in the next decade, so we should look to England and America, and other countries, for guidance.

Mr. Gilmore: Do you think it would be an advantage to raise the limit to 45 miles an hour instead of reducing it to 35 miles an hour?

Mr. BAXTER: The motor vehicles of today, whether they be four-cylinder or six-cylinder, 10 h.p. or 80 h.p., are built to cruise comfortably at between 40 and 50 miles an hour.

Mr. Ewan: But some drivers are going faster than that.

Mr. BAXTER: That does not matter. I am answering the interjection of the hon. member for Tablelands. I am fully in accord with his thought that we should introduce a

regulation providing for a minimum speed of 40 miles an hour for sensible drivers in certain circumstances. Later I will develop that point because it is very important.

I repeat that we should look to overseas countries for guidance, because they are more advanced than we are and have already experienced some of the difficulties that still lie ahead of us.

We should do everything in our power to provide a minimum of a four-lane highway from Brisbane to Cairns. We should be bigger than individuals. We should build something that will give us tomorrow the greatest asset that any Government could have—the benefits of the potential of North Queensland. We must attract tourists, and today they come not by train, aeroplane, or boat, but by motor-car. Let us provide them with the means to travel in Queensland, and we will receive the benefit that flows from an influx of visitors. I have travelled a good deal by car with my family, and I speak with authority when I say that Queensland has the greatest asset of any State, but it has been neglected for too many years. We now have to go to it as hard as we can.

Mr. Ramsden: You didn't do it before.

Mr. BAXTER: In reply to that interjection from the hon. member for Merthyr, we tried, but there was at that time an antagonistic Federal Government that did everything to kill us. That is why we could not progress. We have in Queensland today a Country Party-Liberal Government with an "open sesame" to the coffers of the Treasury, but it has yet to be proved conclusively to me that this Government, in the period in which it has been in office, has, with a Federal Government favourably disposed to it, done any better than we of the Australian Labour Party did in the same period, with a Federal Government opposed to us.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: Do not force me into an argument. I shall prove that is so. I know conclusively that we of the Australian Labour Party, while sitting on the Government benches, did more for Queensland, with lesser grants, than has the Country Party-Liberal Government in the comparable period of time that it has been there. It has had £4,500,000 more than we ever received at any time. What is the Government going to do with it? If we come back here in 12 months' time and we are sitting exactly as we are now, which I know we will not be, and hon. members opposite can tell me that they have done more for the State of Queensland than we did, with one-third less than the amount that they have received, I shall bow my head and say, "Thank you very much," but they cannot do it, and I shall tell them why.

Government Members: Yes, we can.

Mr. BAXTER: Hon. members on the Government back benches are calling out, "Yes, we can," but how can they?

Anyone with a knowledge of economics will know that during the last few years the value of the £1 has decreased by at least two-thirds. Whereas we could speak of £1,000 in 1955 or 1956, the comparable figure now is £4,000, but the larger amount gives no greater advantage because the value of the £1 is less. That is because there are sitting on the Government benches in Canberra those who have done everything possible to kill the purchasing power of money in Australia, particularly in Queensland. The weakest representation on those benches has been from Queensland. The Queenslanders, who are members of the Liberal Party and the Country Party, have voted on numerous occasions for the expenditure of money in South Australia, Western Australia, and Victoria, to the detriment of Queensland, and particularly to the detriment of North Queensland, which is the greatest part of the State. Little development has taken place in North Queensland in the last 20 years, and from my knowledge of that part of the State, I tell hon. members that if any country decided to invade Australia it could put 20,000 troops into North Queensland without our knowing that they were there and within six weeks they would be providing all their own needs. Why? Because we had a Brisbane Line. The Government of the day said, "All right. Get rid of everything north of Brisbane." Do not underestimate the value of the Brisbane line. I warn you too, sir, not to under-estimate—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I advise the hon. member that if there is any warning to be done, the Chairman will do it.

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Taylor, my expression was to you. I warn you, sir, that any danger that arises there—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BAXTER: This is very important, and I am worried about it. We must do something for North Queensland and Central Queensland.

To return to the subject that I was discussing, I shall tie in my statements on North Queensland, Central Queensland, and Southern Queensland with the subject of traffic control. The Acting Minister for Labour and Industry is not here now because he is attending to his official duties as an acting Minister, but I want to pay him this compliment—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the hon. member that there is no Acting Minister for Labour and Industry. The hon. member for Wavell will not be sworn in till Thursday.

Mr. BAXTER: I am sorry, Mr. Taylor. I thought he had been sworn in. I say to the Acting Minister-elect that he has a very difficult problem on his hands. As a friend of his, I should like to advise him not to be so forthright in his statements.

A Government Member: Why attack him now?

Mr. BAXTER: I am not going to attack him. I am a friend of his. He has a very difficult job during this period of government. I am not going to predict what will happen after the next election, but I do wish him every success during his period of office. Although I will fight him tooth and nail all the way, I offer him my congratulations and express the hope that he will be sensible in administering his portfolio. I say that wholeheartedly, because he is a man in whom I have a great deal of confidence. He must carry the baby because it was the Minister for Labour and Industry who controlled the traffic regulations and who said that we must do everything possible to give speedy transit to traffic through the streets of Brisbane and in adjacent country areas. It was during his term that the 40 miles-an-hour speed limit was introduced. There is nothing wrong with that. I agree with it.

Mr. Pizzey: Would you like to develop the minimum speed limit proposition?

Mr. BAXTER: I will develop it, and the Minister will be surprised at what I tell him. I will give him a personal experience I had a fortnight ago coming from Southport to Brisbane. The hon. member for South Coast, or the hon. member for Logan, can tell hon. members just how far it is from Southport to Brisbane. One would think that with traffic moving as fast as it does today one could cruise at a fair speed on an open road outside a built-up area. What is the speed limit outside the built-up area?

The CHAIRMAN: 60 miles an hour.

Mr. BAXTER: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. It is 60. As I say, I was coming up from Southport and had an experience which stressed just where the Government has fallen down on its job. My experience can be encountered on almost all roads in Brisbane and nearby areas, particularly on the roads to the North Coast and the South Coast, when the traffic is heavy at the week-ends.

It is only a hop-step-and-jump from here to Southport, and in travelling that distance last Sunday week I was prepared to sit behind the traffic. It took me 2½ hours to come from the junction of the Gaven Highway to the Creek Road-Logan Road intersection.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: I know the shrewd boys over there with high-powered cars will interject. The point I am making is that if a man drives dangerously by doing something that is detrimental or dangerous to human life, quite apart from driving at excessive speed, he should be convicted. But what must a driver do if he is stuck behind, as I was, a bluey-grey Holden, 1953 to 1955 model, and a little Ford Prefect, which crawled along at

20 miles an hour? In stating that I do not want it to be thought that I am a police pimp, something that I would never desire to be. This was on the open road after we had left Southport. The smart boys opposite say, "Why didn't you pass him?" I was two cars behind at that stage. I was prepared to stay there. It was to my advantage and, as a result, I am alive today. We came to a divided highway. I put it on record now that that divided highway would not have been constructed but for the previous Minister for Transport in the Labour Government. What happened when we got to the divided highway? The Holden went to the middle of the road and the little old Prefect went to the outside of him. Nobody could pass. Do not forget that they were travelling at 20 miles an hour. They had fulfilled every obligation the Government had imposed upon them. But what happened? The Government's legislation incited other drivers to pass them. This is not a matter for levity; it is a very important matter indeed. At this stage there were three cars in front of me—a Fairlane and two Packards. Those three cars went around. The Fairlane went for at least 50 yards in a state of quivering hesitation as to whether or not it would stay on the road. It was not that the vehicles were travelling at an excessive speed. The whole incident was caused because in his ministerial capacity the hon. gentleman did not have the guts to say that the person travelling at 20 miles an hour jeopardises the lives of many people by not moving to the left-hand side of the road and staying there. If the Minister was fair in his administration he would come forward and say that the man who does not do the right thing on a divided highway should suffer a penalty. I say without fear of contradiction that he should pay a penalty of £500 because he contributes more to the accident rate than the so-called drunken driver or the excessive speedster. The Minister has fallen down on his job because he has not done the right thing. He should put up signs worded, "Vehicles averaging under 40 miles an hour keep to the left; vehicles averaging more than 40 miles an hour keep to the right." He should be fair to the police officers. They should be given instructions so that they can take appropriate action against the motorist who, by not allowing other drivers to pass him, forces them to drive dangerously. The motorist who brings about that situation should be required to pay a greater penalty than the driver who passes him. The greatest factor contributing towards the unpopularity of the Police Force and the Government lies in the fact that the police will take action against a driver travelling at 30 or 40 miles an hour but they will not take action against the driver doing only 15 miles an hour who jeopardises the lives of hundreds of people every time he goes on the road.

Why should it take 2½ hours to return from Southport? It is only a comparatively few miles. It is a normal 1½-hour run, yet it took us 2½ hours. I am a normal driver.

I like to travel at 40 to 50 miles an hour on the open road. Anyone who does that is doing quite well. In the city the normal driver travels at 25 to 30 miles an hour. I do not care what is said about the normal driver. My sympathy is with him. I do not want him to have to take unnecessary risks because of the stupidity of other people who are not normal drivers, and they are not all blokes who wear leather jackets. The hon. member for Nundah says they are decent citizens. We have decent citizens who travel at 20 miles an hour. They have a streak in their make-up and for some reason or another they will not travel on the side of the road and allow faster cars to coast past them. When all is said and done, nobody wishes to travel very much faster than the other fellow. He wants to cruise along according to the capacity of his car, and because of the improvement in mechanisation most cars will cruise at from 40 to 50 miles an hour. There may be times on double-lane highways where it is necessary to drive at 60 miles an hour to pass.

I stress emphatically that we have to do something as a Parliament and not as Opposition members or Government members, and place on record that we believe that drivers who travel at from 20 to 25 miles an hour must get out of the way for the person who travels conscientiously and safely at from 40 to 50 miles an hour.

Mr. Pizzey: That is the law now. They are required to move over.

Mr. BAXTER: That is just what I wanted the Minister to say. The Minister says that it is the law now, but he has done nothing to prevent the man who travels at 20 miles an hour from controlling the passage of cars on a double highway.

Mr. Nicklin: I suggest that you should have taken that man's number and reported it to the Police Department.

Mr. BAXTER: I can give it to the Premier if he desires, but, as I said earlier, I am not a police pimp. Once again, through you, Mr. Taylor, may I say to the Premier, "Never mind about my taking his number. I know his number. I know his car. I even know the person." I have had a talk with him. He is justified in doing what he did because the Premier, the Cabinet, and the Government as a whole have done nothing so prevent him from staying in the middle of the road travelling at 20 miles an hour. The Premier knows that the double roads were designed for the passage of vehicles travelling faster than others. That was not passed by his Government, but in our time. The Premier knows very well that double highways were provided so that the fast-moving traffic could get away from the slow-moving traffic. There is nothing more frustrating today than the feeling which the Government is creating.

Mr. Knox: Do you suggest that the £500 fine you propose will stop that?

Mr. BAXTER: Yes.

Mr. Knox: Do you recommend it?

Mr. BAXTER: I do. If hon. members opposite gave it the same publicity as they give the 35-mile-an-hour limit, they would have nobody in the middle of the road travelling at 20 miles an hour when there is faster traffic doing 30 or 40 or 50 miles an hour as it is entitled to do, and 60 miles an hour, for that matter. I say that in all sincerity. It will help the police officers to do their job.

Mr. Knox: If the A.L.P. is returned to office will it bring in a fine like that?

Mr. Bennett: The hon. member for Wavell went past you at 50 miles an hour.

Mr. Knox: I am asking the hon. member a question. If Labour came into office would they introduce that fine?

Mr. BAXTER: To the hon. member for Nundah I must say in all truthfulness, as I said when I began my speech, that I am speaking now as an individual representing a constituency in Brisbane. I would not know. But I would urge them to do so because I think it is essential to do something along those lines.

I have told the Committee of the three people who went around the right-hand side of the two cars.

Mr. Ramsden interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. member for Merthyr should wait a while because he is on a committee that might have to deal with the subject I am about to speak on. Anybody who drives a car knows that the person on the left-hand side of a driver is on what is commonly known as the "blind" side. Let us go back to the same day, last Sunday week. Because of this Government's legislation, because of its administration of it and its instruction to the Police Department on it, when I did not go round the cars in front of me—and I reiterate that I did not want to because I wanted to use it against hon. members opposite; I will be honest—a little Morris 8/40 with seven people in it came round me on the blind side, my left-hand side. Hon. members know as well as I do that that is the wrong side to pass on. It passed me and these two other cars, the Holden and Prefect. Who forced it to do that, if not this Government? Let us be sensible about the open road and impose a penalty on the driver who retards the progress of traffic along the roads. The three people who went round me on the right-hand side were quite entitled to, but, because of the state of the road, only two got through and the third hit a soft shoulder that gave him a particularly dangerous stretch of perhaps 20 or 25 yards.

I do not condone for a moment the action of the young fellow who came up on my left-hand side, which is my blind side in

driving, and passed, I am told, at least 15 cars. He was lucky to get through. If he had not, there would have been an accident somewhere along the road. He would not have had to come up on the blind side if the Government and its police officers did the right thing and made those men in front do the right thing, too. Why was that man in the middle of the road? Why did the man in the second car close up the middle of the road?

The Government has forgotten the most important part. It is influenced too much by statements that the road toll is so-and-so, and that the majority of accidents in Queensland are due to "grog" and excessive speed. Where was the influence of those two things in the actions of the three who did the right thing and the fourth who did the wrong thing in passing on my blind side and who was fortunate enough to get away with it? Neither of those influences came into that situation.

The greatest factor contributing to accidents today is the legislation of this Government. These things have been allowed to become rampant. I am sure that the hon. member for Nundah, who is trying to say something to me, will agree.

Mr. Knox: That matter of the person passing on the wrong side is serious. What sort of penalty would you provide for that offence?

Mr. BAXTER: There is no law today that would give me the right to impose on him the full penalty. I think that he was a greater threat to the lives of others than was the person who went before me and broke the law by trying to go round on the right-hand side. There is no retreat for the man who comes up on the left-hand side.

Mr. Knox: He should go to gaol, do you mean?

Mr. BAXTER: Yes, for the maximum penalty.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is repeating himself a great deal. I think he has established that point. If he has other points to make, I should be pleased to hear them. I do not want him to continue repeating the same story.

Mr. BAXTER: I would not have repeated it except for the edification of the hon. member for Nundah. I think that we in Queensland have, over a period of time, done a very good job in traffic control.

Mr. Sullivan: You will agree that you have seen great changes in the road to Southport in the last five years.

Mr. BAXTER: Yes, I have. I must congratulate the Government on the fact that it has followed in exact detail the policy laid down by the former Minister for Transport, Mr. Duggan. I am not saying anything

detrimental to hon. members opposite. I think the Government has done a good job, just as former Labour Governments did a good job. We should have a four-lane highway almost all the way to the South Coast, giving access to what is, in my opinion, the best beach area within 50 or 60 miles of Brisbane.

Mr. Gilmore: Dave Low would not agree with you on that.

Mr. BAXTER: No, I know he would not. The hon. member for Condamine asked me a question and I thought he was entitled to an answer. When people from Brisbane go to the South Coast—I am one of them—they expect to receive, and do receive, the benefit of certain amenities. But when one goes to the North Coast, one strikes the slums of the coastal areas of Queensland. I say that in all sincerity. I have recently been to all the resorts as far north as Gladstone.

Mr. Camm: Only to Gladstone?

Mr. BAXTER: In fairness to the hon. member, I am not going beyond Gladstone on this occasion because it is on this area that I wanted to express an opinion on my recent experiences.

Since the Liquor Act came into force, I have made it my business to have a look at the amenities provided on the North and South Coastal areas. On the South Coast, between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m. and between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m., a man and his family can, if they wish, have a glass of ale in comfort in pleasant surroundings. If one goes to the North Coast, however, my experience is—I say this seriously—that outside of Caloundra it is a toss-up to see who the hotel-keepers think are the biggest pigs—the man and his wife who want a glass of beer or the swine that come out of the farmer's pigsty. I would not have allowed my dog to drink in the conditions under which people have to drink at Mooloolaba on a Sunday. What action has the Licensing Commission taken? It has not the guts to come forward and do something about Sunday drinking. The licensee of this hotel had a very good business. I looked through a window and saw a very attractive lounge in the building, but one could not get a drink in there. One had to go round the side to the back, where there was a veranda, 4 feet by 8 feet and 4 feet by 16 feet, with 24 tables on it at which 38 people were sitting. What would happen under those conditions? If one ordered a jug of beer, more beer would go down one's back than one drank. I had a look round, and out in the yard there were five beach umbrellas over five tables at which I counted 28 people, and there was one table without an umbrella on which there was an empty jug and eight glasses. I did not have a drink.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: I like to have a glass of beer when I want it, and so does my wife. But we like to have it in comfortable conditions. So we decided to go to Maroochydore. But what happened there? I walked into a hotel where there were 39 people in a dungeon. I then walked out and found the licensee. Anyone who knows the room that five of us share here in Parliament House could probably gauge the size of this room. It would be about 12 feet by 10 feet, and in it there were five tables at which 20 people were sitting. How can one take one's family into a place like that and enjoy a glass of beer under the veritable slum conditions that exist in these two places? I beseech the Government to do something about these conditions if they want tourists to come to Queensland, I do not care what is said about the South Coast and the broken-down trucks and cars to be seen in the wrecking yard in close proximity to Southport on any day of the week that is 200 per cent. better than my experience on the North Coast. If the hon. member for Cooroora is in the Chamber and he can prove to me that I am wrong, I am willing to apologise to him.

We have a job to do and I can speak with authority only of places in close proximity to Brisbane, but I should like to see the right thing done. I do not think that even in the next 40 years will the North Coast approach the South Coast, because they are not moving. If you go into a restaurant—

Mr. Chalk: You stand up.

Mr. BAXTER: The Minister who has just entered the Chamber says "You stand up." That is correct; you do stand up. I find these things out as an ordinary person in the community. I am like any other Tom, Dick, or Harry. I do not tell people I am the Minister for Transport, or the Minister for Railways, or the Minister for Health, or the Minister for Public Works. I do not tell them that because I would not then get the true facts. To get at the true facts one must do the right thing and meet the people on their own ground, and that is where the Government have fallen down. I speak as an individual trying to do the right thing by the State of Queensland. I want Queensland to get the greatest tourist trade of all time and if the Government is not told these things, nothing is done.

Another point I want to stress is that while the Government claims to be enforcing traffic laws, some bright boy "bobs up" somewhere in the Police Department or the Executive Building with ideas such as are contained in a newspaper article that I have here. Whether he exists or not, I do not know. He may, or he may not. He might be a figment of the imagination of the man who writes the article, but he says here that "grog" and excessive speed are the predominating factors in accidents in Queensland today.

The Minister for Labour and Industry is not present today. He initiated a move to foster friendly relations between the police

and civilians. That has to be done if the law is to be enforced, but how can statements like this be overcome. They give a certain impression to the ordinary driver if he is booked at any time. I have not time to deal with this matter; I wish somebody would give me an extension of time. But I will cite a decision of the Illinois University in America and of universities in England. They said that it was impossible to ascertain the main contributing factors in accidents. The mere fact that one man has had 10 oz. of brandy or whisky may not mean anything to him, despite the fact that his breath smells of liquor, but to another man the same quantity of alcohol could be very dangerous. I emphasise to the two boys cackling on the front benches, the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Public Works and Local Government, that it is within their jurisdiction as responsible citizens and members of the Queensland Government to ensure that if a man is booked for drunken driving at least he should have the right to say, "You test me to see whether I am drunk. Before you test me I claim the right to demand the presence of a witness who will see what happens." The man who is charged or challenged has the right of some representation. Never mind what the contributing factors may be—I could enumerate ten—whenever a police officer says, "I am going to book you for drunken driving because you have had an accident," even though the driver's breath may smell of alcohol, and despite the fact that the Illinois University and the Seven-professor University of England decided that it was impossible to tell whether a man was drunk from actual consumption, I maintain that the driver is entitled to say to the constable, "If I am to be charged with being drunk I want to undergo a test before you arrest me and I want it done in the presence of an independent witness." In my opinion, that is only fair, both to the police constable and to the motorist. He is entitled to that as an individual. I do not take away from the individual his rights. I am not, of course, condoning drunken driving in any way.

(Time expired.)

Dr. DELAMOTHE (Bowen) (5.48 p.m.): I was appalled this morning at the villainous attack by a member of the Opposition on a Government member. I was even more appalled at the basis of that attack. We on this side of the Chamber have frequently been accused of character assassination, but, I venture to suggest, never has the sort of language that was used this morning been used of members of the Opposition. If the attack had been based on some worthwhile or important principle, although not agreeing with it, perhaps one could have forgiven it.

On what was this attack based? It was based entirely on the fact that the hon. member for Sherwood made known certain facts about a person who has just been

admitted to the Q.C.E. I believe that the hon. member for Sherwood was doing a public duty in pointing out to members of the Opposition who did not know, but should have known, the past history of this man.

Mr. Graham: Don't you think we would have known?

Opposition Members interjected.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I am very pleased that members of the Opposition were not so ingenuous or naive as not to know that this man was a prominent Communist.

Mr. Graham: You had better get off that subject.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I will not get off it. I will stay on it because it is an important subject. It is important to me, and it is important to hon. members opposite. To my knowledge this man was secretary of the Collinsville branch of the Communist Party.

Mr. Graham: We know that.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: He was district organiser for the North Queensland branch of the Communist Party.

Mr. Graham: That is right: He is in the A.L.P. now.

Mr. Sullivan: You would expect that.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I should not expect him to be there because there are decent men in the A.L.P., and for the moment I just cannot understand how this man, who has been all these things that hon. members opposite know about has been accepted into the ruling body of the A.L.P. He carried out indoctrination in Communism among the youth of Collinsville, he was tossed out of the R.S.S.A.I.L.A. in Collinsville in 1948, and he was a member of the inner group of Communists in North Queensland, and in Queensland, yet hon. members opposite defend him most valiantly. In doing so, members of the Opposition, in the form of their attack, are carrying out what the R.S.S.A.I.L.A. in its latest circular on Communism describes as one of the methods of attack on anti-Communists.

An A.L.P. Member: Getting onto McCarthyism?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I do not know if members of the R.S.S.A.I.L.A. are McCarthyists. There are plenty of members of the R.S.L. who are on the Opposition side and who would resent the suggestion just as much as I. Let us see what the R.S.L. has to say.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will hon. members allow me to hear what the hon. member has to say.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: In its circular, the R.S.L. said—

"One of the most successful Communist weapons is to destroy the character and if possible the career, of anyone who successfully denounces Communism. One of

the main tasks of the Communists is to slander by any possible means those who expose their real nature. Their efforts have succeeded in Australia. In many circles in Australia it is considered worse to be a strong anti-Communist than to be sympathetic to Communists or indifferent to them."

I raise this matter because Vickers has come and he will go, but Communism is slowly infiltrating Australia. It is slowly infiltrating the world. I ask hon. members opposite to note the headlines in today's "Telegraph". Castro started like hon. members opposite, and like many of the people in Australia, apathetic and sympathetic, and then accepted aid. Now what is the theme? Missile bases erected by Russia! At one time Castro was just as unafraid of the Communists and their infiltration as are members of the Opposition, and today we are faced, for the third time in my life, and for the second time in the lives of some hon. members opposite, with the possibility of a ghastly war.

Mr. Bromley: You will dodge it, too.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I remind the hon. member that I served for five years in the last war, and I ask him to match that.

We on this side of the Chamber are on President Kennedy's side when he said today—

"One path we shall never choose is the path of surrender or submission."

Just to show that we are consistent and that the hon. members opposite are consistent, let me read this further statement from today's "Telegraph"—

"The Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, today told the House of Representatives that the Federal Government fully approved the action taken by President Kennedy to arrest the buildup of armaments in Cuba . . . 'We have instructed our own ambassador to the United Nations to do all in his power to support the passing of this (the American) resolution'."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I trust the hon. member for Roma and the hon. member for Maryborough will cease these conversations across the Chamber while another hon. member is speaking. It is decidedly rude.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Compare the Prime Minister's attitude with that of the Leader of the Opposition in the Federal House, Mr. Calwell—the Leader of hon. members opposite—who is reported in the same issue as follows:—

"The world was watching with horror the situation that was developing. The Labor Party did not want to see the extension of missile bases into Cuba or anywhere else. Australian people would hope that the crisis would be resolved in the United Nations."

Not one word of support for people with whom we are allies, for people with whom we are joined in a regional pact, for people

to whom we looked to save us in the last war and to whom we will look to save us in this war!

Almost every day that I have sat in the Chamber, I have listened to hon. members on this side sounding the tocsin, tolling the bell of warning, on the infiltration of Communism, while hon. members opposite, I am sure with their tongues in their cheeks, have stood up and supported and protected people they know to be the enemies of democracy.

Mr. Graham: We are entitled to.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Hon. members opposite are not entitled to support Communists in any circumstances. Communists are the enemies of Australia and the enemies of our way of life, and I will never cease to attack them any more than hon. members opposite will cease to support and protect them. It is time hon. members opposite woke up. The time of decision is at hand.

I should like to speak now of some of the small points in the Budget that are often overlooked. I propose to deal with a couple of matters that are of very great importance, particularly to North Queensland.

I refer first of all to the Queensland Institute of Medical Research, on which over the last three years £259,705 has been spent. Between £20,000 and £25,000 has been spent at the Innisfail field station and on work in North Queensland in other than the Innisfail area. The particular purpose of this work has been the elucidation of those two worrying diseases that occur only in North Queensland from animals there—leptospirosis and scrub typhus. It is erroneously believed that Q-fever is prevalent in North Queensland, but this is not so. It was not until the recent epidemic at Queerah that it was evident to any degree.

As hon. members know, leptospirae are primarily parasites of wild animals that occur in the tropics, and most of the work at the Innisfail field station has been concerned with acquiring precise knowledge of the species of animals that carry each type of leptospira. Investigations are being made into the food they eat, the type of country they inhabit, whether they like wet or dry areas, and so on.

Much the same thing applies to scrub typhus, which is carried by a mite that lives on some of the same animals, and a great deal of work has been done in the elucidation of that particular problem.

A very much greater problem in North Queensland, of which I am sure hon. members have seen much in writing in recent months—

Mr. Walsh: Unemployment?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: It is something much more important than that. I refer to the incidence of skin cancer in North Queensland. As hon. members know, the Department of Health and Home Affairs maintains radiotherapy institutes at Mackay, Townsville, and

Cairns. As a matter of interest, in the past year the Mackay clinic treated 1,413 cases, while, 1,380 were treated at Townsville, and 1,299 at Cairns.

Whilst the local hospitals board is responsible for the X-ray equipment and its maintenance, and the salaries of local staffs, the Government meets the fares and salaries of visiting staff who go there every three months, and the cost of employing a full-time radiographer at Townsville. Those particularly interested in skin cancer—the people who carry out the treatment, the skin specialists, and those with long experience in the North—are very keen to have undertaken something beyond the mere treatment of the many thousands of cases. It is believed that a request by the State Government to the Federal Government for an approach to the Rockefeller Foundation to undertake a research project based on the North Queensland University College could not only elucidate the cause of skin cancer, but might easily unlock the secrets of the cause of general cancer, too. That seems a very wide claim to make but it is made with a great deal of seriousness. First of all, with skin cancer the affected tissue is easily accessible for research as compared with cancer of other organs, where in many instances one has to dig to get at them. Secondly, a large amount of affected tissue is available for research, as evidenced by the many thousands of cases of skin cancer as compared with the tens of cases of other forms, and, thirdly, sunlight has been reasonably established as the cause.

If the Rockefeller Foundation can be persuaded of the force of these arguments that research into the cause of skin cancer could be a short-cut to the solution of the cause of cancer as a whole, then it is also reasonable to presume that the foundation would wish to carry out its research in an area that would supply conditions that are most favourable for it. Those conditions are that it is known that people who live in the tropics are exposed to more sunlight than people living on any other part of the earth's surface, and that in that sunlight is a much greater content than elsewhere of ultra-violet light, which is presumed, with good reason, to be the actual exciting cause. There are, living and working in tropical North Queensland, and have been for about 100 years, many thousands of the susceptible class of people, who are descendants of people from the British Isles, particularly the descendants of the ruddy Scots and the ruddy Irish. I use the word "ruddy" not as a synonym for another word. Living alongside them one finds members of another European race who have been there in some numbers since 1870, the Italians, and living beside those two races one finds the dark-skinned races of the Australian aborigines and the Torres Strait Islanders. So we have not only the susceptible races, but also two other insusceptible races, to act as controls. Therefore, I put it

as a very strong suggestion to the Government that the matter should be considered very closely, that some consultation should be held with the doctors in practice in North Queensland, and that, having been persuaded of the value of this approach, an approach should be made through the Federal Government to the Rockefeller Foundation to undertake a research project in Townsville.

Finally, before leaving these small but very important matters within the purview of the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, I think it only right that I should congratulate him upon the very great success of his recent visit to Canberra in again stimulating the generosity of the Federal Government, in this case in the payment for the hospital treatment of pensioners, which will result in at least an additional £400,000 for the State Government. I am sure that the Treasurer, having drawn up the Budget without taking this fact into account, will be very appreciative of it. The other day I listened to the hon. member for Townsville North speaking on the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report. After having listened to him I went away with the impression that what he said had been prepared by somebody who had read the report but had not understood it and had then prepared a speech for someone else who had not read it.

Mr. Tucker: That is completely incorrect, of course.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: It struck me that it had probably been prepared by the hon. member's tutor, Mr. O'Brien, who is the North Queensland secretary of the A.R.U.

Mr. Tucker: A very good man, too.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I know that the hon. member thinks so. I know that he is the hon. member's tutor in these matters.

Mr. Tucker: I assure you that it was not prepared by Mr. O'Brien.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: It gave me that impression, because I know what the hon. member thinks of him.

Mr. Camm: By whom was it prepared?

Mr. Tucker: Myself.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I would be surprised to know that the hon. member did allow "Podge" O'Brien to prepare it because he is well known in the North as one who has frequently flown the Russian flag on his premises.

Mr. Tucker: That is not true.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: It is true.

Mr. Tucker: It is not true.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: We are dealing with facts. If the hon. member wishes to confirm what I say he can ask his own Leader, who will confirm it for him. The whole tenor of the hon. member's speech was a complete distortion of the text of the report.

Mr. Thackeray interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member for Rockhampton North continues to interrupt I shall have to deal with him. I ask him to remain quiet and refrain from saying "Hear, hear!" If he persists, I will reprimand him.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I am surprised at the hon. member, because I have a great respect for him. I understand that when the Collinsville convoy was coming south he was asked to accommodate members of it and that he said, "Well, there is only one A.L.P. member in the convoy; I will accommodate him." Because of that I have always held him in great respect. I pay him that compliment.

Mr. Evans: He stood on that, too.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Yes, he did. It was in great contradistinction to his Deputy Leader, who invited all the leading Communists in that convoy to partake of refreshments at Parliament House. This sole A.L.P. man was excluded from the entertainment.

The hon. member for Townsville North in his speech attacked the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report as fostering road monopolies.

Mr. Thackeray: How true.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: "How true," says a member of the Opposition. He could not be further from the point than to say it fosters road monopolies. In fact, it sets out to destroy road monopolies, which in fact hon. members opposite fostered.

I took the opportunity, through the good graces of the Minister for Transport, to circulate a typed copy of the report to every railway union in my area. I have yet to hear one railwayman say anything other than that there is nothing for railwaymen to be afraid of in it.

The hon. member for Townsville North bemoans what the report has to say about railway men being transferred from one depot or town to another. I understand that transfers have been going on in the Railway Department since 1862.

The hon. member spoke about accommodation. Obviously he has not travelled up and down the State's railway lines and seen the wonderful accommodation that has been provided by this Government for members of fettling gangs who, in the time of his Government, were accommodated in leaky-worn-out tents.

The hon. member for Townsville North spoke about how railwaymen were hardly done by, but in the same breath he accused the Minister or Ford, Bacon and Davis—even at that stage I could not work out whom he was attacking—of causing thousands of pounds worth of losses to railwaymen in moving them from one place to another. The hon. member cannot have it both ways; either railwaymen have so much money they are in a position to lose thousands of pounds, or they are so poorly paid that they could not lose thousands of pounds.

I suppose that one of the things that railwaymen in the country and in North Queensland applauded most was the finding in the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report that pinpointed the very big losses, amounting to £2,250,000 a year, in the city. The hon. member for Townsville North spent a deal of time in urging the electrification of the suburban railways.

For a North Queenslander to do that leaves me speechless, so I will move on to the hon. member for Mackay. I am sorry that he is not in the Chamber but I did want to make one point. I could have taken a point of order on the matter at the time. He threw very loose accusations around this afternoon about my having shares in a sand company. That is completely untrue. The members of the Bowen Mineral Company are Mr. W. Hickmott and his two sons, and Mr. Alf Blair of Proserpine. Those four gentlemen also own a mine that contains a large silver-lead seam. They have sent specimens to Japan and have since received quite large orders for shipments of the ore. They have insufficient money to develop the mine so they are selling the sands for a royalty to get enough capital to develop their silver-lead mine. It will provide much-needed foreign exchange and employment for a certain number of people in my area. That is something that members of the Opposition do not like to see.

With regard to the sand the hon. member for Mackay bemoaned the fact that we were selling it overseas. We have been selling wool, wheat, sorghum and raw sugar overseas for years. We have even been selling kangaroo skins and kangaroo meat. There is an abattoir for goats' meat in the West, so I advise members of the Opposition not to go out into that area. The hon. member for Mackay thinks that we should keep all these things in Queensland—just keep the metals in the ground, the wool on the sheep, and the kangaroo skins on the kangaroos. That is his belief, despite the fact that during the time Labour was in power these exports were in order and were the correct things to do. After all, if we are to import goods we have to export others to pay for them.

To put the minds of the hon. members opposite at rest, the story is that more than 10 years ago the Bowen Progress Association sent fairly large samples of this sand down to the Australian Glass Company for testing. The association was informed that it was 99 point something per cent. silica and was admirably suitable for glass-making, but "Unfortunately", they said, "we have an inexhaustible supply of suitable sand at the mouth of the Brisbane River, so we are not interested in your sand." For 10 or 12 years the sand has remained where it is, waiting for someone to become interested in it. I applaud the action of these four gentlemen, who have been sufficiently active and keen to think of a way of financing their larger project. We should all applaud them and thank them for what they are doing.

I come now to something that will be of interest to all hon. members. According to the experts, some of the best soils in Australia are to be found in the valleys of the Bowen and Burdekin Rivers. Thanks to the activity of the Department of Public Lands in clearing brigalow and cactus, and owing to the very great efforts of the graziers in the area, some 120,000 acres of this very good land have now been opened up. At the request of the State Electricity Commission investigations have been carried out in the Collinsville and Bowen River areas concerning a dam to supply circulating water to the extent of about 4,500 acre-feet a year for a possible coal-fired steam generating plant at Collinsville. Those investigations have covered a great deal more than would have been necessary to arrive at an answer to the possibility of the storage of sufficient water for this purpose. That answer is now available, but the investigations were carried further and a fairly extensive investigation was carried out concerning six possible dam-sites on the Bowen and Broken Rivers.

The information disclosed shows a very promising situation in that, without a great deal of extra expense, a suitable dam can be constructed which will allow for the irrigation of these very wonderful soils. It is so fortunate that we all live in hope that before very much longer a decision will be made between Collinsville and the Herbert River—the choice between the coal station and the hydro station. If Collinsville is fortunate enough to be chosen, not only will a small dam on the Bowen River supply the water for the power station but it will also, with very little extra expenditure, supply enough water to irrigate 4,000 to 5,000 acres on an experimental basis, because a few miles further up the Broken River—and some of the members of my Government have already seen the site—a dam will allow the irrigation of from 40,000 to 60,000 acres. That opens up quite a promising development of Collinsville.

I hope that the choice of Collinsville as the site for a generating station will trigger off this whole development. Up to now Collinsville has been merely a coalmine with people living around it. Such a development as this will bring in a completely new set of people, first of all to build the powerhouse and storage dam, and secondly to run the powerhouse. But it will also bring in the possibility of closer settlement for the production of green-fodder crops and possibly irrigated cotton crops, for both of which there is a large unsatisfied demand. It is easy to see how that would alter the whole economy and the whole set-up of a place like Collinsville, which hitherto has been a couple of coal mines intermittently producing, with all sorts of industrial strife largely caused by their isolation and the fact that the miners dug more coal on the post office steps than they ever dug underground.

With this altered economy the first signs are already showing up in that at Collinsville—and I have said this before and it can be said over and over again with advantage—we now have two new coalmines as modern as anything in Australia. Today what was previously the State underground mine has been cleared of all its machinery under its own power and cemented up. A completely new mine has been formed a mile away. It is highly mechanised in the most modern way and is producing 400 tons of coal a day with no great strain or labour required of the men working there. Hon. members will be just as pleased as I am to know that the State Government will secure 2s. 6d. a ton for all the coal mined there. The first lot of coal, which was taken from the Dacon mine, was supplied to the Bowen coke works last week. I was home at the week-end and had a look at it and spoke to the people who know about coke. They say it is as good as any they have seen come out of the coke works.

That is a promising outlook and it needs only one decision to trigger the whole thing off. In a few years we will have a completely new picture in the Collinsville area of cleared country, green pastures, irrigation, fat cattle, a longer meatworks season, more meat, and more ships at the wharf. All this will lead to greater trade from the port of Bowen. With modern means of moving coal, the establishment of an export coal industry is not beyond the bounds of possibility.

Such a dam as I have mentioned would also have the advantage of providing the extra water so necessary for the irrigation settlements at Clare, Millaroo, and Dalbeg which, at about October and November, begin to get a little short of water. Fortunately, over the last two or three years Jupiter Pluvius has stepped in and sent storms to replenish the supply, but, if this extra water can be stored, the economy of that area will be radically improved.

Whilst this has been going on, a very intensive investigation of underground water in the Burdekin delta has also been in progress. That is very important, because this water is the basis of the whole economy of the Ayr-Home Hill area, and up till now the supply has been unlimited. In 1935, and once or twice since, it fell to a dangerously low level. However, although it never again reached the 1935 level, it has dropped sufficiently to be a worry. The Irrigation and Water Supply Commission is carrying out extensive investigations, and officers of the Commonwealth Bureau of Mineral Resources are assisting with the latest seismic methods. From that work will come much useful information.

Also tied in a little with this story, which I am sure will be covered by the hon. member for Hinchinbrook, is the investigation in the

Herbert River district of not only the possibility of a power station, but also the provision of irrigation in the Mt. Garnett area. From that investigation has come a very interesting suggestion that I think was first put up many years ago by Dr. Bradfield, and which was also suggested by Mr. Nimmo when he was the Irrigation Commissioner. The suggestion is that if an irrigation dam is built on the Herbert River, water from it will be diverted a short distance back to Dry Creek and into the Burdekin to supplement the water supply.

Naturally, these things will cost millions of pounds and they cannot all be done tomorrow. As "Mother" Beaton's Cookery Book advises, one has first to catch his fish. This Government is attempting to catch the fish by carrying out these important investigations, the results of which will be available not only to this Government but also to other Governments for years to come. On them all future planning will be based.

When the Burdekin Dam is an accomplished fact, these other propositions will become subsidiary storage places for water to be added to that in the Burdekin Dam which I understand, even when full, will irrigate only about half the possible area of soil in the commanded area. Whilst we will get some production from the soil by smaller irrigation schemes and smaller dams, they will all fit into a master pattern and will be subsidiary to what we hope will some day be the general storage scheme in North Queensland.

Hon. H. RICHTER (Somerset—Minister for Public Works and Local Government) (7.50 p.m.): I think that I should reply to some of the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Kedron, in his speech. He referred to an overall plan for education prepared by the Hanlon Government in 1946. It is perfectly true that a plan for the establishment of educational regions was prepared in about 1946. However, we can find no evidence that an overall plan was adopted at that time. In fact, there is no evidence to suggest that between 1946 and 1950 changes were made in accordance with a State-wide plan.

Mr. Hanlon: Are you speaking as Minister for Public Works and Local Government or as Acting Minister for Education and Migration?

Mr. RICHTER: I am merely replying to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

He also implied that the establishment of perimeter high schools began in that period. In fact, the first perimeter high school, Cavendish Road, was opened in 1952. There is no argument about that. It celebrated its birthday only recently, and that fact was established then. By the end of 1957 only seven perimeter high schools had been established, whereas the present Government established 12 between 1958 and 1962, and it will establish another six in 1963.

State high schools were introduced in 1912. In 1952, after 40 years, there were 20 high schools and 20 secondary departments. In 1963 there will be 73 high schools and 56 secondary departments.

The hon. member for Kedron said—

"In 1946 we realised that an ever-increasing sum would be required in the forthcoming years for expenditure on school buildings and education generally."

The following figures show the increase in education expenditure on school buildings at that time—

	£
1944-1945	80,400
1945-1946	117,600
1946-1947	177,800
1947-1948	224,300
1948-1949	252,200

Let us now compare those figures with the amounts expended on school buildings about ten years later, when the present Government came into power. The figures are—

	£
1957-1958	2,072,300
1958-1959	3,040,700
1959-1960	3,448,000

The figures comprise expenditure on State schools, State high schools, technical colleges, the Queensland Agricultural High School and College, and sundry educational works. The latter are included in "Other Buildings, Works and Services" in the Auditor-General's report. I mention that for the information of hon. members.

The hon. member for Kedron further said that the Victorian expenditure on education this year will be 10 per cent. higher than it was last year. Mr. Bolte's figures reveal that the increase is 8 per cent., not 10 per cent. If we take a comparison of expenditure on education in Victoria and Queensland we should view the figures with a certain amount of caution. The Victorian Budget papers show, as an item of expenditure for 1962-1963, the sum of £1,126,400 for pensions. That was not the fact with education expenditure in Queensland.

It is true that since 1954-1955 expenditure on education in Victoria has increased by 150 per cent. I will admit that, but this is the point: even omitting the increased expenditure on superannuation, Queensland's increase in expenditure for the same period was 140 per cent. It should also be borne in mind that, despite the fact that Victoria's population is almost twice that of Queensland, the expenditure by the Department of Health in that State was £20,000,000 last year as against £19,000,000 in Queensland. Our free-hospital scheme leaves a smaller proportion of both loan moneys and tax reimbursement available to us for education.

I cannot see the point in the Deputy Leader of the Opposition quoting the numbers sitting for Scholarship and the Junior Public examinations. It is hard to follow. He points out that the proportional increase in Scholarship examination candidates during

the 11-year period when his party was in power was about the same as that during the five-year period that the present Government has been in power. He admits that a similar position obtains in the number of Junior candidates. In fact, during the 11-year period from 1944 to 1955 there was a 56-per cent. increase, as against a 200-per cent. increase in the latter period of 1955 to 1962. These figures show the number of Scholarship candidates in the years mentioned—

	No. of candidates
1945	7,845
1955	14,889
1956	15,123
1962	28,006

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. RICHTER: If the hon. member remains quiet he will get the story.

Junior candidates were as follows:—

	No. of candidates
1945	4,790
1955	7,498
1956	7,938
1962	22,859

The hon. member for Kedron said that last year the Government concentrated on the construction of high schools, and that in many cases State primary schools had suffered from insufficient classrooms. That is not a fact. In 1961-1962 this Government spent £1,603,000 on the construction of primary schools, the third highest amount ever spent on such schools and more than one-third greater than the amount spent by the previous Government in their last year of office, 1956-1957. In the last three years, primary school enrolments have not increased. Despite this, in the three years 1959-1960, 1960-1961, and 1961-1962, £1,888,000, £1,455,000 and £1,603,000 respectively was expended on primary-school buildings mainly in trying to overcome the building lag left by the previous Government.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition also expressed concern about the ability of the schools to accommodate additional pupils when the school-leaving age is raised to 15. As he was so concerned about that I want to reassure him on the point. The 1962 statistics reveal that already 83 per cent. of the children in their 15th year are still at school, so there should not be any great trouble there.

Again the hon. member apparently misunderstands education in the United Kingdom. Apart from the fact that the Scottish system differs completely from that of England, it also must be borne in mind that there are more than 400 different local education authorities in England, each of them free to adopt its own system. The general pattern there is for children to transfer to secondary schooling at the age of 11, entering a Grammar or secondary modern

school. In a few centres there are in operation comprehensive schools resembling in many ways Queensland's high schools that have been operating since 1912. It is certainly not true that students then go on to matriculation by automatic progression. In fact, students who intend to proceed to matriculation invariably sit for the General Certificate of Education examination at a stage which corresponds closely to the Queensland Junior Public examination.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that he sees no signs of secondary-school buildings being ready next year. He has not looked very far. Never before has the building of new secondary schools been commenced as early as it has been this year. I believe that it will be right up to our proposed programme.

Mr. Hanlon: You were not ready this year. The Kelvin Grove students have been at the Central Practising School all this year.

Mr. RICHTER: I am telling the Committee that they have never before been started as early as they have been this year.

A further claim of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is that 5,000 of last year's school-leavers are still unemployed. That is a gross exaggeration. As at 30 September, out of 26,300 school-leavers 972 were registered as unemployed.

Mr. Melloy: That does not mean a thing.

Mr. RICHTER: Those are the official figures.

Mr. Melloy: That does not mean a thing.

Mr. RICHTER: Where did the hon. member get his figures?

As to the claim of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the Government would be saving money by removing the necessity to provide text-books to Grade VIII pupils when this grade is included in the secondary school, it should be pointed out that it is not the practice in any Australian State, even in those where children transfer to secondary school at the age of 12, to provide free textbooks for secondary-school students. For some time emphasis has been placed on the provision of adequate classroom accommodation at both primary and secondary schools to meet the demand occasioned by the increase in population and for students seeking higher educational qualifications. In the last five financial years 1,221 primary and 922 secondary classrooms were completed, 64 new primary and 31 new secondary schools were constructed and additions were carried out at 470 primary and 156 secondary schools. In the last five years the Government has provided 2,143 classrooms for a net increase of 26,408 in primary and secondary school enrolments, as compared with 1,493 classrooms provided by the previous Government for a net increase of 47,147 enrolments during the five-year period 1953 to 1957. I want to emphasise that point. This Government has provided 2,143 classrooms for an increase

of 26,408 students whereas the previous Government, in a similar period of five years, provided 1,493 for 47,147 pupils. I repeat, that was for 47,000 students compared with 27,000 in the last five years. Hon. members can realise the overcrowding that previously existed. Expenditure from loan funds on education works in the last five financial years totalled £18,147,692 compared with £7,875,966 during the last five years of the term of the previous Government. I repeat, £18,000,000 compared with £7,000,000.

To implement the new education syllabus, a heavy secondary-school construction programme is being undertaken this financial year, with the construction of the first section of six new high schools in the metropolitan area, and new high schools at Beaudesert, Beenleigh, Burleigh, Chinchilla, and Gaydah. Accommodation will be provided at those schools for the opening of the 1963 school year. Seventeen secondary departments are to be constructed in country areas. Seven of them will be established on new sites and 10 at existing primary schools. In addition, extensions will be completed or commenced at 14 existing metropolitan high schools and 18 existing country high schools, and at five existing secondary departments.

The estimated expenditure on secondary accommodation to be provided this financial year is £2,692,000. As I said earlier, it is not proposed to concentrate on secondary accommodation at the expense of primary accommodation this financial year. Primary accommodation will not suffer. As I said before, an estimated amount of £1,306,000 from loan funds will be expended on primary-school buildings. This will include the erection of new schools in country and metropolitan areas, as well as additions to existing schools.

Mr. Melloy: How much will you spend on secondary schools?

Mr. RICHTER: I will give the hon. member that information in a minute.

The Government has also extended the policy of providing residences for public servants in country areas, with the result that more official residences have been erected, and will be erected, for principals of high schools. During 1961-1962, five residences were completed at the Atrerton, Bowen, Caboolture, Charleville, and Lockyer High Schools. The residence at the Southport High School was under construction, and a tender was accepted for a residence at the Mareeba High School. A further three residences for high-school principals are included in this year's Public Service housing programme.

The last five years have witnessed many significant changes and improvements in school organisation and design. Primary-school development has shown an advance in balanced planning, especially in the siting of individual buildings, taking into consideration the future growth of the centre and the

progressive development of the whole area of the grounds. The use of successful colour schemes and the integration of buildings and landscape have helped to create a very friendly atmosphere which is so essential in primary-school education. The buildings for the Opportunity School section have been built with the care so necessary for the selection of the specialist services and equipment for this humanitarian branch of teaching.

In secondary schools and secondary departments attached to primary schools many significant advances have been made, too. The many specialised services for training in science, art, home science, and commercial and agricultural science have been catered for in buildings carefully designed and equipped for the modern facilities so essential for secondary education today. Canteens have been provided and equipped in secondary schools, and sporting facilities, with the introduction of football and cricket ovals, etc., have been greatly intensified.

The buildings in progressive communities and in all cities have developed a much more permanent character while still maintaining the flexibility of structure so necessary for an expanding population. While timber is still retained as the basic building material, much of the ground-floor structure is of steel and concrete so as to preserve, as far as possible, a clear, uninterrupted play and assembly space, which is often partially enclosed against bad weather. This design of free space not only offers the advantage of a covered area but also provides a means of quick convertibility into temporary accommodation should any unprecedented increase in the demand for school facilities be experienced. I think the Committee will agree that modern building methods for schools, by making this provision, allow for very easy conversion if the occasion arises.

Mr. Tucker: There are classrooms under every school in Townsville, as the Minister knows.

Mr. RICHTER: I am not talking about classrooms. I am talking about the present construction methods, which make it very easy. It was very difficult with the old type of building that had stumps.

Earlier I mentioned natural lighting and ventilation of classrooms, controlled louvre cross-ventilation, and the planning to overcome the glare in school buildings. This has been done very effectively by our architects and it is very much appreciated.

I think the hon. member for Nudgee asked for some figures. I will give him a few now of expenditure by the Department of Public Works on State public buildings during the period 1 July, 1957, to 30 June, 1962, that is, during the period of this Government.

The total expenditure was £31,886,918. During the preceding five years under Labour the total expenditure was £14,767,911.

Mr. Graham: It just shows how costs have increased.

Mr. RICHTER: I will come to that in a moment. During the last year under Labour the expenditure was £3,646,462 while in 1961-1962 it was £8,244,421.

As for costs, have a look at the figures of classrooms provided both at primary and at secondary schools. During the last five years 1,221 were provided at primary schools compared with 1,156 in Labour's period. At secondary schools during our period of five years, 922 classrooms were provided while only 333 were built during Labour's five years. These are the totals: under our Government 2,143, and under Labour 1,493.

Mr. Melloy: I asked you what you were going to spend on high-school construction in the next 12 months. You gave us the primary figures but not the secondary.

Mr. RICHTER: I will give the hon. member that information. The amount expended on State Schools, State high schools, technical colleges, and other educational establishments during the period of this Government was £18,147,000, while during the five years under Labour it was £7,875,000.

In the five years' administration of this Government, £798,000 has been spent on the University. During the five years of Labour administration, £143,000 was spent. In the last year of Labour administration, just before we took office, the total expenditure was £32,865. Last year, we spent £320,354. The figure for 1960-1961 was almost a tie—£311,441.

Let us now go to the construction of new court houses and police buildings. During our five years of administration, almost £3,000,000 has been spent—£2,988,772. The Labour Government in its five years spent £1,127,103. Major police station and court house work carried out includes the new police headquarters in Brisbane, and new police stations at Longreach, Broadbeach, Woody Point, Inala, Magnetic Island, Tin Can Bay, Mt. Gravatt, Banyo, Bedourie, Barcardine, Jondaryan, Dulacca, Paluma, Kilkivan, and Burketown.

New court houses—I have opened quite a few of these—have been erected at Mt. Isa, Winton, Coolangatta, Sarina, and Eidsvold, and the district courts have been built in Brisbane. New court houses are at present under construction at Mareeba, Longreach, and Blackall, and tenders have been let for new police stations at Ayr and Home Hill.

During this period we spent £6,818,384 on other Government buildings, whilst the Labour Government during its five years spent £3,267,982. The amount that we spent more than doubled the amount spent by Labour. During their last year in office, £742,000 was spent. In our last year, the amount was £2,065,000.

The amount spent on repairs and general maintenance of Government buildings was £4,145,845. The extent of maintenance and repair work is such that careful scrutiny is necessary to ensure that the limited funds available are expended on the more urgent needs. The institution by the department of a system of general inspection has resulted in an overall improvement in the presentation of Government buildings throughout the State. The department is responsible for the servicing of public buildings, which includes the payment of water rates and gas and electricity charges, which have increased tremendously because of the greater number of buildings that we have to service. During the previous five years under Labour administration, the expenditure was £1,257,000. Because of the additional buildings that we have had to service, we have spent £1,937,287.

I rose merely to reply to some of the inaccurate statements of members of the Opposition. The Government is proud of its record in education and public works. We have done a very good job, and I wish to make clear the legacy that was left to us by former Labour Governments. Public buildings were in a shocking state of repair when we took office. I remind hon. members of the dilapidated state of Parliament House in those days. The condition of the kitchen and the staff quarters was deplorable, as members of the Parliamentary Buildings Committee well know. It has cost the Government more than £100,000 to bring Parliament House up to its present standard, mainly because of the neglect of former Governments.

A similar state of affairs existed in most public buildings throughout the State. Country court houses and police stations were allowed to deteriorate, and it has been a gigantic task to bring them up to their present standard. I can assure hon. members that public servants appreciate what we have done for them. Their working conditions and office accommodation have improved tremendously. Schools generally have been given a new look; they have been provided with improved ventilation and lighting, and have been painted in very attractive colours suitable for Queensland's climatic conditions. That is something which former Governments never thought of. Any suggestion that the Government has wasted money on education and improved school buildings is not true. What better investment can any Government make than to improve the standard of education of our young people? That is the very thing we have tried to do, that is, to provide for the training and education of the young people who in a few years' time will be expected to guide the destinies of this State.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (8.23 p.m.): I should like to associate myself with the Financial Statement placed before the Committee for its consideration. We should

pay a well-earned tribute to the Treasurer on the Budget that he has brought down. It is an achievement of which he can be justly proud and from which I believe the State will benefit in the years to come. In my opinion, this is a Budget produced by men who know and who care. I am not speaking of many of the rabble on my right.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Neither the hon. member, nor any other hon. member, may refer to hon. members as "rabble".

Mr. HUGHES: Let me say that the people will know them by their actions. Let the people be the judges at the next election. Although I wish hon. members on my right, the members of the Opposition, no personal harm, I am sure that we will see them in Opposition for many years to come.

The Budget is an accounting of past activities in the State and is a State stock-taking. I believe that it mirrors the achievements of the Government and is a blueprint for the progress of the State. I think hon. members should congratulate the Minister for Justice, the Minister for Education and Migration, and the Minister for Health and Home Affairs particularly on the work that they have done in their departments. I take this opportunity, too, of offering my congratulations to the hon. member for Wavell, Mr. Dewar, who will undoubtedly be given control of the Department of Labour and Industry.

Now let us have a look at the Budget. We have heard so much wailing from members of the Opposition; we have heard cries from members opposite that all is lost in this State. We have heard them from those who seek to make capital out of the misery of the unemployed; from those who feel that this State is far from well; from those who say that we are about to be brought to our knees and that we are almost financially bankrupt. We have heard the most irresponsible statements in the world.

Mr. Bromley: You are morally bankrupt.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member, who carries a brief from the S.P. bookies, says we are morally bankrupt. I will deal with him well and truly in the course of this speech. If I have not time then, I will deal with him in the debate on the Estimates. I suggest that the Labour Party has had its election campaigns financed by ill-gotten gains from its protection of S.P. bookies. They are the ones who shroud themselves in purity and innocence, yet they belong to the very party that tolerates poker machines in New South Wales. If I ever have heard sophistry or looked at a group of demagogues, I can hear it and see them here.

Now let me get onto the Budget, because the handling of the State's business is worthy of a close and analytical look. In his speech the Treasurer pointed out that we had increases in grain production last year. The sorghum crop was a record 7½ million

bushels, 50 per cent. above the previous year; maize production was 4½ million bushels, 12.5 per cent. above the previous year. Wheat was 16 per cent. up on last year with a crop of better promise, the sugar crop could produce a record 30 per cent. above last year; butter was up 33 per cent., and cheese up 76 per cent. This is not a "booze-and-betting" Government. In fact, these very things, good seasons, favourable climatic conditions and buoyant economic conditions indicate that matters have taken a noticeable turn for the better. Vehicle registrations have improved. That, of course, reflects a high standard of living. Building approvals by the Brisbane City Council have improved. They are at the moment letting the public know that there have been noticeably high increases in the number of building approvals that have been granted. Business and industry is increasing and more dwellings are being built.

£3,000,000 is to be spent on development works in the brigalow lands and on beef roads. The sealing of beef roads is to be undertaken and there is huge expenditure on the Mt. Isa rail project. I could go on enumerating these works all night. £10,500,000 is to be expended on the Mt. Isa project, £3,500,000 more than last year.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the hon. member for Ashgrove and the hon. member for Belmont that I cannot allow conversations across the Chamber while another hon. member is making his speech. As I said this afternoon, it is decidedly rude.

Mr. HUGHES: This Budget speaks for itself and is deserving of the commendation and support of the citizens of this State. I am sure they will register that support next year when the election is held. I can tell by the defeatist attitude of members of the Opposition, who every day come into this Chamber and sit there dejected, bleating like emasculated lambs because they know the Government has already won the election not only because of its honesty and virility, but also because by its wise administration it can produce results in its Budget such as the State has never before seen. I could go on quoting these achievements. I refer, for instance, to the £214,800 special debenture allocation, which attracts a £40,000 subsidy. And so it goes on.

Because of increased enrolments this year at State schools and universities—exceeding 10,500—the Government's expenditure on universities in 1961 exceeded by 17.7 per cent. that of the previous year, and that in 1957 by more than £576,844. It now exceeds £1,000,000; to be precise, £1,317,316. There have been worthwhile reductions in land taxes, and hon. members have been informed of further reductions for people who own and live in their own homes. This is not a taxing Government; it is a Government of wise and able administration that is

able to effect the economies that help John Citizen—the worker in the street—whose interests hon. members opposite supposedly protect.

Never has any other Government protected the workers as much as this Government has. The masters of the art of sophistry, Mr. Taylor, are sitting on your left. The hon. member for South Brisbane has been spirited away again, but he was a member of the Brisbane City Council at the same time as I was. He knows full well how the Labour Party looked after the workers when it had control of the council. It sacked 2,000 men. It blew out the brains of the council; it sacked all its technical men. To this day the council has not fully recovered from the severity of the blow that it was dealt by Labour. What a lot of hypocrisy we hear from hon. members opposite when they talk about employment. All too often, gullible electors seem to fall for it. Friends of the workers, my eye!

Let me get back to something constructive in analysing this Budget. We are in the process of exempting residential land under 48 perches from the payment of land tax. There have already been upward advances for State housing. What has been done in this field is revolutionary. That is well demonstrated by the modern homes that have replaced the slums under Labour. Not only was the previous Government prepared to foster temporary housing accommodation, but it made money from it as well. The tenants lived in misery and fear. How could hon. members opposite have had the gall to allow such degradation and such an insult to humanity to continue to exist?

The present State Treasurer wiped that blot off the character of the State. Victoria Park, Coopers Plains, Moorooka, Archerfield, and various other places were blotted with temporary housing accommodation. Advance limits have now come in for housing to help people to obtain their own homes. The limits have been increased from £3,000 to £3,500.

In addition, the Government are carrying out the greatest road-building programme in the history of this State. We have the beef roads development. New powerhouses at Swanbank and Callide are being constructed. We have a record loan works vote of £8,000,000 and a monumental school-building programme catering for 40,600 students at high schools. Indeed, every person in the State can derive a measure of benefit from the good, wise, and able administration of the present Ministers. Many hon. members opposite agree with me on this but they cannot say so. In the main they support the legislation that comes before Parliament. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition makes the valiant attempt that must be made—I have respect and liking for him personally and in that regard—to put up a case, weak as it may be, for the Opposition. They had

hopes for a double-bunger debate but it stopped at the Trades Hall because it turned out to be a squib and fizzled.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member for South Brisbane is back. The Senator Aylett of this State is back with us again. It is nice to have him with us on occasions, because even the hon. member must have a small amount of intelligence which would enable him to absorb some of the worth-while things that are said from this side.

There are a number of matters in which the State has taken a particular interest. I have given some consideration to these matters, one being certain legislation and the other being the employment of school-leavers. I hope there is sufficient time to deal at least reasonably with those two items.

I should like to bring before the notice of the Chamber the fact that there should be legislation for the use of white canes by blind people.

Mr. Bromley: I asked for that, but the Minister said he would not do it.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member for Norman has said that the Minister said he would not do it. This white-cane legislation principle was sent to the southern States at a time of a conference on traffic matters, and it was said that unless it could be uniform throughout Australia, even though Queensland supported it, it would not be desirable for Queensland to have it.

Western Australia has this legislation and I should like to give details of it to the Chamber. There have been many meetings of a special committee that was set up to deal with this matter. The committee is headed by Mr. Morrison, of the Blind Workers' Union, and Mr. Ian Stewart is the secretary and representative of the Q.M.L. The other members of the committee are Mr. J. Pharr from the Welfare Association for the Blind, Mr. T. Fuery for the Blind Worker's Union, Mr. S. Larwell, and Mr. I. Howe of the Council of Social Services Organisation, Mr. Downard from the Roads Safety Council, and myself. On a number of occasions the members of this committee have given serious consideration to the introduction of the white-cane legislation.

Mr. Thackeray interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: We have Professor Thackeray, the hon. member for—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: I am sorry. The hon. member for Rockhampton North is in the Chamber. I think I could well tell the Chamber some of the logic that he imparted on one occasion outside this Chamber to members of the Young Labour Movement on the borders of New South Wales. He said that to the north, New South Wales is bordered by Queensland, to the south by

Victoria, to the east by the Pacific Ocean, to the west by Central Australia, and then he said, "Now, how old am I?" A member of the Young Labour Movement said, "Well, you must be 44, Professor." When he was asked how he arrived at that answer, he said, "Well, I have another friend in the Labour Party who is only 22 years of age, and he is only half as crazy as you are."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If hon. members wish to ask a reasonable question of any speaker they may do so, but the speaker is not obliged to answer them.

Mr. Thackeray interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please keep quiet while I am speaking. I am warning the hon. member for the first time that I will deal with him if he continues to act in a disorderly manner. I was about to say that I sincerely hope that these irrelevant remarks will not continue. If they do, I will have to deal with hon. members who pursue them.

Mr. HUGHES: Having the protection of the Chair, I will now get down to a serious basis. This is a very serious matter, and I hope hon. members will treat it as it should be treated.

I put forward a case and press for the implementation of this white-cane legislation because I believe there is an urgent need for it. There are safety measures for the protection of the blind. Sighted members of the community have agility and resourcefulness from their faculties and are able to get themselves out of difficult situations. We are concerned about this matter and we desire to reduce the unduly high number of accidents. We know that sighted persons get into accidents and become victims. We read about it daily in the metropolitan Press. We believe a very strong case can be put forward on behalf of members of the blind community for the white-cane legislation. The increase in traffic in Brisbane alone warrants consideration of it. Blind pedestrians need this special form of assistance. Those who do have sight should show the greatest consideration for the blind.

I hope particularly that motorists will be susceptible to a form of education in consideration for the blind. The Queensland Road Safety Council in particular is especially interested in the proposal and is doing everything possible, by co-operation and engaging in an educational campaign, to bring about a greater community awareness. The Blind Workers' Union has received a number of complaints that motorists are completely disregarding the use of white canes by blind persons crossing roads. Recently a blind person was struck by a motor cyclist on a zebra crossing outside the Q.M.L. Hall, at the corner of Vulture Street and Stephens Road, South Brisbane, even though he was using a white cane at the time. I believe the Queensland Road Safety Council intends to

launch, for that and other reasons to avoid tragedy, a campaign to educate motorists on the use of the white cane. However, there is only one real way and that is protection by legislation as well as by education.

Mr. Bennett: Can you tell us why they took the patrol off Gladstone Road after a fortnight?

Mr. HUGHES: Gladstone Road is a very long road. Anyway, I am dealing with this matter seriously. There is a need for a police patrol at a number of these zebra crossings on main arterial roads. I do not question the sincerity of hon. members. Every hon. member is concerned with safety and human welfare. In this regard the Police Department and the traffic authorities have much more work to do and, in my opinion, there should be many more such road patrols, particularly near schools and for the blind. I believe all organisations for the blind want legislation, particularly of the New Mexico type. I believe it would be to the benefit of hon. members if I read this provision of the New Mexico law—

"Whenever a pedestrian is crossing or attempting to cross a public street or highway guided by a guide dog or carrying in a raised or extended position a cane or walking stick which is white in colour or white tipped with red, the driver of every vehicle approaching the intersection or such place where the pedestrian is attempting to cross shall bring his vehicle to a full stop before arriving at such an intersection or place of crossing and before proceeding shall take such precautions as may be necessary to avoid injuring such pedestrian.

"It is unlawful for any person unless totally or partially blind while on any public street or highway to carry in raised or extended position a cane or walking stick which is white in colour or white tipped with red.

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to deprive any totally or partially blind person not carrying such a cane or walking stick or not being guided by a guide dog of the rights and privileges conferred by law on all pedestrians using streets or highways, nor shall the—"

An Opposition Member: Can't you read your notes?

Mr. HUGHES: As a matter of fact, I took this down over the telephone rather hurriedly.

It goes on—

"Nor shall the failure of such totally or partially blind persons to carry a cane or walking stick or to be guided by a guide dog on the streets, highway or sidewalks of this Commonwealth be held to constitute, nor be held to be evidence of, contributory negligence.

"Any person who violates any provision of this Act shall, upon conviction thereof, be sentenced to pay a fine not exceeding

20 dollars and costs of the prosecution, and, in default of payment thereof, shall undergo imprisonment not exceeding ten days."

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member for Kedron, who is trying to emulate everything a parrot does, with his midget-mindedness—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not obliged to take notice of irrelevant remarks.

Mr. HUGHES: I know, Mr. Taylor, that you are doing all possible to try to curb the "spirited" exuberance of certain members on my right. However, this is a very serious matter and I feel that the hon. member for Kedron particularly might pay the blind people in the community the respect to which they are entitled.

Mr. Bromley: While you are on that subject, do you think they should get the basic wage?

Mr. HUGHES: I am dealing now with white-cane legislation, and, in the limited time that I have, I am not going to be diverted to matters outside this particular legislation. This form of law applies in every American State, including the new States of Alaska and Hawaii. There are some variations, but the New Mexico law is typical of the type of legislation that the blind community wants included in the statutes of this State.

I believe it well worth while to quote from the Lions Club journal, "The Lion," of July-August, 1962. The editor of that journal said—

"The late George M. Bonham, a member of the Peoria, Illinois Lions Club, is credited with originating the white cane in 1929. He presented the idea to the International Convention and saw it adopted. In many variations—red tipped, electrically lighted and even electrically sensitized—the white cane has become the official symbol of the blind throughout the world. As early as 1933 the police of Cleveland were stopping motorists who did not respect the white cane, although the records do not show whether that city had an ordinance. In 1950 the convention of the National Federation of the Blind adopted a resolution urging the ten remaining States which did not have white cane laws—including Pennsylvania—to adopt such legislation. Today all States have laws requiring motorists to give white canes the right-of-way."

I ask the newly-appointed Acting Minister to give serious and sympathetic consideration to bringing before this Chamber for inclusion in the Traffic Act provision for the protection of those of the blind community, who are carrying white canes, from the thoughtless and inconsiderate motorists who do not pay to our blind friends the respect that they merit.

In England, a white cane with a black handle denotes that the user is deaf as well as blind.

Mr. Dickinson, a member of the blind community who takes an active part in community affairs, and his wife, who was Mercy Griffin, are touring England and they have written to say that motorists in that country respect the use of the white cane. I mentioned to hon. members a few minutes ago the knocking down on a zebra crossing of a blind person by a motor cyclist. This person was using a white cane. If comparisons of traffic safety are needed, there is one to consider.

Western Australia has legislation that is similar to the New Mexico law. White canes are used extensively in that State. Blind persons there have had this added protection, which is psychological as well as legal, since 1957. Members of the blind community in Queensland are wholeheartedly in favour of the greater use of the white cane.

We want that law in Queensland, and I personally can see not one scintilla of evidence that can be brought against its implementation; indeed, I can see every justification for it. Our people are the same as others, and our motorists are essentially the same. Our obligations to each other, too, are entirely the same.

I am sure that many hon. members are of this opinion. I spoke of this matter with the hon. member for Albert a short while ago. Not only is he in favour of it, but he is concerned also with the whole question of road safety. I am sure that other hon. members who are seriously concerned with human welfare will not only support this suggestion but will also press for its implementation. It is not a political matter; it is one concerning human welfare. I believe that through the radio, Press, and television, and with the assistance of the Queensland Road Safety Council, the public should be acquainted of the significance of the white cane. They will then back our request for the necessary legislation. I intend to arrange a deputation to the incoming Acting Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr. Dewar, who is not only very sincere in his attention to his duties, but is also very concerned about road safety. He is in the vanguard of those who want to ensure the safety of members of the community, and I am confident that he will give sympathetic and worthwhile consideration to the committee's request. Only time will reveal the outcome of our representations.

As I said earlier, great credit is due to Cabinet Ministers, and I pay a personal tribute to the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, Hon. H. W. Noble, for the wonderful job that he has done for the State. Despite Labour protestations, the Country Party-Liberal Government has not only maintained free hospitals but has also extended the range of services and facilities. There are more free beds, more employees, more specialised services.

Mr. Bromley: More empty beds, and they are getting patients up before they are ready.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member for Norman says that there are more empty beds. By his interjection the hon. member pays a tribute to the administration for not only maintaining but also expanding the facilities in our free hospitals. He admits that we do have free beds available to members of the public. The expenditure under Labour in 1952-1953 was £5,223,490. The State is now budgeting for an expenditure of over £12,000,000.

Mr. Bromley: Which is £1,912,000 less than last year.

Mr. HUGHES: It is more than double the figure in 1956, the year before Labour went out of office. They spent £5,005,000. If we make a comparison with what the State was like under the tyranny and dictatorship of an inept Labour rule, we find that it was stagnating and that a spirit of progress was not engendered. Capital was not attracted here for the development of this State. Industries were not prepared to come here because they thought they would be taxed out of existence, if not nationalised or socialised. But when we come into the Chamber to consider a Budget from which everyone will benefit and which shows that more will be spent on a wider range of facilities and services in our free hospitals, we are told that we are living in the past. Thank goodness the people of the State have not to live in the darkness of the past. Thank goodness they can look to the future with confidence, knowing that the Government will improve their standard of living and their social and welfare services.

We have proof of expanded hospital services in the additional beds and improved facilities that are available. The Government has not only maintained free hospitals; it has also improved them greatly. All this has been achieved with efficient administration, and this State can boast of the best hospitals in Australia at the lowest cost per head of any State. Of course the Minister and the Government deserve very high tributes for their efforts.

I should also like to pay tribute to the Minister for Health and Home Affairs for granting a subsidy recently for child-welfare centres. I think that I am well qualified to express the thanks of the many mothers, deserted wives and widows for the way in which the Minister considered my representations for subsidies for child-care centres. That applies especially to parents of children attending the Kurilpa Child Care Centre. All these parents have a terrific responsibility to carry. They are deserted wives, widows, or widowers, and I leave to the imagination of hon. members the plight they are in. This subsidy is a heaven-sent gift to enable the Kurilpa Child Care Centre to build a new building and the committee to continue to function.

Mr. Bennett: It was I who organised that land for them, and nobody else. I was the alderman for the district.

Mr. HUGHES: I did not quite catch the interjection of the hon. member for South Brisbane but I am sure he would not have the arrant dishonesty to claim that he arranged the subsidy for that centre.

Mr. Bennett: I said I organised the land for them.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not suggesting that the hon. member did not have something to do with the land. I was also a member of the council, making representations in the matter of that land. The hon. member took an interest in them on some occasions, and I give him full credit for it.

As chairman of that building committee, I can assure Dr. Noble and the Government that they have earned undying gratitude for the sympathetic consideration given to my representations for a subsidy for the building in that area. Even those who cannot actually derive a personal benefit from the use of the centre know the progress that has been made and the sympathetic consideration that this Government has shown in enabling the building of the Kurilpa Child Care Centre.

In the field of native welfare, the expenditure this year is £303,529, which, if we are to move into the past, is half as much again as Labour spent. The Minister has done wonderful work in this regard. I refer particularly to the aid granted to Opal.

I could go on and on, but these brief references are enough to show why we, as members of the Government, feel there is no need for any defensive attitude in considering this Budget. We have no reason whatever to do anything but go out among the populace with our heads held high, very proud of the fact that we have had wise administration and that we have taken, as I said initially, sound steps in the progress of the State. The Minister and the Government can be thankful that the people have reposed, and will undoubtedly continue to repose, their confidence in us. As a result, we will again take our places on the administrative benches of the Government of this State.

Mr. Bromley: What Minister are you praising now?

Mr. HUGHES: I am speaking collectively of the Government.

Now there is the matter of education and the employment of school-leavers. It is a matter that should incite not only the mental capacities but also the interest of all members; it is one that should engender full-scale interest.

Mr. Bromley: Do you know that Mr. Pizzev said, "After education, what?—unemployment." Mr. Pizzev said that.

Mr. HUGHES: There are so many inane interjections that if the public of this State could occupy to the full the accommodation in the gallery and witness the antics of hon. members on my right whilst I am dealing seriously with matters of human welfare and the saving of life, and with the employment of school-leavers, they would be so utterly disgusted that hon. members opposite would occupy the Opposition benches for the rest of time.

To continue, technical progress is transforming the employment and occupational patterns of the industrialised countries. It is a matter of which I have read a good deal and to which I have given serious consideration because it affects all sections of the economy and makes it very difficult to strike a balance in manpower supply and demand. These matters on which I am going to touch are all associated with the employment of school-leavers. We need to relate the education and training of young people to their foreseeable future requirements. In fact, the guidance officers are doing a worthwhile job. I have not time to canvass to any great extent the European countries on the guidance and welfare of youth and the employment of school-leavers, so I shall make only brief reference to the matter of progress. Advanced mechanisation is something that I believe suggests a new trend in school-leavers' employment.

There is a lessening in the number of those who are manual workers, but there is a greater grading and intake of those who are of supervisory capacity. Supervision tends to take the place of direct handling. Manual dexterity tends to be replaced by understanding of the installation or equipment. In these days, instrumentation in automative processes requires workers specialising in precision control or regulating instruments. The worker, playing a key part in industry, is the technician specialising in research, design, manufacture, electronics, operational research, laboratory work, and so on. Generally speaking, technical, scientific, and managerial staffs are growing in number, especially in the new, rapidly expanding industries. In this regard the trend is leading to far-reaching changes in the pattern of occupations.

I should very much like to be able to develop this argument to a more defined degree but time is against me. However, let me say this because it is worth quoting—

"The United States is one of the few countries to make detailed occupational forecasts for each Branch of Employment. We can take as an example the forecasts for the years 1960-1970 as published by the United States Department of Labour, to the general trend of future development."

I quote from that source—

"A continuing sharp rise in 'white collar' employment especially in the professions (for every 100 professional or technical

workers in 1960, 143 will be needed in 1970); a fairly rapid expansion in employment in offices, shops, and services (for every 100 in 1960, 127 in 1970); a slightly less rapid expansion in the number of skilled workers (100 in 1960—124 wanted in 1970); a slower increase in the number of semi-skilled (100 in 1960—118 in 1970); little if any change in the number of jobs for unskilled workers, and a steady fall in the number of farm workers (for every 100 in this occupation in 1960—only 83 needed in 1970)."

I believe that we in Australia can learn something from this survey. I believe that there is not a tremendous amount of difference between the pattern that projects itself in the U.S. level and this mode of society in Australia. There is no doubt in my mind that education is the keynote of success for today's younger generation. There is ample evidence even today that the fields of top-level employment embracing professional, business, and industrial management provides opportunities for young people who have the qualifications to comply with the exacting demands that people need to occupy top-level, well-paid positions. There are numerous vacancies but it requires the young man or woman to complete his or her education. I believe that hon. members can find justification for my remarks if they take the trouble to look at the great number of jobs that are advertised in Saturday issues of the metropolitan Press. They call for special qualifications in the managerial or professional field. That, of course, indicates that school-leavers need a high degree of education to hold down those positions. There are numerous vacancies, as I said, but it means that young people have to complete their education. The Government has provided in our schools opportunities for students who desire the advantage of a complete education.

Here is a factual example of some of the achievements in this field. The expenditure on State schools in 1952-1953 was £4,784,189 and in 1956-1957 it was £7,620,040. In 1961-1962 it was £12,988,182. In other words, three times the amount is now being provided for the education of the young people in this State by a Government that is not only aware of the need for education, but is also providing the opportunity for it. If ever a Government has earned the right to continue with the administration of the State in one field alone, this Government has earned it in the field of education. I believe that the people of the State will show their confidence in the Government.

I have spoken for the blind community. I am a member of, and the Government representative on, the blind committee. We have spent more than twice the amount that Labour spent just a few years ago on technical education and practical instruction in State schools, apprenticeship, and adult education. The student of today can enjoy every possible facility. The accelerated building programme in the last few years

has resulted in modern, well-equipped schools. Gone are the old dull, brown walls and the old type of building. They have now been replaced by new classrooms, painted in soft pastel shades and designed to obtain the maximum amount of natural light and air. Regardless of these achievements and the splendid work of the Country Party-Liberal Government, the State is faced with a vital problem. As I said earlier, there is one vital matter that we must tackle, and this should engender a sympathetic attitude, particularly from hon. members opposite. I am referring to the matter of the employment of school-leavers. I have heard much criticism, and many hypocritical utterances, from a bunch of demagogues about this subject, but never have I heard a constructive suggestion put forward. Whilst there have been unprovoked criticism, unwarranted attacks, mud-slinging and personalities from members of the Opposition, I have never heard them put forward a constructive suggestion. It is on that basis that they live, wallowing in the misery of the unemployed, whom they keep in subjugation. On that basis, how can the Labour Party expect to live, let alone take over the administrative benches of the State. As I have said, the problem is not peculiar to Queensland. The other Australian States, and indeed all other countries in the world, are faced with the complex problem of school-leavers. Of course, this is the result of the extremely high birthrate in the immediate post-war years.

Mr. Graham: Are members of the Government claiming credit for that? They have claimed credit for everything else.

Mr. HUGHES: There may have been hope for the hon. member to claim some credit for something, but I doubt if it is to be found in that direction.

A Government Member: He is a bit old.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and he is living in the past. It is about time that the people of the State realised that most hon. members opposite are living in the past. We have had presented to us the most wonderful Budget ever brought down in this State, yet hon. members of the Opposition continue to live in the past, subject to the wishes of the people in the Trades Hall and the Q.C.E., and dancing to the strings pulled by their masters. While statisticians and other knowledgeable people may say that the greatest ratio or number of school-leavers seeking employment occurred last year and this year, it is nevertheless a matter demanding the attention of the Government and the leaders in business, industry, and union affairs, and community-service-minded people. We should do everything possible, at the earliest opportunity, to provide every possible avenue of employment. It is not strictly a governmental responsibility. This is not a Communist-Socialist State where the State owns the person. Here the person owns the State. Yet I believe that, while the

Government does not have the sole responsibility, it can do, and is doing, all that is practicable to help. However, I have a suggestion to make which may in some small way help to alleviate the problem. It is a very pressing matter and I believe that the Government, leaders in business and in industry and in union affairs and all community-service-minded people will give the matter the attention it deserves. One might ask: what is the solution? I do not know. I only wish I could come up with one. Few can claim to know. If hon. members opposite treated the matter seriously enough they could at least come up with some suggestions to help the Government and the people of the State, rather than decry everything and pour cold water on even the slightest suggestion that may have some bearing on the future welfare of the people.

I have devoted some time and attention to the study of this problem and I believe that my suggestion will help alleviate the position. While we have in the Budget a stock-taking of the achievements of the past, we should also stock-take on failings so that we can improve. Out of that has come the strength of this Government. Gone is the rule of fear in the Public Service. Better super-annuation! All these matters that this Government has implemented have come from an analysis of failings in an effort to improve conditions. That is why, when Government members are able to use their mental capacities and put forward suggestions, they are not ridiculed on this side of the Chamber as seems to be the practice of members of the Labour Opposition. It means that this Government takes notice, and we know of a number of suggestions that have been made and that have found their way into the Statute Book.

We could embody some changes in the apprenticeship system of this State. Let me cite as an example the hairdressing trade.

Mr. Bromley: I can tell you a bit about that.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member for Norman says he can tell us about the hairdressing trade. From where I stand he has about the finest head of skin I have seen for a while.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Bromley: Jealousy is a curse, you know.

Mr. HUGHES: Seriously, in this State we could take up some of the unemployment of school-leavers by reviewing the apprenticeship system, particularly in the hairdressing trade. At the moment there must be one apprentice to two seniors and it is a five-year course. I know that in other trades, dressmaking for example, you can have three apprentices to one on the adult rate of pay and the person on the adult rate could be as young as 18 years. Here is a way in which many young girls could find employment. I

have spoken to quite a number from the high schools. Even this morning a young lady who came into town expressed her intention of doing the rounds of all the hairdressing salons seeking a position as an apprentice next year. She went with a forlorn hope because I know, as do many others who have preceded her, that girls who do the rounds of the hairdressing salons of the city cannot get an apprenticeship as the basis of the system that now applies does not give them the opportunity. There is ample evidence that many more apprentices could be absorbed into the trade. That is only one avenue for increased employment for school-leavers.

As I say, the apprenticeship period is five years. I understand it can confidently be claimed that a three-year course is sufficient. In other Australian States and many other countries a three-year apprenticeship is all that is necessary. In England, Europe, and the United States three years is sufficient. Why not here? Other Australian States have it, so why should not Queensland? Our girls are certainly no less intelligent than those in the South; they are probably more so. In my opinion, they are better-looking and at least equally capable. On that basis, why should our young ladies not have the same opportunities as those in the South? Why is there not an apprenticeship of three years, with an additional two years' experience in a salon before they are permitted to open salons of their own?

Surely it is not in the interests of the hairdressing trade to retain an apprenticeship of five years. This causes both personal and industrial problems. The present system keeps young single girls out of work, whilst forcing salons to employ married women. One of the anomalies of it is that the management is forced, arbitrarily and legislatively, to employ married women. Furthermore, between the third and the fifth years, these girls lose from £500 to £700.

I spoke to the manager of one leading hairdressing salon on this matter and he said, "Mr. Hughes, you are perfectly correct in your idea. It would be good for the trade and for the community. It is realistic. Furthermore, if a girl cannot learn hairdressing in three years, she will never be a good hairdresser. It is easier now than it was three years ago."

There is no doubt that much depends on the salon at which a girl is serving her apprenticeship. She should be given every opportunity to learn, instead of spending years sweeping the floor and more or less filling in time as a form of cheap labour. At present we have a shortage of lady hairdressers, yet hundreds of young girls are going from salon to salon seeking apprenticeships, but cannot find positions.

Mr. Bromley: They are being exploited.

Mr. HUGHES: There are members of unions on the Apprenticeship Board. Let us face it realistically. It is not a political

matter, but a board on which both employers and employees serve. They can amend the regulations.

Here is an advertisement that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of 20 October—

"A city hairdressing salon requires two female hairdressers permanent position must be fully experienced £23 per week plus overtime."

Now what about the standard of living in this State? The manager of that salon informed me that he did not expect to get any replies.

This raises the question of whether the apprenticeship requirements in trades, particularly hairdressing, should be reviewed. If there are anomalies in this trade, there are quite likely to be anomalies in others. I believe that many trades could be reviewed and many apprenticeship terms of time reduced. Much more employment would thus be available to young people, instead of having people necessarily and arbitrarily being to employ married women.

I do not know the policy of the Labour Party on this matter. I wonder if the hon. member for Norman, who has been a constant interjector, wishes married women to remain in employment to the exclusion of young people leaving school who desire apprenticeships, but who are forced by this system to stay out of employment.

Mr. Bromley: I believe in full employment for everyone who wishes to work.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member for Norman believes that married women should be employed to the exclusion of young school-leavers.

A comparison can be made with the clothing trade, which is under a Federal award. That provides for one apprentice to one adult on full pay in callings such as specialist cutter and tailor. In other groups, which include dressmaking and the making of underclothes, white work, shirts, artificial flowers, fur trade, and so on, there is a basis of three to one.

I cannot see the necessity for a five-year course, and a basis of one to two in the hairdressing trade, when there is a three-year course in other States and other countries, and a basis of three to one in dressmaking. Our system is keeping out of employment many young people who could well be employed serving apprenticeship periods. As I said earlier in my speech, according to the projected view expressed in the United States survey, up to 1970 many young people will require to be employed in a greater ratio in skilled trades and as white-collar workers. I make the plea on behalf of the young people to the unions and the employers in the State—

Mr. Bromley: What about the Government?

Mr. HUGHES: This is a matter for the unions and the employers. Apparently the hon. member does not know that the unions

and the employers meet on the Apprenticeship Board with equal representation. After its deliberations, recommendations are made to the executive, which in turn sends them on for governmental approval. On that basis it is not a matter for the Government. I believe that the apprenticeship system in many trades and professions has been long due for an overhaul because it is arbitrarily keeping many young people out of employment. Last year and this year we have had in Queensland, New South Wales, and indeed in all other Australian States, a tidal wave of young people leaving school. This has been caused by the high post-war birthrate. It is not a matter of the Government's waving a magic wand and saying, "There is a job for everyone", unless one supports the system to which hon. members opposite subscribe, a system under which people are mere serfs who subjugate their welfare and human rights to the State. We are not prepared to wave a magic wand in that way, but we can find some of the reasons for this failure. The worthwhile results achieved by the Government and its Ministers show that they have administered wisely and well. Full consideration has been given by the Ministers to suggestions made by Government members, and we will go to the electors of Queensland next year knowing full well that, because of the wonderful work of Cabinet Ministers and the blueprint for progress that we have placed before the people in the Financial Statement, we have earned their votes and the right to continue in government. Hon. members opposite, who are now silent, will be in the political wilderness.

Mr. WHARTON (Burnett) (9.23 p.m.): I, too, wish to congratulate the Treasurer on presenting a very excellent Budget. It reflects the sound policy of the Government in its conduct of the affairs of this State. To provide for a surplus of £109,000 instead of a deficit of £693,000 is certainly a very creditable effort, but figures really mean very little when one considers what has been done for the people of Queensland.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: I do not think I need waste the time of the Committee in replying to interjections by hon. members opposite. I should like to comment on one or two aspects of the Budget. The grant of £3,340,000 by the Commonwealth Government is an achievement for the State.

Mr. Sherrington: Don't talk rot!

Mr. WHARTON: It is an achievement for the Premier and the Treasurer, because they put up a very good case for Queensland. Hon. members opposite complained because we went to the Commonwealth and got some money and are spending it wisely and well for the benefit of the people of Queensland.

I also wish to mention that savings have been effected in various departments. The fact that surpluses have been shown in Trust Funds indicates that Ministers have the interest of the State at heart, and reflects great credit on the Treasurer. I say, too, that in spite of the presentation of such a good Budget, it has been done in a rather poor season. If we have come through a year of unfavourable seasons and have presented a Budget such as this, I would say it would be fair for members on this side to ask what could be done if we had decent seasons which would reflect themselves in an improvement in finances in the private sector of the State with resultant benefit to the overall employment position.

I wish to express my appreciation of the fact that there are no new taxes, and that concessions have been granted in land tax and in the abolition of the duty on the transfer of leasehold land.

In a £120,000,000 Budget the part education has played—accounting for £26,000,000—is something about which the story has been well told. Hon. members would not want me to tell it again but I do wish to thank the Minister for providing in my electorate a high school at Gayndah and a school house at Biggenden, and for the many other educational facilities which have not only improved my electorate but have also reflected the good government that has been displayed in this State.

There are many matters about which I could speak, but I do not want to go over what others have already said. However, the Estimates for housing, main roads, and public works—hon. members do not want me to repeat them—stress the significant part that this Government has played in the well-being of the State. I compliment the Treasurer and all Ministers concerned for the part they have played in making this State a much better one to live in, not only for those concerned with hon. members on this side of the Chamber but with those on the other side as well. We have put forward a Budget that I am sure will cater for everybody's needs.

I was pleased, of course, to notice the increase from £11,000 to £13,000 in the grant to rural fire boards. These people are doing a voluntary job, and with them there is no suggestion of a 40-hour week. They are making a worthwhile contribution to the safety of property. It is a very valuable contribution because these men fight for long hours in protecting property, and the amount provided for equipment is appreciated by board members. As I say, I am pleased to see that it has been increased. As a matter of fact, it should be increased even more.

I am pleased to notice, too, an increase in the allocation for the eradication of groundsel. It is something that is of great concern to people on farming lands, particularly in my area, which may become heavily

infested. I am afraid that this pest will spread to many of the better lands in the Burnett electorate. It is growing profusely along the coast, particularly around Maryborough, and the winds are bringing the seed into my area. There is much evidence of its spread.

I should like also to say something about irrigation, partly because of my own personal interest and partly because of the need for irrigation in the Burnett, where various farming and agricultural pursuits are undertaken. The growing of sugar, tobacco, grain, citrus, and small crops is practised there, as well as many other forms of agriculture.

Irrigation plays a very vital role in the Burnett electorate. I am sorry that the hon. member for Maryborough is not in the Chamber because I wanted to say something about his visit. He came up to have a look round and learn about irrigation. I know that he has much to learn. He was very critical about what the Government had done in the field of irrigation. He wanted a lot of money spent in that direction. I asked him if when he furnished his house he did it all in the one go. If the Government used all its money on irrigation, what would it use for all the other projects that hon. members opposite would be seeking?

I should like to say something about the farm water supplies scheme.

Mr. Tucker: Not that again!

Mr. WHARTON: I know that it would not interest the hon. member for Townsville North.

Mr. Tucker: You have said it three times. We can read it in "Hansard".

Mr. WHARTON: I wish the hon. member would read it and apply some of those principles.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Baxter): Order! The hon. member will confine himself to the subject under discussion.

Mr. WHARTON: The matter under discussion is irrigation. What the Government is doing in the field of irrigation is probably not appreciated by hon. members opposite, but we on this side realise its value and appreciate what the Government is doing. It is spending £16,000 on an investigation in the Burnett area. This year £6,000 is being spent on investigations into the various sites for weirs and storage dams, which are very necessary on the Burnett. Storage weirs are necessary on streams that have ceased to flow. That applies to streams throughout my electorate, from Gayndah right down to Bundaberg. When the investigations are completed we will have a great deal of knowledge about where the weirs should be built. I only hope that the State's financial position will allow us to build them.

The Government is fully conscious of the benefits to be obtained by development and the utilisation of the State's valuable water

resources, and, in spite of limited financial resources, it has made substantial progress in the investigation and assessment of these resources and projects for their conservation and utilisation. Expenditure from Loan and Trust Funds on these works since the Government took office amounts to £11,624,000. That is no mean figure. The expenditure for 1961-1962 was £2,296,000, and the proposed expenditure for 1962-1963 is a further £2,585,000. After all is said and done, we must consider our resources. Money has to be made available not only for irrigation, but also for education, public works, and all the other things that hon. members opposite are always singing out for to provide employment. We are quite happy to spend money on public works to provide employment, but at the same time we have to retain some for irrigation. I suggest that the allocations the Government has made for education have resulted in the best use being made of the available money.

The limited resources available are being used to the best advantage by their application to a balanced programme of development involving continuation of the major Mareeba-Dimbulah project, with the creation of new production and new settlement opportunities; the provision of small dams on streams to provide the security of an assured water supply to areas of existing development, and the provision of the means of expansion of production in these areas of established irrigation know-how.

The Government has also given great encouragement to the establishment of improved water supplies for stock, domestic, and irrigation supplies on individual properties with the provision of technical and financial assistance under the Farm Water Supplies Assistance Act in response to a widespread demand for further water-conservation activities, and a large number of additional projects, particularly the construction of small dams on streams, is in progress.

Expenditure on the Mareeba-Dimbulah irrigation project during 1961-1962 was £810,000. A temporary scheme was approved by the Government to serve 15 farms in the Paddy's Green area, and this work was completed during 1961-1962. Twenty-three new farms were allotted during the year, bringing to 60 the total of new farms opened; 462 farms are now using irrigation water, 126 being direct from the channel system, 260 from streams supplemented by water from the Tinaroo Falls Dam, and 76 from unsupplemented streams. The acreage planted to tobacco last year was 9,610, which produced a crop valued at £5,500,000. As natural flows in most of the streams had ceased by August 1961, this large production was made possible by water supplied from the Tinaroo Falls Dam. The production represents a spectacular increase of approximately £5,000,000 since the inception of the scheme.

The Government has approved of a further temporary scheme, which is now functioning for Paddy's Green, to cost some £45,000 to supply another group of 17 landholders, pending permanent development of the area, which has since been approved, at an estimated expenditure of £1,690,000. The Government has also approved of the extension of the irrigation works to serve the Mareeba (aerodrome) section at an estimated cost of £310,000.

The Moogerah Dam was completed in 1961-1962, with the exception of some minor works, at a cost to date of £1,255,000. Most of the plant was transferred to the Leslie Dam for use in its construction. Expenditure on the Leslie Dam during 1961-1962 totalled £423,225, which included £100,000 from the Commonwealth Unemployment Relief Grant. This expenditure was incurred in the provision and erection of plant, the construction of access roads, and the setting up of the township, store, and office facilities. The allocation for 1962-1963 for this work is £348,000. It is anticipated that concrete placing in the dam wall will commence towards the end of this year.

The expenditure on the Borumba Dam during 1961-1962 was £427,000. The allocation for 1962-1963 is £650,000. I quite appreciate that some hon. members opposite do not wish to hear these things. They are ever-ready to condemn the Government for some things it has done. They should not do that because the Government has done a great deal for Queensland.

Mr. Graham: You are reading from a Government report. We can all read that.

Mr. WHARTON: It would not be any use to the hon. member if he did read it.

Greater realisation of the benefits of irrigated production in stabilising and increasing production on the part of landholders has resulted in widespread demands for further water conservation on Queensland streams, and on the need for improved water supplies for stock and domestic purposes. As a result of this demand, 14 individual projects are under investigation to discover if possible the best sites for projects to help the people, and to meet their needs. The Farm Water Supplies Assistance Act introduced by the Government has proved to be an extremely popular measure, and no fewer than 1,320 applications were received for technical, or technical and financial, assistance during 1961-1962, including 224 for financial assistance.

I wish now to say something about the farm water supplies scheme. Hon. members will know that 90 per cent. of the money is provided for them and 10 per cent. is found by the individuals who appeal for help. There is a little problem in respect of helping the people who need it most. Those who have the finance can buy their equipment, but the man who has a mortgage and is in a small way has a problem

to get finance on his mortgage from the Agricultural Bank. We should look at this problem in the light that the smaller landholders should be given the opportunity to go into irrigation and should have the opportunity to acquire plant, by securing finance, even on a second mortgage or a bill of sale, or some collateral security other than a bill of mortgage. Hon. members will well appreciate that if the farmer has a large overdraft and needs other finance for an irrigation plant, it is very awkward for the bank to release his first mortgage for a second one when the amount involved is not very great.

Another problem that concerns us with irrigation is the high cost of electric power. Under the present system of regional-board electricity control we have to pay almost twice as much for electric power as for diesel power. I regret to say that a good many irrigators are turning from electric power to diesel power, and I am rather concerned because electricity has played a vital role in developing this State; rural electrification has been extended widely throughout Queensland and it is unfortunate that men who waited for the supply are switching back to diesel power. We should concern ourselves with this problem because, although the tariff applicable is E.1, and the rate is 5.1d. for the first 500 units per month, 4d. for the next 500 and 2.9d. for units in excess of 1,000, the problem arises that, where we have meters for every plant, it is not possible for the average irrigator to get onto the lower tariff. On my own property I have 14 meters and it will be appreciated that I cannot get onto the lower rate. We should look into the matter and try to have a lower industrial rate struck to encourage the use of electricity for irrigation, making a contribution towards the further extension of rural electrification and at the same time avoiding the return from electric power to diesel. That seems to me to be wrong.

I want to emphasise that the Treasurer has presented a good Budget, one that has been introduced to create a great deal of employment, which is vital. Unemployment is one of the matters we are most concerned about. We must have full employment. A fully-employed population is important to us, and in the Budget the Treasurer has set out to achieve that.

Later we might have a look at some remedies and means of injecting encouragement into the private sector to enable it to provide employment. There we can have development depending not so much on the Government. I realise that the Government should provide work at appropriate times when there is a shortage of it in industry, but the State must be developed in the private sector. Those who wish to work for themselves in primary production and in businesses should be encouraged, and I am concerned with the fact that at the moment, particularly in primary industry, incomes have risen only 4 per cent. as against the rise in salaries and wages of 198 per cent.

in 12 years. That is rather wrong. We have neglected a particular section of the community which, after all, should play the biggest role in creating employment and developing the State. On that note, I will end my contribution to the debate.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (9.45 p.m.): I share the opinion of my colleagues in the Opposition of this Budget. It surely is uninspiring, unimaginative, and without hope. Barely anything in it could be singled out for special credit or commendation. It is typical of the Budgets that have been presented by the present Treasurer since he has occupied that office, and it shows no change whatever in his attitude over the years to his obligations in the way of budgetary provisions. It will leave Queenslanders most dissatisfied with the efforts of the Treasurer and his Government to solve the many financial problems that have beset this State in recent times, particularly those relating to unemployment and other matters that have been dealt with so capably and admirably by members of the Opposition.

I suppose it is fair to say that I do not know how the Treasurer could have balanced his Budget were it was not for the radical change in the policy of the Government over the last 12 months. I refer to that policy and express the attitude of the people of Queensland to the Budget by saying that it is a "boozezy" Budget, on an alcoholic foundation, with doubtful odds on a chancy future. It has been admirably, effectively, and efficiently decimated by previous speakers from this side, and I do not wish to weary those here this evening with a further decimation of the figures that have been presented to us by the Treasurer. They remind us of the great decline in the moral policy that has been espoused by him and the Premier for a long time. I should say that if a commercial traveller dropped articles among his customers as the Treasurer has dropped his Budget among us, he would be regarded as a shoddy dropper.

Much has been claimed on the subject of education. It has been argued by some supporters of the Government that it has done much for education in this State. I say that what it has done it was forced to do because of the situation as it was found, and because of the policy that was adopted by the previous Labour Government. When I refer to the situation as the Government found it, I mean the situation of many migrants coming to Australia, and more parents demanding, because of the policy of the previous Labour Governments, better education for their children. Parents of the present generation have a proper appreciation of the value of education, and they are demanding better treatment for their children than was given by Tory Governments in the early pioneering days.

We have heard during the course of this Budget debate the fear of Communism expressed by some speakers who were scraping the bottom of the barrel in their fear of what might happen to them at the next State election. They spoke of the evils of what might happen to the country if the youth of Australia adopted certain foreign ideologies and principles. They overlooked the fact that Russia spends 15 per cent. of its national income on education. The American record is not so good; it spends 5 per cent. of the national income on education. We in this country, in spite of the anaemic bragging that we have heard for the last three weeks, spend only 2.3 per cent. on education. So the Country Party-Liberal Governments in this State, and in the Federal sphere, cannot be very proud of their record of achievement in education when it is compared with the practical attitude adopted by people in other countries. However, other speakers have dealt with education, and have dealt quite effectively with that aspect of it.

One feature of Government administration that has been continuously overlooked by the Government, to the detriment of the State, is the need for the clean and healthy administration of the Queensland Police Force. Unfortunately, these men, the majority of whom are very decent men who should and can be respected by the community, are being brought into disrepute, and to some extent into public scorn, because of the policy of the Government and the example and attitude of one or two leading officials of the Police Force.

Mr. Ewan: Name those people.

Mr. BENNETT: If the hon. member will allow me to make my speech, I will name them. I might name so many, if time permits, that it will embarrass him. I initiated my remarks by saying that it is very important that a State should have a clean, healthy, and vigorous Police Force, one that is respected by the community. I share the opinion of one leading authority on matters of this nature who wrote—

"The police of a State embraces its whole system of internal regulation, by which the State seeks not only to preserve the public order and to prevent offences against the State, but also to establish for the intercourse of citizens with citizens those rules of good manners and good neighbourhood which are calculated to prevent a conflict of rights, to assure to each the uninterrupted enjoyment of his own so far as is reasonably consistent with a like enjoyment of rights by others."

Any hon. member who examines that statement carefully and in detail will agree that the part played by the Police Force is, or should be, a very important one. I again insist that the fine body of men that we have in Queensland has been plunged into a state of discontent. If the Government does not believe that the Police Force is in

a state of discontent, then it is hiding its head in the sand. There are schisms; there is intrigue going on; there are factions. This is all because they are not getting the correct leadership and because they are not being inspired by a fair and consistent Government policy. Of course, it is idle for me to say that they are an essential force in the community and that it is absolutely imperative that we preserve them as a good, strong, and respectable force.

We read with alarm the startlingly staccato warning given recently by the Senior Puisne Judge of Queensland, Sir Roslyn Philp, who would not make such a remark lightly. When addressing a jury in his official capacity, he said, *inter alia*—

“Your liberty and my liberty are in jeopardy.”

That is a very serious statement to make, and I believe that Sir Roslyn Philp was absolutely justified in making it. He made it on sworn testimony that came under his notice—that is perfectly obvious—and I think he did the State a great service in drawing public attention to the fact that his liberty and other people's liberty would be in jeopardy if the present policy of the administration were pursued to any greater extent than it has been in the past, to the detriment of the Police Force.

Mr. Ewan: Was he referring to one case in particular?

Mr. BENNETT: He was referring to the policy that has been adopted by the C. I. Branch in recent years, anyway; certainly since the appointment of the present officer in charge of the C. I. Branch. Please do not take this matter lightly. Hon. members on the Government benches have spoken with pious hypocrisy about what events could follow the adoption of foreign ideologies. Without giving any encouragement to affairs outside Australia, here we are fooling with affairs inside Australia that must be preserved intact, otherwise we will have an internal revolution. That is not an idle statement, when we have the Senior Puisne Judge in Queensland issuing such a warning after having served honourably in the Supreme Court for a number of years and consistently, in summing up to juries in the Criminal Court, along with other judges, stating that the police have nothing to hide and that there should not be any anticipation of fear or favour in the evidence they give. It is serious that one of the judges of this State, who was honoured in the senior stage of his career by a knighthood for his service, warns the community that the policy being forced on the Police Force by this Government is something about which we should be alarmed.

I think my legal friends sitting on the Government benches would not disagree with the observation of Sir Roslyn Philp. I am sure that my learned friend, the hon. member

for Mt. Gravatt, who is a Queen's Counsel, would agree wholeheartedly and entirely with the observations by the Senior Puisne Judge.

It is time this Government woke up to itself and decided to take a practical interest in the operation of the policy of the Police Force. Many legal circles—and I am sure the judiciary and the vast majority of police officers and policemen who know what is going on—expected some positive reaction from the Government and a practical statement from the man who at the time was Acting Minister in charge of police in this State. But again a very negative attitude was expressed. No clear-cut policy was defined. As a matter of fact, the situation is frightening. In spite of the half-baked denial by the Minister, I can assure this Parliament that the man in charge of the C. I. Branch did endorse the claim made by the spokesman for the Police Promotions Board when he said they expect at least 25 convictions a quarter. I was in court and I heard the statement made on oath. The officer in charge of the C. I. Branch endorsed those remarks and confirmed that that was the policy of the C. I. Branch, and that they take that into consideration. One of the members of the Police Promotions Board said that he drives his detectives along to get those convictions. They have a “kill” sheet. It does not mean, as its name suggests, that it is a list of matters or crimes investigated. On the police officers' admission it means the number of “kills” or convictions that a policeman gets. Those who choose to act differently from others will find themselves embarrassed by the fact that, on the “kill” sheet that is hoisted every day at the C. I. Branch to the daily view of all detectives, they have not the requisite number of “kills”.

It is high time the Government corrected its policy in this direction. Without going into the details of the statement made to the jury by Sir Roslyn Philp, instead of agreeing that the remarks were justified, the Minister attempted to cover up. I guarantee no direction has been given to those members of the C.I.B. on a policy of this nature as far as promotion is concerned, and what their attitude should be to the work of detectives. I would agree to the keeping of a list of the various matters investigated by detectives, with the senior officer making his comments as to whether or not a conviction followed, whether the work was skilfully handled, whether the detective applied himself diligently, and whether he was efficient in his investigations and carried out his duties to the satisfaction of his superior officers. But the schedule of arrests does not contain any such observations. It is merely a matter of whether or not they get a “kill”. There is no indication to show whether they have worked assiduously, with diligence, or otherwise. That was the Ron Eddington case. The evidence of Ron Eddington, now a detective-sergeant, who won his case only after appeal, proves that he was overlooked because, to use the

term of the spokesman for the Police Promotions Board, "his list was mediocre". He was a uniformed man who had performed his duties assiduously, well, and with diligence, who had a reasonable list on the schedule of arrests, but to the Police Promotions Board his list was mediocre. That is one of the reasons why they overlooked him. Thank goodness we have the appeal board. After having heard the evidence, the appeal board adopted a reasonable attitude and awarded the promotion that was made on that occasion. In spite of the recent publicity given in a certain weekly newspaper to the suggestion that the appeal board should be abolished, I am suggesting that it has been the only thing that has safeguarded the members of the Police Force from many anomalies, a number of injustices, and much unfair treatment. It will be a sorry day for the Police Force if the appeal board is abolished and police officers are left for promotion to the hazards of having to be judged on the number of "kills" they get.

We have already had one investigation presided over by Mr. Arnold Bennett Q.C., dealing with the activities of certain detectives in the Plomp matter. While on that particular point, I must say that all the members of the Queensland Bar who practise in the Criminal Court are very anxious over the tactics adopted in criminal proceedings, and actually referred to by Mr. Bennett when he said that the Crown Prosecutor should be instructed by a solicitor. I wholeheartedly agree with that observation. Alternatively, the Crown Prosecutor should be instructed by some other officer of the Crown Law Department. As the present position prevails, after giving evidence for the Crown against the man in the dock, the investigating detective comes down and sits at the Bar table beside the Crown Prosecutor who, when examining other witnesses, including witnesses for the defence, looks down at the detective, who either nods or shakes his head to indicate whether he agrees or disagrees with the answers given. In that way he gives evidence from the Bar table. If any other witness did that sort of thing he would be put out of court for contempt. But at present detectives follow that procedure, which is crying out for correction. They should be made to sit at the back of the court along with the other witnesses instead of being able to walk out of the court to confer with other detectives and then, after returning, by their nods and gestures, indicate to the jury what evidence they believe to be correct and what evidence they believe to be wrong.

Certain people are getting the wrong impression of police duties. Police duties are to assist the public in their compliance with regulations; to save unfortunate offenders from unnecessary humiliation, inconvenience and distress; with no compromise for crime, to be relentless towards the criminal but with judgment charitable towards the minor

offender. The police duties are never to arrest a citizen if a citation will suffice; never to cite if a warning would be better, and never to scold or reprimand, but to reform and request. The old police philosophy of "throw 'em in gaol" should be replaced by a philosophy of "keeping them out of gaol if you can."

I have been very concerned with many aspects of police administration and I think policemen themselves, or the vast majority of them, will agree that policemen should be beyond reproach. However, there is a great deal of discontent in the force because of the preferential treatment that is "dished out" by certain individuals, and because the members of the force do not respect one or two of the top officials in the force. They are not getting the leadership that a police force expects. When I speak of preferential treatment I refer to preferential treatment being given to certain individuals and to certain police districts. For instance, in some districts patrols wear leather jackets, but in the coldest climate in Queensland, namely, the Toowoomba area, they are not allowed to wear them.

In some police districts certain crimes are investigated, but in others they are not. I wish to touch in detail on an unfortunate accident that occurred in Rockhampton. I refer to the case of an elderly woman, Mary Griffin, who was knocked over, and who died in the hospital some four hours later. She suffered compound fractures of both legs, a fracture of the right arm, a laceration to the left elbow, and shock. So far as I know, and so far as the public know, that accident has never been investigated. I admit that it may be too soon to draw that conclusion. However, it appears there is a great deal of disquiet in Rockhampton about this accident, and it seems that there will be no inquest. The car involved in the accident was not impounded by the police, although cars involved in such accidents are normally impounded, and there are other aspects of the case that give rise to consternation. Even on the next day, when the accident was reported in the Press, the report stated that the name of the driver of the car was not released by the police the night before. I am hoping that those who have authority to issue instructions for a proper investigation into the matter will see that a proper investigation is carried out.

When dealing with individuals in the Police Force, it is to be noted that there is a great deal of incongruity in the punishment that is meted out. Only recently a young constable who had performed 7 hours' duty at night returned to the depot and sat at his table waiting his time to wake the next shift. In the course of sitting at the table, just like the Treasurer, the Premier, and the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, he dozed off and went to sleep. That was a perfectly natural thing for him to do. His superior officer came in and found him, and reported him. He was charged and

dismissed from the force for that offence. This unfortunate policeman also misread, or lost, a roster list at Mt. Isa and commenced duty one hour late. For this offence he was also dismissed from the Police Force. That seems to be rather harsh punishment. However, because fortunately, and refreshingly, members of the Police Force have the right of appeal, he was reinstated when his appeal was properly presented by his counsel.

However, let me instance some of the inconsistencies in treatment. On 12 December, 1959, a first-class sergeant was found guilty of being under the influence of liquor and of having unlawfully removed and partially destroyed a receipt. He was fined £5. Another officer, a constable, was found guilty of driving a police vehicle on duty under the influence of liquor and fined £5. Then, on 10 March, 1960, a first-class constable who was supposed to be on duty in Queen Street, left his post without lawful excuse. He was found guilty of having deserted his post between the hours of 2 a.m. and 6 a.m. and he had the impertinence to be found in my electorate in the small hours of that morning dressed in his singlet and underpants in a car in very embarrassing circumstances. He was fined £3. So there does appear to be some inconsistency in the punishment meted out.

The really serious matter, however, is that police officers, that is, officers holding fairly high positions and certainly those ordinary policemen in the force, have become completely disillusioned. In the first place there are not enough of them to carry out their Herculean task. I have been reliably informed—and possibly it is slightly exaggerated but I am prepared to believe from my information that it is fairly accurate—that, at many times, if not most times, approximately two-thirds of the Police Force are on leave. When I refer to “leave” I include, of course, long-service leave, annual leave, and sick leave. In addition, because of the parsimonious policy adopted by this Government and because of its cheese-paring attitude, instead of being paid for overtime officers are required to take extra leave. There may be certain occasions when the Police Department requires them to work overtime, for which of course they should be paid, but, even though the record shows that they are paid, in certain instances they are in fact given extra leave to make up for the overtime they have worked. That means that the Police Force works at approximately one-third of its effective strength, and it is proving too much for the men.

Press publicity has been given to the fact that we have not enough men on traffic control; we certainly have not enough men policing the roads. It is correct to say, as has been claimed by some police authorities and by officials, that a certain number of road deaths are caused by alcohol and a certain number by speed, but quite a number of them are obviously caused

by the lack of control given by the police traffic control department because it is wanting in numbers. I could refer to several unfortunate accidents that happened recently. Hon. members opposite speak of the Government's records. It has a record loss in road carnage. At one period, 129 people were killed on the road in 98 days. It would be perfectly dishonest to say they were all killed through speed and/or alcohol. Many of those deaths resulted from not having proper traffic patrolling.

I have already mentioned that an unfortunate accident occurred recently in Gladstone Road. I do not wish to refer to it in detail but some 18 months ago, at the request and on the insistence of the unfortunate boy's father, I had applied to have a policeman control the school children as they went across that busy and hectic road after school and I was told that it had been decided, after the taking of an observation, that no police patrol or police supervision was warranted. I was given that decision in writing and I still have the letter. Anyone who would say that would not be dealing correctly with the truth, or alternatively would have made the claim because he knew that this Government was not prepared to put into the Police Force a sufficient number of men to carry out adequately the duties demanded of them.

Motor-vehicle registration fees have been increased, and everything connected with motoring has been made more costly, yet the Government is not prepared to increase, in proportion to these added payments, the facilities to which motorists are entitled. It wants it to be a one-way traffic, and it is not prepared to place enough manpower in control of traffic to deal properly with the situations that arise from time to time. I say that this Government is largely to blame for the road toll recorded during its term of office.

I have mentioned that there is a certain amount of disrespect for a few people in positions of high authority in the Police Force. That attitude can be damaging to the Force and to the State. A very serious and important matter came under my notice. For ethical and honourable reasons, I did not wish to use it politically, expecting it to be dealt with properly and honourably in the manner that one would expect from men in charge of the administration of the State. A certain allegation in writing, containing three foolscap pages, was made against a top member of the Police Force. The information was widely circulated and known throughout the Police Force, and, unfortunately, the great majority of those who know of it believe it. I am not saying whether or not I believe it. It is a very serious and perhaps startling allegation. In the interests of the Police Force and the State, and because it is so serious and is causing so much dissension and dissatisfaction among those being disciplined by this

high-ranking officer, I decided to place the original complaint in writing in the hands of the Premier, which I did.

Mr. Ewan: How long have you had it?

Mr. BENNETT: That is my complaint. It has now been in the hands of the Premier for approximately two months. I know that it has not been investigated. I would not have mentioned this matter tonight, but I do not allow anybody to treat me with derision or disdain, or to act scornfully towards my genuine attempts at public administration. If anyone takes me for a fool, he had better wake up quick and smart.

Mr. Ewan: How do you know it has not been investigated?

Mr. BENNETT: I should imagine that the obvious thing to do to investigate properly a complaint is to investigate the one making the allegation, and that has not been done. I placed the original complaint in the hands of the Premier, but took the precaution of keeping a photostat copy. I do not claim that the allegations are correct. What I say is that they are widely believed in police circles, and the matter is causing a lot of discontent and dissatisfaction.

On cross-examining the Commissioner of Police on one occasion, these questions were put to him and these answers were received—

“Would you say cohabiting with other people’s wives is not very serious?—I said it was a serious matter.

“Would you say cohabiting with other people’s wives is more serious than getting a little bit tipsy on duty?—I would think it would be, but you referred to a little bit tipsy on duty which is not the case here, with respect.

“Would you say a police officer who cohabits with another person’s wife whilst on duty would be committing a serious offence?—I would say so. His conduct on and off duty should be exemplary.

“Would you say a police officer who cohabits with another person’s wife whilst on duty and in his uniform should be dismissed from the Police Force?—If there were no extenuating circumstances I would say that might be an appropriate penalty.”

It is a rather extraordinary answer, but it is the answer given by the Commissioner.

“If he persistently did it?—Yes.

“This man who was cohabiting with another person’s wife, you found him guilty and fined him £5?—Yes.”

I do not know whether that question was embarrassing to the Commissioner, but it was rather a strange answer. The man referred to was not the man in this complaint.

If that is the moral standard of the Police Force—I am not suggesting for one moment that it is; I am saying that it is not, but that it may apply to certain individuals in high

places—how can those people deal appropriately with their subordinates who might follow their example and do similar things? They obviously cannot.

I considered it my duty to see that the matter was investigated in the interests of the person concerned, and certainly in the interests of the Police Force. I considered that there was a moral obligation on me to have the matter investigated thoroughly, and any Government that takes two months to get going on that investigation either lacks a sense of responsibility or has such a weary, worn-out Cabinet that it should be relieved of its obligations.

Mr. Ewan: You placed only one of these allegations before the Government, did you?

Mr. BENNETT: If the hon. member for Roma has plenty of time, I will tell him. Contained in the same report is a suggestion that the series of offences, committed over a long period of time, was committed in premises owned and controlled by the leading and well-known operator of a chain of houses of ill-fame in this city. I know that this person was followed to the particular premises by a member of the Police Promotions Board, who is well aware, according to what I have been told, of what went on in there, and of what had been going on over the period. So what will be the attitude of the Police Promotions Board to any disciplinary measures that might be taken against this man, or to any suggestions about a policy in relation to the methods of getting evidence, the number of arrests that should be made, the types of convictions and so on? The Board will say, “We have a certain policy in this regard. Certain things are going on, and we do not propose for one moment to accept any disciplinary suggestions from you.”

I do not propose to read the document at this stage. Although I have not heard one word from the Premier since I conveyed this information to him, if he had assured me that it had been thoroughly investigated and the allegations were idle—

Mr. Ewan interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: It seems that the hon. member for Roma is putting up a strong defence.

Mr. Ewan: I said that it might be embarrassing to you to read it.

Mr. BENNETT: The Premier has it. If the hon. member is suggesting that it should be read in Parliament, there is nothing to stop the Premier from reading it. If the hon. member for Roma listens to my argument, I will tell him why I do not propose to read it at this stage. The Premier has had ample time to make a thorough and close investigation, and I am of the opinion—I do practise law, as hon. members know—that if any bona fide attempt to investigate the matter were made, the complainant would be

approached. The complainant is a woman with six children, and I believe that she should be approached in the investigation. If the investigation were made and the Premier told me, as the person who had conveyed the information to him, that there was nothing in the suggestions, that they were idle or untrue, I would accept his assurance wholeheartedly. As a responsible member of this Parliament I am not going to be fobbed off by the Premier or anybody else when I try to do the decent thing. I could have read out this document earlier but I have been waiting for some action. As I say, I do not pursue the matter in it in further detail at this particular stage. I did endeavour to see the Premier on the matter once before but I could not. I tried to make an appointment today, but he was too busy. He has agreed to make an appointment for later in the week, so I accept that suggestion that the appointment will be made.

Even at this stage I would not have referred to such a serious matter—and it is a serious matter—because if the allegation is true, this man should not be wielding the power in this State that he does wield; and, if the allegation is untrue, the many police officers, high and low, who believe it to be true should be assured that it is untrue so that they can get about their tasks with heads held high, and with pride in the Police Force. At the moment they cannot do that. I suggest that, even at this stage, I would not have adverted to the subject except that I was inclined to think that two months' delay was treating me with a certain amount of derision and as there were only two days left for the Budget debate, it was my obligation to speak tonight so as to let the people interested understand that I do not allow matters such as this to die before they are thoroughly investigated and cleaned up.

I think that, in the interests of this Parliament and also in the interests of the Police Force—and I say seriously there is grave discontent in the Police Force among men who love to hold their heads high, amongst men who cherish the work they are doing and who feel dissatisfied with the reputation of one or two people in high places—that this matter should be cleaned up. However, I shall not pursue it any further at this stage.

Before speaking on matters other than the Police Force, I feel that the country policeman, and the suburban policeman in particular, is being weighed down with duties extraneous to Police Force activities.

Mr. Rae: You are quite right.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think that is right. I think I know what the hon. member for Gregory means. He means they are being weighed down and I do not think it is in the interests of the policeman that, because of their diversion to other duties, they should experience difficulties in carrying out their more fundamental duties.

There have been royal commissions on this matter of extraneous duties for policemen and I think without exception it will be found that royal commissions throughout the world have always declared that policemen should not be weighed down by duties extraneous to work of a police nature.

I quote from one particular royal commission, which said—

“Holding as we do that the Police are essentially a force for suppressing crime, we look with some doubt upon those extraneous duties which impede that main aim by dissipating the Police strength and by antagonising considerable sections of the community which are normally well disposed towards them.”

Further on, it said—

“This is perhaps not unnatural having regard to the flexible nature of most British institutions. The office of Constable dates back for many hundreds of years and historically there have been considerable changes in the conception of what is involved in police duties both prior to and since the foundation of the modern police force. The instructions issued by Sir Richard Mayne to the Metropolitan police force in 1829 defined the primary functions of police as follows:—

“The primary objective of an efficient Police is the prevention of crime: the next that of detection and punishment of offenders if crime is committed. To these ends all the efforts of Police must be directed. The protection of life and property, the preservation of public tranquility, and the absence of crime, will alone prove whether those efforts have been successful and whether the objects for which the Police were appointed have been attained.”

Finally quoting on this aspect of my submission, paragraph 23 says—

“In general the police should not be made responsible for any extraneous duty the primary object of which is the collection of money.”

My colleague, the hon. member for Sandgate, has already mentioned that many police officers in Brisbane are virtually parking-meter collectors. They have to go round sticking posters or stickers on motor-cars, work that could be equally efficiently done by men who are not trained in the skills of police officers. Perhaps they would not even need to be able to ride motor-cycles. Certainly they would not need to have a knowledge of the control and disposition of traffic. They should be the people to check the meters and collect the revenue. That sort of work is not the duty of police officers, and I wholeheartedly agree with my colleague, the hon. member for Sandgate, when he says that police officers should be relieved

of this duty in the city and given the opportunity to perform the real police duties for which they are trained. This royal commission supports that theory.

It says—

“ . . . for example, the work of Court Collecting Officer under the Affiliation Orders Act, 1914, or the receipt of fines imposed by the magistrates. Some duties, however, which involve the collection of money, must be undertaken by the police, e.g., the execution of warrants . . . ”

It further says—

“ In general the police should not undertake any extraneous duty which is primarily administrative, such as the issue of licences.”

A tremendous amount of the time of police officers is taken up with issuing licences. Continuing with the paragraph—

“ There are a number of statutes in which responsibility for enforcement or power of inspection or entry is conferred upon the police while the general administration of the statute or the power of licensing, inspection and enforcement is placed upon some other authority.”

I do not think it is necessary for me to name the various Acts under which the police must operate and which are extraneous to their normal police training and duties. Some of them are acting as local clerks of petty sessions; some are acting as slaughtering inspectors. They are called upon to perform various jobs, all of which are extraneous to their real duties.

The Government has already been taken to task—I am merely trying to help it to improve its efficiency—for its failure to enforce the traffic laws. As I have mentioned earlier, my conception of enforcing traffic laws and carrying out traffic duties is not to lumber people along to the court. I realise that that is necessary with certain people, but in the main the attitude and policy should not be merely to lumber people along to the court; rather should it be to train, educate, and lead them. As I mentioned even last year, I think it is perfectly obvious that a police officer performing his duty well and acting courteously to the public can curtail and, to a large extent, almost eliminate accidents, particularly lesser accidents. I do not need to stress the fact that on the busy Southport road or on the main arterial roadways leading into the city, if there is a police officer properly and quietly riding his motorcycle at the head of a line of traffic, the line of traffic behaves itself well. It complies with the traffic laws and regulations. If it is done consistently it becomes a habit with the public. I do not agree with police traps. I do not agree with taking people by surprise. I do not agree with traps, because if you try to trap or trick the people they will try to trap or trick the constable, and there will be no co-operation or cohesion between them. Mention has been made of magistrates. If that attitude was adopted it would be only

the persistent, deliberate, and wilful offender who would find his way into court. As it is at the moment, it is a hit-and-miss business and some unfairness could result.

I do not wish to deal with this matter this evening because it is sub judice. However, I deprecate the comments of the hon. member for Townsville South. He should well realise that his comments were cowardly. Speaking for myself, and other members in the Chamber, I should say that it is not our place to take sordid pleasure in seeing people put through the court and suffering adversity. That is not the responsibility of Parliament or the Police Force. Our obligation is to try to encourage them to reform and to do better.

When I appear in the Traffic Court I see members of the Police Force walking along the veranda of the police court in their cycling rig. There are so many of them it is hard to get past them. Very often their presence is not required, except when a case is heard *ex parte*, or is contested, and on many occasions, on a plea of guilty, these police officers are in the precincts of the court, and their presence is unnecessary. Those 30, 40, or 50 men could serve the city better by being out on their motor cycles leading the traffic into the town and, incidentally, saving the city a great deal of expense. It is all very well for the Government to get a reasonable amount of money in fines, but at the same time a vast army of policemen is hanging round the courts. The operation of the courts is costly to the taxpayers. These police officers could serve the State better by patrolling the highways. If a driver expects to come across a motor cyclist at any moment, he is likely to be more reasonable and sensible than otherwise.

I have some observations to make on employment. Earlier in the session I asked a question about homes that are conducted as convalescent homes for elderly people. I was chided in a rather smart way by the Acting Minister for Health and Home Affairs, the Minister for Transport, who said, in effect, that it is nothing to do with the Government. He said that the Government was not interested and did nothing about them, that the licensing of these homes was a matter for the city council. That answer was less than half a truth because, in the first place, the city council does not license the homes. It decides whether it will grant site approval and then, like any other tenement building, or multi-storey building, it decides whether it will approve of the building for multi-unit or tenement purposes. From the health point of view the city council has no control or authority over the conduct of the building as a convalescent home. It has no control over the medical staff, if any, that is required to attend the patients and inmates.

In spite of the fact that my question was a little misdirected because the Government denies all responsibility for them and does not assist them financially, it is a fact that,

through the Commonwealth social services scheme, and other schemes, in certain instances the people who control or conduct these homes receive some subsidy from the Commonwealth health authorities. I do not think that the Minister for Health and Home Affairs would have tried to be as smart as the Minister for Transport. He would have evinced some interest in these homes because as a doctor, and Minister for Health, it is his bounden obligation and responsibility to show some interest in them.

Since asking the question I have been fortified in my anxieties about the home by the leading article in the September issue of the Queensland Nurses Journal, which also on one page expresses concern about the way in which some of these homes are being conducted. We have already read the report of an unfortunate fire in which some elderly people died, including a relative of a distinguished former member of this Parliament, one of the leading brains of the State in his day. They were caught in the fire and one would wonder why they were not able to get out. Possibly it is obvious to those who take an interest in these matters that the reason for the fire in the first place and the reason for some of the inmates being unable to get out is abundantly clear; that is, that some of these convalescent homes, which should be supervised by the Government though they are not, are not properly staffed at night-time. Some of them, which are receiving high returns for the services they render, have only the proprietor looking after the large number of inmates during the night-time. In order to comply with certain regulations they have one qualified nurse and in some instances, unfortunately, I am informed, these old people are given drugs and needles to put them to sleep, not because they need the sleep, not because they need the needles and not because their health would be impaired if they did not have them, but because of lack of staff. If they are not adequately drugged or doped for the night, they may want to get up and walk round a little; They may want to wander out to the kitchen and have a cup of tea, which they are entitled to as pioneers of the State. But in some instances the proprietors, who are interested only in the financial return from these institutions, decide to drug them so that they themselves can get a decent night's sleep and there is not adequate supervision for these unfortunate inmates. Instead of the Minister for Transport saying that the Government has nothing to do with it, I suggest that the Government should make it its business to have something to do with it and introduce suitable legislation and regulation to control the drugs and dope given to the old people and to insist that they be given only from a medical point of view when required. After all, the city council does not claim or pretend to be a medical authority. The Minister for Health and Home Affairs and his department are the medical authorities for the city and the

State. They should insist that these homes, as they are called convalescent homes, semi-hospitals or post-operative hospitals, are properly conducted and that the inmates are not abused by the use of drugs from time to time to keep them quiet and for no other purpose.

My colleagues have dealt with unemployment, which certainly is going to be a real problem for the Government after Christmas. Of course, the position has been worsened by the fiscal policy of the Federal Government, a policy of depressing the economy and creating an unemployment pool. That has been its policy from time to time. After Christmas the percentage of unemployed in this State will increase alarmingly, and it is unfortunate and sad that, even at this late stage, young people who passed the Junior examination in 1961 have not been able to find any employment, let alone suitable employment. After Christmas this year, those unfortunate juniors who worked hard to secure a good and substantial pass will have no chance because the attitude of employers will be that they will take the fresh blood coming newly from the Junior examination, and those others who passed the 1961 examination will be left out permanently from any suitable type of employment. I believe the Government's attitude has engendered in Queensland a fear of unemployment.

(Time expired.)

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 10.46 p.m.
