

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 15 OCTOBER 1963

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 15 OCTOBER, 1963

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

QUESTIONS

NEW T.A.B. AGENCIES.—Mr. Dean, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) Did he see the newspaper statement made by the chairman of the Totalisator Administration Board in *The Courier-Mail* of October 7, that new Totalisator Administration Board Shops would always be opening in Queensland?

(2) If so, will he give serious consideration to curtailing this fast-developing monster which is causing hardship in many homes and also having a detrimental effect on many local business concerns, because money so spent in these shops is directed into an unproductive channel?

Answer:—

(1 and 2.) "I know of no such newspaper statement by the chairman. What appeared was a summary of the chairman's 'Meet the Press' interview on the previous evening. In that interview he made it clear that Brisbane was almost completely covered and he foresaw the need for about two more metropolitan agencies in the near future. He went on to make it clear that expansion of the State's population and the need to combat remaining areas of illegal operation would then be the main factors in initiating consideration of new agencies. There is no evidence that the spreading of the T.A.B. is causing an increase in the gambling habits of the State. On the contrary, there is considerable support for the view that the volume is now much less than in the bad old days of widespread illegal operation. The insistence by the T.A.B. on no credit facility, and its practice of withholding the payment of winnings until a following day have proved a salutary correction of the bad old practices of betting until heavily in debt and of dissipating earlier winnings in subsequent plunges on the same day."

USE OF MEGASSE AS FUEL.—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Primary Industries,—

In view of the acute world sugar shortage which has been accentuated by the hurricane disaster which wiped out a quarter of Cuba's crop, does he consider that the time is opportune, while markets and prices are reasonably assured, to take steps to minimise or eliminate the nuisance caused in all sugar mill areas by the burning of megasse in furnaces?

Answer:—

"Australia relies for its existence in the world free sugar market on being economically efficient. To this end, major economies in cost are derived by using megasse as fuel. Whilst present export prices are high, very recent history shows a different position, and it would be unrealistic to assume the present high level of prices will last indefinitely. I would add that every care is taken to reduce to an absolute minimum any nuisance arising from the use of megasse as fuel during the crushing season."

SEPTIC SYSTEMS AT MURARRIE AND MAYFIELD STATE SCHOOLS.—Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

When will septic systems be installed at the Murarrie and Mayfield State Schools?

Answer:—

"No indication can be given as to when septic systems will be installed at the Murarrie and Mayfield State Schools. Funds are not available at present for these installations. The Murarrie and Mayfield State Schools will receive consideration with other schools when further funds for the installation of septic systems become available."

TOWNSVILLE ADULT EDUCATION CENTRE.—Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Has an appointment yet been made to the position of Assistant District Organiser of Adult Education in Townsville?

(2) Has the possibility of appointing a third organiser to the Townsville centre been examined and, if not, is he prepared to give it serious consideration?

Answers:—

(1) "No. Action is being taken to advertise the position and an appointment will be made in due course."

(2) "The possibility of appointing an additional District Organiser to the Townsville Adult Education Centre and to one or more other Adult Education Centres, has been given full consideration. This year priority has been given to the establishment of a new centre at Mackay and a District Organiser has recently been appointed to this centre. Apart from this appointment, no provision has been made in the estimates for the appointment of additional officers. In view of the heavy commitments of my Department and the funds available, it is not proposed to make any new appointments during this financial period."

DISTRIBUTION FROM BOOKMAKERS' TURN-OVER TAX SPECIAL FUND.—Mr. O'Donnell, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

With reference to the Bookmakers' (Off Course) Turnover Tax Special Fund,—

(1) When, if at any time, was a distribution made to clubs?

(2) If a distribution was made, how much was received by the Rockhampton Jockey Club, the Emerald Club and the Springsure Club?

(3) How much tax was paid into the Special Fund by each of these centres?

(4) If Rockhampton district, inclusive of Yeppoon and Mount Morgan, paid in nothing, why did the Rockhampton Jockey Club benefit?

Answers:—

(1) "A distribution was made of funds available as at February 28, 1963."

(2) "As a principal club, the Rockhampton Jockey Club received £118 8s. 4d. as its entitlement under paragraph (a) of subsection (4) of Section 95c of the Acts. I have no record of the distribution of the balance of available funds made by the distribution committee under paragraph (b) of the subsection."

(3) "The information is not available."

(4) "I refer the Honourable Member to subsection (4) of Section 95c of the Acts. But I remind the Honourable Gentleman that Rockhampton is one of the few places in Central Queensland which races every Saturday. If some Club were not prepared to do so, there would be no racing event on which off-course operators could accept wagers."

HOUSING COMMISSION SHOPPING CENTRE, WULGURU.—Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) Has the Housing Commission an area reserved for a shopping centre at Wulguru? If so, how many business premises have been erected on this area to date?

(2) If any premises have been erected, under what terms and conditions were the occupants and/or owners allowed to erect them?

(3) What terms and conditions will apply to anyone else who desires to erect business premises on the area?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "Yes. An area of eight sites. No business premises have been erected."

(3) "The sites are available on perpetual lease tenure to firms, organisations, companies or persons for business purposes. Buildings are to be of brick or concrete construction to plans approved by the Commission and the Local Authority."

SALE OF FLUORIDE TABLETS WITHOUT PRESCRIPTION.—Mr. Hanlon, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) Is he aware that it is possible to buy without prescription over the counter in Brisbane fluoride tablets in a container on which appears the caution, "Supply of this preparation except on prescription is illegal in Queensland"?

(2) Will he give an explanation of this situation in view of the fact that his introductory remarks on the Fluorine Bill suggest it is in the interests of children's dental health for parents to give them such tablets in the suggested dosage, where fluorine is not added to the water supply?

(3) If there is any danger in the use without prescription of these tablets, will he ensure that the attention of chemists is drawn to the provisions of the law in this State?

(4) Why is it necessary to secure these tablets only by prescription?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) "It has been the policy of my Department to place drugs on Schedule 4 of the Poisons Regulations until they are classified by the National Health and Medical Research Council. This restricts their supply to pharmaceutical chemists by prescription only. At the meeting of the National Health and Medical Research Council held in May of this year it was recommended that fluoride tablets be placed in Schedule 2. Drugs in this Schedule are of low toxicity and may be sold by a pharmaceutical chemist or by the holder of a general poisons license obtainable by a person more than ten miles distant from the nearest chemist without restriction. No record of sale need be kept. It would be necessary to swallow at least twenty-one fluoride tablets before any toxic symptoms would even appear and when it is realised that these tablets are one-quarter of an inch in diameter, it will be appreciated that such a happening is unlikely to occur. Amendments to the various Poison Schedules are in the course of preparation and should be gazetted within the next month. As I have mentioned previously, no other method of preventing dental decay has been shown to be as effective or convenient as fluoridation of water. Reliable safeguards have been devised against adding too much fluoride at the waterworks. Its presence naturally in some water supplies in far larger amounts than the recommended concentration, without harm to health, shows there is a wide margin of safety. Despite the closest watch there is no evidence to support the view that fluoridation carries any hazard to general health in the concentration of one part per million."

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Burdekin River Authority for the year 1962-63.

Commissioner for Transport for the year 1962-63.

Land Administration Commission, including Reports of the Surveyor-General, Superintendent of Stock Routes, and Rural Fires Board for the year 1962-63.

State Children Department for the year 1962-63.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1962.

The Stamp Acts, 1894 to 1962.

The Forestry Act of 1959.

The Abattoirs Acts, 1930 to 1958.

Reports—

Queensland Coal Board for the year 1962-63.

Audit Inspector's Report on the Books and Accounts of the Queensland Coal Board for the year 1962-63.

INSPECTION OF SCAFFOLDING ACTS
AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. A. T. DEWAR (Wavell—Minister for Labour and Industry): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Inspection of Scaffolding Acts, 1915 to 1960, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION OF MACHINERY ACTS
AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. A. T. DEWAR (Wavell—Minister for Labour and Industry): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Inspection of Machinery Acts, 1951 to 1960, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

DAYS ALLOTTED TO SUPPLY

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

“That, during the remainder of this session, unless otherwise ordered, the House may, on the days allotted for Supply, continue to sit until 10 o'clock p.m. Each of the periods between 11 o'clock a.m. and 4 o'clock p.m. and between 4 o'clock p.m. and 10 o'clock p.m. shall be accounted an allotted day under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307. Three allotted days shall be allowed for the discussion of the Estimates of a department. At the termination of the period so allowed the Chairman shall put every question necessary to decide the Vote under consideration and shall then proceed to put the question for the balance of the Estimates for that department; all such questions to be decided without amendment or debate: Provided that, if the discussion of the Estimates of a department be concluded before the expiry of the three days so allowed, the period remaining shall be allocated to the discussion of the Estimates next brought before the Committee. All provisions of Standing Order No. 307 shall, *mutatis mutandis*, continue to apply.”

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hooper, Greenslopes, in the chair.)

Debate resumed from 10 October (see p. 653) on Mr. Hiley's motion—

“That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1963-1964, a sum not exceeding £1,679 to defray the salary of Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor.”

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (11.21 a.m.): Despite the fact that the Treasurer seems to have attempted to simplify the recording of the public accounts, after some hours of work in making comparisons I find that a lot of time is still required to fully comprehend the ramifications of the public accounts of Queensland. It is extremely difficult for anybody, including hon. members of this Committee, to dissect and analyse the figures and make comparisons with previous years because of the actual manner of the presentation of the accounts. In the Commonwealth sphere in the presentation of their accounts, they have a half-way house—if I could describe it as that—where cross entries are made between the accounts, so that they can be much more easily followed than in Queensland. The State Treasurer's separation of the accounts into Trust and Special Funds and Loan Account does simplify it in some small way but numerous amounts coming from the

Commonwealth Government are not readily disclosed and can not be easily checked until the Auditor-General's report is presented to us. For many years that report has not been presented to the House until very late in the session. Until it is available to us it is very difficult to understand the amounts received under the heading of Trust and Special Funds; it is very difficult to distinguish the money emanating from the Commonwealth Government or Trust and Special Funds coming from Consolidated Revenue. Perhaps in his future financial presentations the Treasurer will be able to simplify that information in some way.

Now that the Treasurer's Financial Statement has been presented it makes a rather intriguing study to go back over a period of six years, particularly to the period 1957-1961, when the Treasurer announced deficits amounting, for those four years, to £3,500,000. There was an increasing problem of unemployment and an increasing difficulty in providing the necessary works and services required by the people of Queensland. The Treasurer must have considered what has happened as something like the relief of Mafeking. Mr. McMahon, the Federal Minister for Labour and National Service, now states that this State's finances are in a sound position. No doubt that statement is based on the relief afforded over the past few years to the extent of approximately £7,500,000. There does seem to be considerable improvement in that direction. The expenditure this year will continue to increase and the pressures previously applying because of unemployment do not seem to be so great.

As we look back to 1961 and the days of the credit squeeze we can reflect on the lessons to be learned from that period by the amateur economist. If we refer back to 1951-1952, when we had some semblance of a liquid market for Commonwealth loans and when we had the previous peak of loan allocations for State works and services, and then go through the following 10 years and see the deterioration in the level of public investments, we realise that the credit squeeze was created purely and simply by the failure of the Menzies Government to understand the necessity to place some curb on the levels of private investment. They were allowed to snowball in the Australian community to such a stage that the Commonwealth Government in its wisdom, or lack of wisdom, decided that it was essential to halt inflation and, as with the earlier "little horror" Budget, it became a matter of stop and go, and make and break. This policy created conditions of unemployment, and suffering and hardship for many people, and caused a failure on the part of State Governments to provide the services demanded by the people. One of the gravest features of that period was the fact that, because of the financial policy of the Federal Government, the State Governments were forced to find ways and means of raising additional money to finance the

works and services required by the people, such as hospitals, education, housing, and other matters. In this State, over a period of five years the Treasurer found it necessary to increase revenue from State taxation from £10,000,000 to last year's figure of £17,000,000—an increase of £7,000,000 in a few years. That is certainly a tremendous growth in the revenue of the Government, but according to the Treasurer it was essential. We on this side of the Chamber consider that the financial policy of the Federal Government should have been more carefully scrutinised.

I should like to mention two cases in point. Queensland has lost considerably in the past six years because of a failure by the Government to understand fully the impact of the new tax reimbursement and aid to roads formulas created by the Commonwealth Government in conference with State Premiers and Treasurers. Firstly, under the previous formula the total allocation to the States of Commonwealth aid for roads was £153,072,000, of which Queensland received £29,284,000, or 19·1 per cent. Under the new formula, which was negotiated as the result of pressure applied on the Commonwealth by the Premiers of South Australia and Victoria, and which the Queensland Government allowed to sneak through under its guard, for the present five-year period it is estimated that Queensland will receive £45,831,000, or 18·2 per cent. of the total of £251,923,000 to be distributed. That applies to matching grants, as well as to Commonwealth aid for roads. What I have submitted gives a pretty fair overall picture of the actual percentage figures and shows that there is a reduction of almost 1 per cent. in the Queensland allocation. This reduction of 1 per cent. amounts to almost £4,000,000 in the five years.

I turn now to another matter arranged by the State Premiers in March, 1959, when considerable concern was being expressed over the previous formula and the occasional grants coming through to the State Governments. At that time the Premiers of the States decided on a new basis for allocating tax-reimbursement grants to the various States, including the special grants for claimant States. Unfortunately, there again either somebody was remiss or he failed to realise the real significance of the new formula. I believe it was suggested by the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Holt, and Mr. McEwen. The Prime Minister was not present at the conference. The full allocation for the previous year was taken as a base, not merely the full tax-reimbursement grants and grants of special assistance but also the grants made to the claimant States. The approximate proportion received by the States in the previous year was taken as the base for the new formula. If the figure had not included the grants made through the Commonwealth Grants Commission by the Commonwealth to South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania, the picture would have been entirely different.

For the years 1956-1957, 1957-1958 and 1958-1959 Queensland received 15.6 per cent. of the total of grants made to the States but in the reallocation its share was reduced to approximately 14.9 per cent., or a reduction of .7 per cent. of the total allocation. Apparently there was a failure to realise that the allocation of tax-reimbursement grants was entirely separate from the sums required by the claimant States to bring their services to the people up to the standard of those of the non-claimant States. The Commonwealth Grants Commission is there purely and simply as an authority to decide how much Western Australia and Tasmania require to maintain a level of social services equivalent to that of the other States, and those allocations should not be taken into consideration in determining the base for a formula. If we had been granted the same percentage as before, it would have meant a difference to us of about £7,000,000 more from 1959-1960 to 1962-1963.

Within 12 months of that conference in the South, held in March, 1959, and the arrangement made in June, 1959, many of the Premiers felt that they had been taken for a ride by the Commonwealth Government. No doubt it was one of the reasons for the need, during the past two years, to give the States large non-repayable grants for the relief of unemployment. At that time we had placed our name on the list, along with Victoria, to become a claimant State.

This was the procedure adopted by the Commonwealth Government to overcome a problem it did not want to face. It in fact put up the proposition, and our Government was remiss in failing to realise the full impact of the new formula on Queensland's budgeting. Those are two matters in point and I believe they are rather important to the financial affairs of the State and to the reason why we have not been able to provide adequate services for the people.

I believe there is another matter of very serious concern. In all matters of social services of any great importance there flows from the Commonwealth Government to the States some assistance by way of direct, non-repayable grant. We find that in 1945 this procedure was adopted with hospitals, and all beds occupied were subsidised to a certain extent on a daily basis. It was then realised that if this were not done many people would not be able to afford hospital treatment.

Immediately after the last war, when so many men were being discharged from the services and the marriage rate rose, it was essential that special allocations of loan money be made to the States for the housing of these people. For six years during the war little had been done in providing housing, and it then became necessary for someone to accept the responsibility of building homes to meet this sudden demand. The

1945 Commonwealth-States Housing Agreement came into being, and a certain amount of success was achieved in overcoming the immediate housing problem.

As a follow-up to that period, there has been in the post-war era another problem not yet faced by the Commonwealth Government, and that is in the field of education. The marriage rate was high following the war years, and today the children born during that period require secondary education and in two or three years will no doubt require tertiary education as well. There has not been sufficient recognition by the Commonwealth Government of this problem.

Heavy demands are being placed on the budgets of all Australian States. In Queensland alone expenditure on education during the last 10 years has risen from £8,000,000 to £21,500,000 last year. Expenditure from loan funds has now increased to £5,400,000, and in the next couple of years there will be a need for new universities, which will impose an additional heavy burden on the State. The expenditure on construction of these facilities will be only of a temporary nature, and loan expenditure will not continue for many years. As soon as the problem is overcome, capital expenditure will tend to reduce.

Just as it was found necessary for the Commonwealth Government to participate at the time of the housing emergency, so, too, we find a similar position with regard to education. It is necessary for the Commonwealth Government to intervene and make direct grants for the purpose of education not only at university level but for primary and secondary education as well. This is necessary to enable the States to meet the needs of young people and to provide industry with men and women educated to a uniform standard. There are at present differing education systems in the States, and if we are to have educated people meeting the requirements of industry to enable it to compete with the rest of the world, we must have a system of education that is standard throughout the country.

The cost of expanding technical education will be great. The requirements of industry are such that in many ways our apprenticeship system has become outmoded. Heavy expenditure will be involved in the establishment of technical colleges to train the youth of the country to a standard enabling their ready absorption into highly-scientific industry. That cannot be done under our present system and the current method of spending money. The limitation placed upon State budgets in this respect is causing us to lag further and further behind the rest of the industrialised world.

There is another point, too. In many parts of Australia we have a system of education based on a combination of church and State schools, and it seems inevitable that it is there to stay and will never be altered.

Many things have been said about the system in the past, and gross political prejudice has entered into the matter. The Commonwealth Government is the only Government that can afford to assist in the creation of a uniform system of education between the States, and, indeed, within the States, and I believe that it must intervene immediately if we are to give all the children of Australia a similar standard of education. We cannot afford to have a standard in State schools higher than that in private schools; but because of the progress that is being made in the development of education, private schools may be turning out students who are below average. In the national interest, we must not allow such a position to arise. I know that this is a vexed question, but it is very important to the people of Australia. It is absolutely impossible for State Governments to accept responsibility for the tremendous expenditure that will be required to meet our future educational requirements, and, as I said, in my opinion the Commonwealth Government should intervene immediately.

I do not believe that we appreciate fully the importance of the matter. We say that there is a gradual improvement. However, it is limited by the expenditure of finance controlled by State Governments. In Queensland we have seen the tremendous expenditure that has been rendered necessary by the change-over from the Scholarship examination to automatic progression from the primary to the secondary level of education. Many new classrooms are required this year, and additional teachers have to be trained. With its limited resources, the State Government cannot hope to deal with the problem adequately and educate children and train them to a stage where they can be absorbed into industries for the purpose of making them competitive, both scientifically and technologically, with those in other industrialised countries.

We find that the Commonwealth Government is concentrating in Queensland upon the development of industries producing goods for export. Quite a lot has been said about this, and the Treasurer has issued a challenge to all members of the Committee to say something that will be of value to the future of Queensland. I agree that we must all share the responsibility for ensuring that the State does the job as quickly as possible, but I believe that the Commonwealth Government is concentrating unduly on industries designed to lift the level of exports. I do not say that that is not necessary; it is essential. But in Western Australia, for example, they are concentrating on the cattle industry and other industries that will lift the level of exports, while at the same time assisting the State Government in the development of heavy industries designed to reduce the level of imports into Australia. It is essential that Queensland should expand industrially and that a level of employment should be created which will bring additional

population to the State. After all, it is impossible to develop a State or a country unless, running side by side with development, there is a growing population. I do not think that many of the projects that have been commenced in Queensland are dispensable, but under the method by which the Commonwealth Government is assisting this State they pose some problem for future budgeting in Queensland. Of the £8.3 million to be spent on beef roads, it will be necessary for the Queensland Government, whatever party is in power, to repay about £3.3 million over a period of 15 years from 1967. There have been loan advances of £7.25 million for the brigalow-lands development scheme and it will be necessary to repay those advances over a period of 20 years commencing in 1968. The loan for the reconstruction of the Mt. Isa railway line is repayable over a period of 20 years and, on the estimated cost, on completion of the work an amount of £18.5 million will be owing. In other words, a total of £29,000,000 will be repayable over a very limited period, which will place a heavy burden on budgeting in this State as compared with the position in other States where conditions imposed on loan advances made available for many important projects provide for repayment over the full period of 53 years. In addition, I am not sure whether the brigalow-lands development scheme and the beef-cattle roads scheme are subject to sinking fund repayment.

Mr. Hiley: No sinking fund.

Mr. LLOYD: Those projects will have a considerable impact on the budgeting in Queensland during the next 15 to 20 years. That impact will not be felt in other States which, in addition to receiving direct grants, have only to repay their loan advances over a period of 53 years.

I have said that no doubt the Treasurer has been somewhat relieved in the past two years in being able to budget for a surplus; no doubt he is relieved at present to know that unemployment in Queensland is reducing. Of course, we realise that there is still a serious problem in absorbing into industry juveniles available for employment. There have been many recent complaints in Queensland of a shortage of skilled labour. That position is not confined to Queensland; the shortage is Australia-wide. We are only now confronting it because in past years most of our skilled labour migrated from the State because of the shortage of work here. Skilled labour went to States that were more highly industrialised.

However, this problem is still with us. At the same time, an examination of the accounts discloses that there was no necessity for the Premier to make the announcement he made to this House just prior to the finish of the last session of the last Parliament, namely, that it would be necessary to keep some money aside until the early part of this year to encourage a more rapid

growth of works and to relieve seasonal unemployment. The Premier made that statement, which no doubt reflected the policy of the Government, that it would be necessary to set aside some money for spending during the last six months of the financial year.

It is now obvious from the state of accounts that, because of the additional finance that became available from the February Loan Council meeting, at no time was that necessary. Nor was it necessary to have the very high level of unemployment that existed in March of this year, when 20,000 people were out of work. They could have been put into work almost immediately. A great deal of the unemployment that existed when the last financial year commenced could have been overcome, but the Government planned to put this money to work just prior to the election campaign so that unemployment could be reduced as far as possible immediately before that campaign commenced.

The position was that, with the money he had available to him, the Treasurer took the opportunity of paying off accumulated deficits of £673,000. That payment was financed from three separate funds. The first was the Harbour Dues Fund, from which the contribution to accumulated deficit was £130,000. The Agricultural Bank also contributed £200,000, and the Queensland Housing Commission £343,000. The accumulation of the balances of these three funds shows that the Harbour Dues Fund now has a balance of over £1,000,000, and has increased its credit balance by £260,000. The Agricultural Bank reduced its balance by £20,000 and the Queensland Housing Commission by £120,000 in paying off the accumulated deficit. In actual fact that was not a reduction in the balances of these three funds in the aggregate but quite a substantial increase overall. I realise that that balance would not cover more than two or three days' work, as the Treasurer said last year, but one has to take these balances for purposes of comparison. He still had some money left but there were still the tiresome old losses between 1958 and 1962 from the operations of the Commonwealth Savings Bank. It is shown that £317,651 was paid off to cover losses for those years.

Then we come to the method of spending the money that is made available to the State as non-repayable grants from the Commonwealth Government. The Treasurer's method is to pay loans and subsidies to local authorities from Consolidated Revenue, normally the function of the Loan Account. There was still more than half a million pounds running around loose. In respect of port development the payment of £572,000 from the Loan Fund is shown. Whilst the contribution was made from the Loan Fund the Consolidated Revenue account increased its expenditure on loans and subsidies, and with the reduced expenditure from the Loan Account in that particular avenue it has

meant that expenditure for port development has increased to £572,000. No doubt the Treasurer has made provision for increased port development funds to enable him to have additional money available for dredging the Brisbane River and other work. Undoubtedly it is a very essential work if we are to see the development of oil refineries here.

All these matters indicate to the Committee that there was an over-abundance of money towards the end of the financial year. Had it been diverted into employment-making agencies at the time when unemployment was at a serious level it might have alleviated the position to a great extent. At the end of the financial year he was putting money away for work this financial year and meeting some tiresome old debts. I say this deliberately. From memory the Treasurer has set aside an amount of £80,000 for further losses by the Commonwealth Savings Bank. We all realise the position with the Commonwealth Savings Bank. With the relaxation of the credit squeeze it is quite possible that this financial year there will be a profit from the operations of the Commonwealth Savings Bank. Instead of sharing a loss we may be getting a profit. Surely to goodness much of the accumulated losses paid off this year could be met from this year's profits. In any case the position clearly is that £1,500,000 was used for paying off some rather tiresome losses over the years and also the accumulated deficit.

I have a theory relating to the Mount Isa Railway Project Fund. I have previously mentioned the heavy impact of this fund on State budgeting. It seems that the estimated cost now stands at £26,463,000 and that at the end of last year the Commonwealth Government had contributed an amount of £9,709,000 to an expenditure of some £18,000,000, whereas the State Loan Fund had contributed £9,000,000. The £300,000 appropriated this year from Loan Fund to this account will raise Queensland's Loan Fund commitment to £9,300,000, for which there should be an entitlement from the Commonwealth Government of £18,600,000, which would take the cost of the project above the Treasurer's estimate. During the last financial year the Commonwealth Government said that an amount of £8,000,000 was appropriated for direct loan application to this fund, but last year the receipts from Commonwealth loans amounted to no more than £5,300,000, and this year the Commonwealth Government has appropriated £6,700,000. At the moment, it appears that we are spending more State money than Commonwealth money. In other words, in the past few years this fund has made a heavy impact on State budgeting, when the arrangement with the Commonwealth Government was that for every £1 spent by the State Government £2 would be lent by the Commonwealth Government. To put it another way, if £18,000,000 was spent on the Mt. Isa

railway reconstruction project we should have provided no more than £6,000,000 and the Commonwealth Government should have provided £12,000,000. To the end of June, 1963, the loan account had provided £9,000,000 and the Commonwealth Government had provided a similar amount. I have raised this matter previously. It has always puzzled me why it is really necessary for the State to spend this money when money has been available from the Commonwealth Government. That money could have been used during the past two years to relieve serious unemployment in Queensland. I wanted to put that point on record. There was a very serious unemployment problem and, as the Treasurer stated, it was necessary for him to have a deficit Budget at the time. Now we can pay off accumulated deficits, and some old losses, and we also have final commitments for this fund which may or may not have been necessary. It would seem completely unrealistic for the State Government to contribute so much during that period when the Commonwealth Government agreed to lend £2 for every £1 spent by the State.

In the last two or three years the Treasurer has referred to difficulties facing the State Government with university education. He said that it was difficult for the State Government to make available sufficient finance for the university from State grants to enable it to receive from the Commonwealth Government the full extent of matching grants. These circumstances have been met towards the end of each financial year. Even though the warning has been given it has been found possible to provide from State funds only the essential amount for the basic needs of the university. I criticised the Government two years ago for spending insufficient loan funds on university education. My remarks were misinterpreted because it was claimed that much more had been spent up to the present time than up to 1956-1957, and I agree.

I repeat my statement that there is inadequate expenditure by the State Government, on a comparative basis, on university buildings and university education. I think that is readily disclosed on page 48 of the Commonwealth commitments for the States for 1963-1964. I intend to quote those figures to indicate to the Committee that we are lagging—and we have lagged up to this year—far behind any of the other States in providing the necessary funds for university education and also for the building of universities.

The whole scheme of university education was altered following the report of the Murray Commission and a subsequent report of the Universities Commission of Australia several years back, which recommended that the Commonwealth should make substantial grants towards universities throughout Australia.

The figures from 1951-1952 are rather significant. I do not completely absolve our own Government in this matter although, apparently, in 1951-1952, 1952-1953, and 1953-1954, considering the grants received from the Commonwealth for universities, Queensland's expenditure on universities was comparable with that of the other States. But for the whole period from 1951 to 1964 Queensland received from the Commonwealth Government in grants for universities a total of £10,232,000 out of a total allocation to the States of £86,277,000. In other words, we received only about 12 per cent. of the total, and that includes also the higher figure of £2,450,000 estimated for this financial year. Indeed we have received from the Commonwealth only 1,000,000 more than South Australia. It may be pointed out that we are receiving this money by way of matching grant but I do not fully accept that argument. There is one matching grant and another grant based on capital expenditure on buildings. Surely there can be no justification for South Australia, with a population 500,000 fewer than Queensland, receiving roughly the same grant from the Commonwealth as Queensland! The figures disclose the very important fact that it has not been possible for the Government, or the Government has refused, to carry out sufficient work on university buildings. The grants to Queensland for capital expenditure from 1957 to 1964, set out in a separate table on page 48, totalled £3,193,000 compared with 2,500,000 to South Australia, £2,500,000 to Western Australia and even £2,105,000 to Tasmania, whereas New South Wales received £11,000,000 and Victoria almost £9,000,000. Those were the grants based on capital expenditure by the States.

I appreciate the problems that have confronted the Government on education. It must spend as much as possible on high-school and other secondary-school construction. Secondary education requires the most urgent attention, an emergency having been created by the influx of children graduating from the primary schools to secondary schools. At the same time there has been a form of neglect in that, up till last year or the year before, for three years there was a failure to carry out the essential work of building additions to primary-school buildings and even of constructing university buildings. Those two have suffered most.

Expenditure on agricultural education in Queensland has not increased as much as that on other forms of education. There has been a tendency by the Government to over-emphasise the need for academic forms of education in most State schools. There has not been the same increase in technical, university, and agricultural education, which are three of the essential forms of education in this State. Something will have to be done about that.

This year the non-repayable grants from the Commonwealth Government will be reduced to £2,500,000, and, to make up the

difference, it may be necessary for State taxation to be again increased to some extent, although the revenue now being received from liquor and racing taxation is considerable. In State taxation emphasis has been placed on taxing to the greatest possible extent the habits of the ordinary working people. It may be said that racing taxes are not imposed on the people who bet, but in many ways they are paid by them. Taxes on liquor have increased from £800,000 in 1956-1957 to £1,589,964 last financial year, which is a considerable increase. Racing taxes have increased from £300,453 to £1,151,981, and no doubt there will be a further increase this financial year. In fees for services a considerable increase is shown, from £1.8 million in 1956-1957 to £3.3 million. Charges and taxation have at all times been imposed upon the people to give greater chances of budgeting in the State.

It has become obvious in the past few years that the treble form of government that we have in this country—the Trinity of three forms—has failed to develop Australia and has had the effect of imposing a high burden of taxation upon the people. We find that at Commonwealth, State, and local-authority levels of government there is duplication and overlapping of administration and control. That has been directly responsible in many cases for this high level of taxation.

The Commonwealth Government imposes income taxation and indirect taxation such as sales tax and payroll tax. At another level, the State Government, because of difficulty in getting the Commonwealth Government to accept its responsibilities, is searching for ways and means of imposing taxes to obtain additional revenue. Then there are local authorities existing on rates imposed on the ordinary householders in the community. Although the rates are paid by the householders, people renting homes pay them in their rentals. There are the three taxing authorities fighting each other in their endeavours to find different forms of taxation to balance their budgets or stop inflation.

The most dangerous form of taxation experienced in recent years has been that directed to achieve deflation. Differing methods have been adopted by various governments to take the cream off prosperity and deflate the economy to the extent that prices and wages no longer chase each other. At the same time, this is using a rather artificial method of deflating the economy by increasing costs to stop spending. In other words, the demand for goods is stopped by the removal of surplus money from the community.

The same thing applies to income taxation. During the past ten years the Commonwealth Government, whilst refusing to accept its responsibility in placing some curb on private investment in Australia, found it necessary to tax the people to the extent of £880,000,000 to subsidise, from its own sources of revenue, the loan requirements of the States for works, services, and housing.

That was a tremendous amount of money, and it was necessary to expend it mainly because the Commonwealth Government refused to accept its responsibility. In 1961 it was forced to apply a credit squeeze, as it was called. The Government found belatedly that it had the power to curb the activities of fringe banking institutions and finance companies that were flooding the investment market of Australia with debentures on which rates of interest up to 20 per cent. were offered. Although the effect of the credit squeeze was bad in that it created unemployment, stifled industry, and caused a recession in the development of Australia, it brought the availability of government finance back to some sort of a stable level. In 1951-1952, which I have used as a peak year, £225,000,000 was allocated for State loan works and £86,000,000 was made available for semi-governmental and local-authority spending. That figure decreased during the subsequent years when fringe banking and finance company debenture offerings were being made at high rates of interest, and it became necessary for the Queensland Government and all other State Governments to embark upon expenditure at a semi-governmental and local-authority level. From 1951-1952 to 1962-1963 the proportion of these debenture borrowings increased from 20 per cent. to 35 per cent., and what the Treasurer has often described as the rather mischievous procedure of debenture raising of semi-governmental and local-authority requirements has become necessary to overcome the lag in government borrowings and has become a Commonwealth-wide tendency. However, in the last two years there has been a greater liquidity of money, and unless Governments take advantage as quickly as possible of loan offerings at home and from overseas that will enable them to carry out developmental works, we will soon be in a position similar to that in which we have been over the past 10 years. Where there is a need for large power stations and water-supply schemes, as loans become available we should grasp them and make possible capital investment on a public finance basis so that development can proceed as quickly as possible. The Commonwealth Government must not revert to its old habits and then have to apply another credit squeeze. We must not allow the position to recur where State Governments cannot carry out certain projects while other people in the community use money as a commodity to buy and sell on a large scale. Australia has to be developed quickly if it is to absorb the population that it needs.

Much has been said in past months about North Australian development. It has been used as a gimmick by many people; in fact, the Premier has used it as a political gimmick. Immediately following the last war, an authority was set up by the Commonwealth Government and the State Governments of Queensland and Western Australia,

but what is really needed is an Australia-wide development commission that is not tied by the individual arguments and jealousies of the Loan Council or the Premiers' Conference, a commission that will recommend to the Commonwealth Government the essential developmental schemes that require urgent attention. Only by this means will development proceed as it should. For example, the Calcap power station in the Callide Valley is a project that could, if expanded sufficiently, create secondary industries in that area and become a project of national importance to be considered by a commission such as I have suggested. The commission could then bind the Commonwealth Government to the projects to which it should make an immediate contribution.

Why should we be in our present position in the reconstruction of the Mt. Isa railway line? We will have to bear virtually the full cost of undertaking a nationally important project that will return to the Commonwealth Government much more financial benefit than the State Government will enjoy. We have to meet a cost of £20,000,000 at a high rate of interest, repayable in 20 years. The interest bill will amount to anything up to £1,500,000 a year, which must come from Consolidated Revenue, thereby reducing our expenditure on some other works. As I say, the scheme is of national importance, so why should we be put in that position because of political jealousies between the States? Why should we be refused the entitlement of the paltry—and I use that word deliberately—sum required for this national project?

The same remarks apply to the development of water schemes. At the present time the State Government is forced to shelve the responsibility for many of these schemes on to local authorities or semi-government organisations. The Pine River Dam scheme, for instance, is being undertaken by the Brisbane City Council from its loan allocations, in spite of the fact that that project is essential in the provision of water in South-east Queensland. It is of sufficient importance to justify the Government's undertaking it. When it is finally completed and handed over it could then be the loan liability of the Brisbane City Council.

These are not isolated schemes. Much of the developmental work required will have to be done in the northern part of the Commonwealth. A commission established on a Commonwealth basis, comprising representatives of the States who should not be politicians, would be able to examine, analyse and carefully consider where these schemes were most essential.

In the few minutes I have left I should like to refer to the new department that the Government has created, namely, the Department of Industrial Development. This, of course, was part of the Labour Party's policy in the last election campaign. We had said, as a political party, that insufficient was being

done to encourage, foster and expand industry in Queensland and I believe it would have been much better to have established some form of industrial advisory board in addition to the appointment of a Director-General of Industry. That board could comprise representatives of unions, industries, manufacturing concerns and others, who would examine primary industries with a view to establishing secondary industries in their immediate neighbourhood. By this method primary industries could get together in conference and have their schemes examined with a view to establishing secondary industries at the centres of primary production. When those industries had been examined by the board it could recommend to the Government that the necessary finance be made available to establish secondary industries to process the primary products. The scheme would be economic and would have a great chance of success. It would apply to many centres of primary industry in Queensland where not sufficient finance is available to establish the necessary processing industries.

The western district is one of the finest citrus-growing areas in Australia if not in the world but, because of the cost of transport to the coast it has been impossible for this industry, on its own resources, to expand, and it has languished. Here is an excellent opportunity to establish the means of processing this citrus fruit in the centre of production, and economically transporting the processed goods away from that production centre. I believe that, not only with this industry, but with many other primary industries in Queensland, we could associate in the various areas primary industries producing the goods and secondary industries processing them and exporting the processed goods from those centres.

That is the only way I can see to stop the continual migration of young people from country towns. The problem is not so great in the major cities where industry can absorb many of the young people leaving school. The problem is much more acute in country towns where, after young people graduate from high school they cannot find employment. Consequently they migrate to the major towns and cities to find jobs. When I said there was not such a great problem in the major cities, I meant on a comparative basis. We have a big problem to find employment for them all in Brisbane; the same applies to many large provincial cities. But the problem is even greater in country towns where there is a gradual migration away of the young people, which is to the detriment of those towns. This drift to the cities can be overcome only by the creation of secondary industries in those centres that presently are concentrating on basically primary-producing industries. It would also help to overcome Queensland's need to import much of her processed goods from other States.

(Time expired.)

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (12.22 p.m.): My primary remarks today are directed towards still further ameliorating the lot of that section of the people who are, I think, correctly known as our senior citizens. I have been very interested in them for many years; I hope to remain interested in them for the rest of my life. After all, it may not be very long before I, myself, may be classed as a senior citizen.

When the Australian Labour Party was in Government, the moment a person became old and exhibited even slight signs of senility or feebleness of mind he or she was grabbed like a wild beast, put into a railway carriage with bars on the window, and shipped to Goodna where he or she was left to rot and subsequently die. The moment they got there the pension was taken from them—not under any State law, but under the Commonwealth law. Some of those old persons were hundreds of miles from their relatives and friends, consequently their relatives and friends could not visit them as often as they would like. Many of them were penniless and forlorn. I used to go regularly to see them. It would almost have broken your heart to see them sitting there just waiting for the end. They did not have a penny to spend unless their relatives gave them some money or they had saved some of their own.

During the regime of the A.L.P. Government I continually made representations, in and out of Parliament, in an effort to get a better deal for these people who had sacrificed quite a lot to make this State what it was. The most amazing thing about these old people at Goodna was that many of them in their younger days had been A.L.P. stalwarts; many of them had fought and struggled to make the A.L.P. the political party it was at that time. But it appeared that the A.L.P. had no time for any old person the moment he or she exhibited any signs of senility or feebleness of mind. It is to the eternal credit of this Government that the moment it was able to do it it took those pensioners out of Goodna. They were transferred first of all to hospital annexes at Oakey, Dalby, Toowoomba and various other places. As time went on and it could be done the Government transferred them to annexes at the various base hospitals throughout the State. Later, when the Government had time to study the problem, geriatric wards were set up at the various hospitals. Bear in mind that once a pensioner is taken out of Goodna and placed in a hospital annexe or geriatric ward his full pension is restored. He immediately becomes a full citizen in regard to pension rights, and he is able to live out the evening of his life in comfort and decency and with the ability to buy from his own pension some of the little necessities of life that mean so much to these old people. We did not have a geriatric ward at the Townsville General Hospital when the Minister for Health came to Townsville a couple of years ago and opened the nurses'

quarters. I suggested to him that, instead of pulling down all the old hospital buildings up on the rise, a portion of them should be left intact and used as a geriatric ward. The matter was put to the Townsville Hospitals Board by the Minister and it was decided to leave the old buildings there, where they are now used as a geriatric ward. Unfortunately, there is not sufficient accommodation for all those who really need to go into the geriatric ward at Townsville. There is a long waiting list of people who should be there but cannot get there simply because there is insufficient accommodation.

I frequently visit that ward at Townsville and I should like hon. members to visualise the position. The wing of the old hospital that was left standing is a two-storey structure with brick walls, and brick subdividing walls, but with wooden verandas and, of course, a galvanised-iron roof. Only the top portion is used as a geriatric ward. Next to the geriatric ward is the isolation ward for children suffering from infectious diseases, and next to that again, in the same building, coupled together by the verandas on each side, is the V.D. ward. The geriatric ward has a maximum capacity of 19 females and 12 males, or 31 all told. I repeat that the accommodation is so limited that all who should be in that ward cannot be accommodated. At the one time, in the isolation ward there have been as many as 22 infants suffering from contagious infection. As I said, there is a common veranda connecting them, and the only dividing line between the geriatric ward and the isolation ward is the internal brick wall. Further on is the V.D. ward, in which at times there have been as many as eight patients, six males and two females. We know, of course, that today V.D. is not the tremendous scourge that it was a few years ago before the discovery and introduction of antibiotics, and that even the most virulent case of syphilis can be cured in four, five or six days by mammoth injections of penicillin. The V.D. patients have to remain there purely for check purposes for four, five or six days. All these patients—the geriatrics, the infectious-disease infants and the V.D. patients—are accommodated in what is left of the top storey of that wing of the old hospital.

Mr. Melloy: The whole block is in a shocking condition.

Mr. AIKENS: The block may be in a shocking condition structurally but I can say that at least these geriatric patients are in their own home town and can be visited by their friends and relatives. They are receiving their age pensions and they are not, as they were under the Government to which the hon. member belonged, herded into Goodna and allowed to die like wild beasts. I have no quarrel with the temporary arrangements that have been made. I could not possibly quarrel with them because I suggested this set-up to the Minister for

Health. I believe that everything possible is being done for them. While it is true that the building itself is not in the best possible condition, no quarrel can be had with the manner in which the geriatric patients are being cared for. As a matter of fact, the standard of nursing and attention at the Townsville General Hospital is commendably high, particularly in the geriatrics' ward. The sister in charge is Sister Hart. She has with her a staff of sisters, trainee nurses, wardsmen and wardsmen. If you were to go to the geriatric ward in Townsville and hear the praise that is lavished by the patients on those sisters and nurses and those wardsmen and wardsmen you would know that at any rate what the building lacks in structural permanence is made up for in the loving care and attention that is given to all the patients by the staff. Their food is of excellent quality. The treatment is the very best that can be given to anybody. So there can be no quarrel with—as a matter of fact, there cannot even be the mildest criticism of—the way the patients are being treated in that ward or the way they are being looked after.

Now, because of representations that have been made from more than one source, including myself, the hospitals board is considering the establishment of a separate geriatric ward in the Dalrymple Road area, across the railway line from Garbutt, somewhere near the site of the No. 4 Air Depot during the war. Unfortunately that ground is owned by the Commonwealth Government and it is very reluctant to let it go because it is on the approach to the Garbutt runway. But I really think the job of getting a separate geriatric ward away from the general hospital should be expedited, and it is obvious that we must not allow its construction to be placed in the hands of architects who have no conception of the requirements of a geriatric ward. For instance, we do not want a typical hospital building of two or three storeys. What we need is a large, commodious, airy building right on the ground floor, built on the ground. We want it to have plenty of ground space so that shady trees can be planted and lawns can be planted and mown and so that patients can be wheeled out into the sunshine—and most of the female patients in the geriatric ward are in wheelchairs—so that they can be wheeled straight out of the hospital onto the lawn under the shade of the trees, particularly in the hot summer months, and so that they can be given the treatment to which they are fully entitled.

They are getting all the treatment now. As a matter of fact, the hospitals board has put a sort of gangway from the present geriatric ward onto the hillside where a small area of ground has been cut out of the side of Castle Hill, and every now and again a patient is pushed across this little gangplank over to the space that has been cleared. But there are no shade trees there. The patients

just go out for a little bit of sun in the morning and a little bit of sun in the afternoon.

I appreciate that this Government has done in the circumstances, as a temporary measure, everything that could possibly be done for those old people in Townsville and I know that it plans to do more. My appeal to it today is to get on with the job as quickly as possible. No praise that I could give would be too high, and I am sure no praise anyone else could give would be too high, for the way in which the medical staff, and particularly the nursing staff, look after those old people and, of course, by looking after the old people they look after the little children who are in the next ward with infectious and transmissible diseases. I do not know whether those who have venereal disease deserve to be looked after as well; but, whether they deserve it or not, they are looked after just as well as the geriatric patients. So my appeal today to the Government is to have the new geriatric ward at Townsville built as soon as it can possibly be built because the need is urgent and I do not want to see a continuance of the long waiting list for entry into the geriatric ward in Townsville. That can be obviated only by the construction of a new geriatric ward in the manner and in the circumstances that I have outlined to the Committee.

Mr. Hughes: Do you know the average age of the inmates there at present?

Mr. AIKENS: Those figures can easily be got.

I want now to make a few general remarks on some statements made in the Address-in-Reply speech of the hon. member for Townsville North. I make these remarks not in any derogatory spirit at all, not in any spirit of criticism, but merely as, should I say, some fatherly advice to the hon. member for Townsville North and to members of the Australian Labour Party, because it grieves me to see a once great, powerful and influential party reduced to the pitiable remnants of the A.L.P. that we see in this Assembly today. I really believe that they have encompassed their own destruction.

The hon. member for Townsville North said in his remarks that at the last election my vote dropped by 2,000. The first piece of advice that I should like to give him is that before making any statement in the Chamber, or anywhere else, he should check his facts. That statement was quite incorrect because my vote was only 200, not 2,000, less than I received at the previous election, and that was quite understandable. As a matter of fact, we expected that it might drop a little more.

It is quite true that my majority was reduced from 4,200 to 2,800, a drop of 1,400. That was quite expected because three years ago my A.L.P. opponent was Billy Edmonds, who had just thrown away the Federal seat of Herbert to John Murray.

To use the vernacular, he was "on the nose" with even his own supporters, and we did not know how many A.L.P. men in 1960 voted for me simply because they would not vote for him. It is quite true that I have the strongest Labour seat in Queensland, yet I sat at home and won it by 2,800 votes. We were not going to take any part in the campaign, as I said in my speech in the Address-in-Reply debate, but we did make a very, very mild and belated effort. A barber's pole could have had the endorsement of the Q.C.E. wrapped round it and polled as many votes in Townsville South as were polled by Mr. Trower. I have nothing to say about him, but to assert that my performance in Townsville South was an indication that the A.L.P. is on the march is just plain bunkum. As I said before, out of 27,000 valid votes cast in Townsville, the citadel of Labour, on 1 June last, the two A.L.P. candidates received a paltry 11,000. That means that 16,000 electors would not vote for the A.L.P. candidate in either Townsville North or Townsville South.

I mentioned the matter of a donation by the road-transport hauliers to the A.L.P. In reply, the hon. member for Townsville North said that that would be an insult to good railway men who were connected with the election campaign, and he mentioned two of them, namely, Mr. E. P. O'Brien and Mr. Ted Stannett.

I wish he had told the full story. Mr. E. P. O'Brien and Mr. Ted Stannett are members of the A.L.P. and they are both militant trade unionists. I wish the hon. member had told us that in the closing stages of the campaign—I understand within the last 10 days—O'Brien and Stannett and many other prominent militant trade unionists who were members of the A.L.P. in Townsville were ordered to keep out of the A.L.P. campaign. They were not allowed to speak from any platform or over the air, because the hon. member for Townsville North was afraid that their participation in the closing stages of the campaign would alienate the votes of the snobs living in North Ward in the Townsville North electorate.

Mr. TUCKER: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is completely wrong when he says I made that statement, and I ask that he withdraw it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gaven): I ask the hon. member to accept the assurance of the hon. member for Townsville North that that statement is not true.

Mr. AIKENS: I will because you so order me, Mr. Gaven, but I now have to accept his assurance that he did not say something that appears in "Hansard". Did he not say that my remark regarding the donation of money by the road hauliers to the A.L.P. was an insult to men like O'Brien and Stannett? I ask him to tell the full story.

It was also said that the A.L.P. in Townsville had Aikens by the throat. That is a statement of opinion, but anyone who lives in Townsville and knows the feelings of the people there, as I do, realises that if anyone in Townsville has anyone else by the throat, it is the Communists who have the A.L.P. by the throat. That is why the A.L.P. put up such a pitiable performance at the last election.

I know that the hon. member for Townsville North is quite young and eager in the game, but he will walk in where angels fear to tread, and he has become the laughing-stock of the people of Townsville as the result of a report of his speech in this House that appeared in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin." In that speech he accused the Premier of being un-Christian. He said that the Premier was un-Christian in claiming that the A.L.P. and himself were associated with Communists. You know my religious views, Mr. Gaven. I do not suppose that anyone would consider that I was a man deeply steeped in any religion. But for goodness sake, for the sake of honesty and decency, let us stop dragging Christ into the mire and slime of party politics. I remember an hon. member who is no longer with us referring in an oleaginous way to this State as a Christian democracy and to this Parliament as a Christian Parliament. If we have no better argument than to say that a man is un-Christian, for goodness sake let us say nothing. Party politics are putrid enough now; let us not descend to dragging Christ's name into our arguments.

I am no defender of the Premier or anybody else, but the trouble with the A.L.P. today—this is good advice to its members—is that it is following the Communist technique of propaganda. As we know, the Communists believe in the method of the stampede. They think that if you go round and bang enough drums, blow enough trumpets, mount enough platforms, put enough notices up on fences, and inundate the people with placards, dodgers, pamphlets, and so forth, you will stampede them into voting for you. The Communist technique is to abuse anybody who does not vote for them. Let me tell the A.L.P. that the people are not fools. They cannot be stampeded, and they bitterly resent anyone who regards them as dills. Unfortunately, members of the A.L.P. today are adopting the propaganda attitude that the people of Queensland are fools and can be stampeded into voting for them. I remember discussing this issue with the late Ben Chifley at a Parliamentary luncheon. He said to me, "They tell me you have the political game all sewn up." I said, "I don't know about that, Ben." He said, "What do you think influences the people when they vote?" I said, "I really believe that the people have made up their minds three months before an election whether or not they are going to vote for a candidate, and that they vote for or against

a candidate on his performance or the performance of his party over the last three years." He said, "Then you know as much about politics as you need to know, because that is the basis of political propaganda." He said, "You cannot stampede the electors into voting for any political candidate or any political party if they do not want to."

Mr. Smith: When did you say you started your campaign this time?

Mr. AIKENS: I started my campaign about 11 days before polling day, and it was a very anaemic campaign. As a matter of fact, I was almost ashamed of it. I did put an extract from the Parliamentary history of this Assembly in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" about six weeks before polling day, but that was merely for general information.

Mr. Tucker: You spent £600 with "The Townsville Daily Bulletin".

Mr. AIKENS: I addressed eight street meetings at night, I spoke twice over radio station 4TO, and I had two or three—I am not sure which—five-minute sessions over television. We did not have a booth at the election and we did no campaigning other than what I have mentioned.

Mr. Windsor: Didn't you have a tennis racquet and a couple of balls and say that that was the only racket with which you were associated?

Mr. AIKENS: That was an advertisement that I ran three years ago. The hon. member is three years too late.

Let me refer now to a matter raised by the hon. member for Baroona—a photograph of Parliament House with the hammer and sickle imposed on it. It is true that the great majority of people voted against the Australian Labour Party at the last election because of the fear of Communist infiltration into the A.L.P. It was not the photograph of Parliament House with the hammer and sickle imposed on it that influenced them. They made up their minds a long while ago that the Communists had infiltrated the A.L.P. I walk down the streets of Townsville every day and I meet people from every stratum of society. Ever since the Bundaberg A.L.P. convention I have heard workers who voted A.L.P. all their lives talking about the infiltration of Communists into the A.L.P.; so all that the photograph of the hammer and sickle superimposed on Parliament House did was—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gaven): Order! I must inform the hon. member that Mr. Speaker has disallowed any debate on that subject.

Mr. AIKENS: I will not proceed with it. It simply told the people something they already knew.

I also said in my Address-in-Reply speech that the Labour Party was on the way out in Townsville, and I will produce two photographs and two cuttings from "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" to prove my point. This is a photograph from "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" of 7 May, 1963. It is a very fine photograph of the last Labour Day procession in Townsville, and the caption is:

"Heading the Labour Day procession yesterday were Mr. A. J. Trower . . ."

who was, incidentally, my A.L.P. opponent in Townsville South—

". . . Mr. P. J. R. Tucker (M.L.A. for Townsville North), Senator N. E. McKenna . . ."

who is A.L.P. leader in the Senate—

". . . and Mr. J. P. Eustace (May Day President)."

Incidentally, Mr. Tucker and Mr. Trower ran a copy of that photograph in their election propaganda advertising and said:

"These men led the Labour Day procession."

This is what "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" had to say about it—

"While the crowd was estimated at between 3,000 and 4,000 people, the estimate of unionists taking part was about 200."

As a matter of fact, we counted them. There were 184 trade unionists. In a city with a population of 53,000 and a tradition of Labour trade-unionism going back to the days when the blacks were bad, only 184 trade-unionists out of an estimated 15,000 marched in the A.L.P. procession last Labour Day in Townsville.

Mr. Campbell: Just before an election, too.

Mr. AIKENS: Yes, just before an election.

While every one of those 184 was not a Communist—I would not be silly enough to say that—it is a fact that every prominent Communist in Townsville was one of them.

Do hon. members of the A.L.P. think that the 3,000 or 4,000 people who watched the procession are blind, deaf and dumb? Do they think they are dills? They stood on the side of Flinders Street and watched this pitiable procession go past and they saw every prominent, top-ranking Communist in Townsville marching with the pitiable few unionists who followed Mr. Tucker, Mr. Trower and Senator N. E. McKenna.

That is the position of the Labour Party in Townsville today, and consequently it did not need any photograph—and, in deference to your ruling, Mr. Gaven, I will not mention the particular photograph—to remind the people that the Communists have moved into the A.L.P. If they wanted any further indication that the Communists in Townsville have the A.L.P. by the throat, I have here a photostat copy of an advertisement that appeared in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin"

of 31 May, 1963, the day before polling day. It is a long advertisement that cost £5 or £6. It says—

“Vote Tucker for Townsville North and Trower for Townsville South.”

and it is signed by F. H. Matzkows, the most prominent and most virulent Communist in Townsville. Here is another one from the same page. It is headed “Queensland State Elections,” and at the bottom it reads—

“Vote: Perc Tucker for Townsville North and A. Trower for Townsville South . . .”

It is authorised by Hughie Fay.

These people are acknowledged Communists. They do not hide their light behind a bushel where their Communist affiliation is concerned; they openly admit that they are Communists and they are proud of the fact. There we see the most prominent Communists in Townsville advocating a vote for Tucker in Townsville North and for Trower in Townsville South. Yet the hon. member for Townsville North claims that the Premier was un-Christian in saying that he was associated with Communists. As far as I know, the hon. member for Townsville North, like a good deal of us who live in Townsville, is a man of average respectability and reputation. In my radio talks and television talks about this claim that the Communists are tied up with the A.L.P., I referred to that old and true western saying that if you lie down with dogs you cannot blame the people if they think you have fleas. The people of Townsville and the people of Queensland must have thought that at least some of the members of the Australian Labour Party were Communists, or suspected them of being Communists. At least they said, “Members of the Labour Party are lying down with dogs and we think they have fleas.”

We have another western saying that the hon. member for Gregory would know: “If you fly around with crows you cannot expect people to think that you are a canary.” Those are the lines along which the electors of Queensland thought. I have shown the Committee a photograph and have read an extract from “The Townsville Daily Bulletin” to demonstrate what the A.L.P. in Townsville is like today. Bear in mind that if it had not been for the commercial aspect of the Labour Day procession last May, it would have been a farce. Had it not been for the motor-car people moving in with a procession of motor vehicles, and the business houses putting in commercial floats, and what-have-you, it would have been a pitiable farce as a Labour Day procession.

He is a photograph of what the Labour Day procession in Townsville was like when the A.L.P. in Townsville was a party of power and influence, and when the people had confidence in it. That was at the time

when I belonged to the party. I will read what “The Townsville Daily Bulletin” said about the procession that year—

“Over 2,000 workers proudly marched behind their union banners in yesterday’s Labour Day procession which was led by our Deputy Mayor, Alderman T. Aikens, and Messrs. Keyatta and Jesson, Ms.L.A.”

When I say that the Labour Party in Townsville is slipping, and is on the way out as a political force, you can take it from me that I know what I am talking about.

Mr. Houston: The Liberal Party may even put up a candidate next time.

Mr. AIKENS: I am glad that interjection was made. I will tell the Committee what happened with regard to the Liberal Party. I do not know whether the Liberal Party will thank me for saying this. The Liberal Party has not run a candidate against me in an election since 1953 because it is more politically astute than the Australian Labour Party. I will tell the Committee how the Liberal Party has set a very clever and carefully-laid trap at every election since 1953, and the A.L.P. has stupidly and blindly walked into it—boots and all. Hon. members on that side have not enough brains to wake up to the fact that the Liberal Party has set the trap for them. The Liberal Party knows that if it ran a candidate against me in Townsville South, or even in the old Mundingburra electorate, it could not possibly win it. It would lose not only a candidate, but probably the candidate’s deposit as well. The Liberal Party also knows that it would lose the votes of Aikens’s supporters and Aikens’s friends in all the neighbouring electorates. Consequently it says, “Let us pull our candidate out. We won’t run against Tom Aikens. The Labour Party will be silly enough to put a candidate in the field against him.” The Liberal Party knows that the moment the A.L.P. puts a candidate in against me in Townsville South, in addition to not being able to win my seat the A.L.P. loses the support of all Aikens’s supporters and sympathisers as far north as Cardwell, as far south as Bowen, and as far west as the Northern Territory border. I know that the Liberals are a little embarrassed at my saying this. Go into the Flinders electorate. I am not in any way trying to belittle the wonderful work that has come about as the result of the personal representations of the hon. member for Flinders, but go to that electorate, where I was born and bred, and ask my friends and supporters along the Flinders what they think of the A.L.P. in running a candidate against me. They will tell you, quite frankly, “If the A.L.P. runs a candidate against good old Tom Aikens the A.L.P. must stink and we will not vote for it in this electorate.” Go to Hinchinbrook and Bowen; ask the hon. member for Burdekin, although he does not need my assistance. Ask the hon. member for Townsville North. In Townsville North they have only one little Tory pocket in

North Ward and a line ball in Belgian Gardens and Magnetic Island. If I were the A.L.P. candidate for Townsville North I should poll no fewer than 10,000 votes against any Liberal candidate. Everyone knows that is true, yet the hon. member for Townsville North was scratching to poll 6,000 votes at the last election. He has all the poll in West End, all of Garbutt, all of Pimlico, all of Currajong and a lot of Aitkenvale, where I polled a majority of from 5,000 to 6,000 against the Liberals and could poll that majority again, yet because the A.L.P. ran a candidate against me in Townsville South, hundreds, and maybe some thousands, of A.L.P. supporters in Townsville North said, "If they attack old Tom in Townsville South, we will scrub the A.L.P. in Townsville North." The hon. member for Townsville North knows that to be perfectly true, as does everyone with any brains, except the A.L.P. At every State election the Liberal Party sets this crude and clumsy trap for the A.L.P. and they fall into it, boots and all. They have not the brains or the intelligence—they are too stupid and silly, politically speaking—to see the trap laid for them. I do not know that the Liberals will lay it again now that I have spilt the beans, but that is what has happened. It is all true. Members of the A.L.P. can ask Dr. Delamothe from Bowen what happens, and they can ask John Row from Hinchinbrook and Percy Tucker from Townsville North. If the A.L.P. put a candidate in the field against me, believe me they would have to scratch dirt to win.

Mr. Houston: You know, you are credited with bringing about Murray's defeat by saying you were a friend of his.

Mr. AIKENS: I will tell the hon. member what I could have done. I could have gone onto the platform with John Murray and wiped the floor with Ernie Harding. John Murray could tell the hon. member that and so could Percy Tucker. It is just that our party does not become involved in Federal election campaigns. The A.L.P. can be very thankful we do not because if we did it would not do too well in the North, believe me. As a matter of fact, I have been waiting for years for the A.L.P. to wake up to itself as to why the Liberals do not run a candidate against me, and now I have given the reason.

Mr. Houston: What happened to George Marriott when you supported him in Bulimba?

Mr. AIKENS: As a matter of fact, he wrote to me and thanked me.

Mr. Houston: He lost his seat.

Mr. AIKENS: No, he did not. George Marriott lost his seat in 1950.

Mr. Houston: He lost his seat because you supported him.

Mr. AIKENS: The hon. member lives in Bulimba, or he represents Bulimba. I do not know if he lives there. If he is like some of the other A.L.P. members he probably never goes near his electorate. George Marriott lost his seat in 1950. It was not until the scandal was exposed in this Chamber by the Treasurer, in perhaps one of the finest speeches he has ever made, and it was decided to hold an inquiry, and the seat was declared vacant and a by-election held, that I came down to help him. The hon. member is well off the beam. George Marriott had already lost the seat. Had I come down in 1950 it is probable that he would have retained it.

However, I was talking about the foolish A.L.P. belief that they can fool the people and I was trying to tell them that they cannot. I am reminded that, during the election campaign, the hon. member for Townsville North and my A.L.P. opponent addressed several meetings of railwaymen on railway premises and throughout the campaign they made a very great point of the claim that they were 100 per cent. behind the railwaymen and consequently that, if they were elected, the interests of the railwaymen would be their first concern. I believe that they fooled quite a lot of railwaymen by that approach; but they cannot fool the railwaymen any more, at least the hon. member for Townsville North cannot, because quite recently Western Transport opened a huge terminal building—in my electorate, too, by the way—with the obvious intention of running the railways out of business and if possible putting them on the scrapheap and the railwaymen on the breadline.

We all received an invitation to the opening of that big terminal of Western Transport's. I did not go because I am 100 per cent. behind the railwaymen all the time but the hon. member for Townsville North went, and as a matter of fact he was there to such good purpose that Curly Anderson virtually had to kick him out of the way so that he could get up onto the dais for the official opening. That shows the insincerity that I think is characteristic of the A.L.P. today.

If you want to know just what someone within the A.L.P.—and he is a very powerful person in the A.L.P. in Townsville—thinks of the recent campaign of the A.L.P. in Townsville and throughout the State, I suggest you go into the Parliamentary Library and read the 19 August issue of "The Worker" newspaper under the heading of "District Secretary Costello Reports Union's Northern Workings for June."

Mr. Costello is, of course, the A.W.U. district secretary in Townsville and as such is a very powerful and influential man in the A.L.P. I am sorry that I cannot read the whole of the two-column spread in which he blasts Mr. Tucker and Mr. Trower for the way in which they mishandled and muddled up the recent election campaign in Townsville, but hon. members can go into the

library and read it for themselves. I will read two paragraphs from it. Mr. Costello says—

“At the beginning of the month, we had the State Elections, and most Northern District officials were tied up assisting one way or another in the campaign within their various areas, to try and have an Australian Labour Party Government returned to the Treasury benches in Queensland. However, the results of the elections were very disappointing but not surprising.”

“When I say, ‘not surprising,’ I mean that, because of the way I feel the campaign was conducted throughout the State, and particularly in local areas.”

Further down he goes on to say—and I think this is the most scathing condemnation of the A.L.P. in Townsville and in Queensland that has ever been written, and I repeat that it was written by Mr. Costello, the district secretary of the A.W.U. in Townsville—

“I am sure that if the campaign policy adopted in the State elections had been used in the last Federal elections, we would not have had the success we did, particularly here in the Herbert Electorate.”

There perhaps is the most damning indictment of the A.L.P. election campaign, written not by an enemy of the A.L.P. but by one of its staunchest adherents and supporters in the person of Mr. Costello.

I remind the A.L.P. that in the last election campaign they had, of course, what they thought was a winner, or two winners. They had the unemployment position, which the people did not believe because, as I keep repeating, the people are not fools; they realise that under Labour we had up to 6, 8 and 9 per cent. unemployed in Queensland whereas quite recently there was only 1 per cent. or 2—point-something per cent. unemployment. But their real winner, of course, was the three weeks' annual leave that the A.L.P. was going to introduce by legislation if the people could be inveigled into voting for it at the last election. Imagine any party going to the people of Queensland, with their intelligence and retentive memories, and saying, “With Jack Duggan as our parliamentary leader, we are going to introduce three weeks' annual leave!” The people have not forgotten, and are not likely to forget, that when the Leader of the Opposition was a member of the Gair Cabinet he violently opposed every effort made at Australian Labour Party parliamentary meetings to introduce three weeks' annual leave.

He did even worse than that. Because he is a presentable and personable fellow—I have nothing against him personally—and very fluent and persuasive, he talked men like Bunny Adair, Alex Skinner, and others in Caucus who originally were in favour of three weeks' annual leave, into opposing it when the vote came before Caucus, but when the split in the A.L.P. came he hopped into the three weeks' annual leave corner and

left good men like the ones that I have mentioned high and dry. Having persuaded them to go with him, he ran for cover and deserted them.

If any more evidence is wanted of how sincere the Leader of the Opposition was in his promise to the people that if his party were returned he would introduce three weeks' annual leave by legislation, one has only to remember what he said here a few weeks ago in the Address-in-Reply debate. He attacked vehemently the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission for introducing three weeks' annual leave without considering the state of the economy and the effect it would have on the cost of living. As a matter of fact, he damned and blasted the Industrial Commission for introducing it.

Mr. Houston: You know that that is not true.

Mr. AIKENS: That is what he did. There is no need to argue about it. All the hon. member for Bulimba has to do—and I so challenge him—is to publish in full in any union newspaper in Queensland what the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech in the Address-in-Reply debate about the introduction of three weeks' annual leave by the Industrial Commission. Let him publish it in full without any backing and filling or any alteration.

If they really want to know, I shall tell hon. members opposite why the Labour Party lost the last election. Again I speak more in sorrow than anger, and in a paternal sense. In addition to the fact that they had Duggan leading them, which is a handicap that they never will be able to carry, and the fact that the people believe, with considerable justification, that the Communists have infiltrated the A.L.P., the campaign was kept going for too long. If they had any chance of winning at the outset, they talked themselves out of it. If the campaign in other electorates of Queensland was waged on the same basis as that in Townsville, with the people subjected to an incessant barrage for eight or nine months, with placards and posters everywhere, they talked themselves out of any chance that they might have had initially long before the campaign ended.

Quite frankly and truthfully, my A.L.P. opponent, Mr. Trower, had more placards posted up in Townsville South than he received votes on polling day. He placed them as far back as last August. He had them placed on every second or third post and on every street corner and vacant lot, but they did not carry his photograph. In January or February this year he replaced them with another large placard, which included his photograph.

I do not want to repeat all that I said in the Address-in-Reply debate, but I do say that nobody can blast the people for eight or nine months and expect them to be interested in the campaign for all of that time. To see that, one has only to look at the history

of the major political convulsions that have occurred in this State over the years. In 1915 the Labour Party struck the Denham Government out of office. That campaign lasted one month, and in those days we had no radio, television, or aeroplanes. In 1929 the Moore Government swept the McCormack Labour Government out of office in a campaign lasting six weeks. There was no TV in those days, and not many radios or aeroplanes. In 1932, when the Labour Party swept the Moore Government out of office, the campaign lasted four or five weeks. If shrewd political campaigners such as the late Forgan Smith had fallen for the blarney of the Trades Hall—the Communist technique that you have to blast the people for eight or nine months—and had earbashed them for that length of time, the A.L.P. would not have won the 1932 election. The people would have been sickened long before polling day.

Certain things happened in Townsville that the people there are not likely to forget, and the hon. member for Townsville North should consider himself lucky that his Q.L.P. opponent, Dr. Dorney, is the very essence of a gentleman. Had the A.L.P. done to me what it did to Dr. Dorney on one occasion, I would have blasted it right out of the water. Dr. Dorney was to make an appearance on television station TNQ7, which is right at the top of Mt. Stuart. A gate at the bottom of the mountain was left open for Dr. Dorney. A group of A.L.P. supporters whose names are known to the police drove out in a car, the number of which is known to the police and to everyone else, and locked the gate. When Dr. Dorney came along, he did not know what to do. If I had been there, I would have broken the gate open, but Dr. Dorney, being a gentleman, climbed over the gate and walked the 7 miles from the bottom of the mountain, climbing over 3,000 feet in doing so, to the television station. He arrived an hour and a-half or 2 hours late, and he was so exhausted and sweat-stained when he appeared on television that he looked like a rag-picker—in fact, a number of people thought he had been imbibing too freely—but he made no reference to the fact that the A.L.P. had locked the gate and forced him to walk seven miles. He refused to refer to it throughout the campaign. It is not an offence to lock a gate, I know; in fact, on some occasions to do so might be doing somebody a service; but the police told Dr. Dorney the number of the car and the names of the A.L.P. men who were in it and who had locked the gate. He said, "No. I don't fight that way. I am not going to take them on nor take any action against them. I am just going to let them go; I will fight the campaign fairly." Can you imagine what would have happened to the A.L.P. if it had done that to me? I would have appeared on the television screen with blood streaming down my face—I would have made sure of that—and the A.L.P. candidate would not have got a vote. The

hon. member for Townsville North had against him a Q.L.P. candidate such as that and a Liberal candidate equally gentlemanly, and he just managed to sneak in.

My A.L.P. opponent, Trower, was only a young fellow. I hardly know him, but what I do know of him is not to his detriment. He appears to be an ordinary fellow, just like the rest of us. However, he has blotted his copy-book in Townsville South for all time. This is not altogether unexpected, because one can always rely on the A.L.P., during an election campaign, to sink to the uttermost depths, or to sink to the occasion, I might say. Most of us rise to the occasion; the A.L.P. always sinks to the occasion. My opponent went round Townsville South during the closing weeks of the campaign and ascertained from the people living in one house that the people living in the house next door were devout Roman Catholics. He would then go to the door of that house, knock on it, and when the people came out he would give them a little spiel—there is nothing wrong in that—and then say, knowing that they were devout Roman Catholics, "I would like you to know that my brother is a priest in Cairns." Roman Catholic priests in Townsville South came to me and said, "Is Trower's brother a Roman Catholic priest in Cairns?", and I said, "No, his brother is an Anglican priest." He did not tell these people that his brother was an Anglican priest; he said merely that he was a priest; and many devout Roman Catholics in Townsville South voted for Trower thinking he was a member of their faith and a member of their church. I did not mention the matter at the time. I could have mentioned it from my public platform; I could have blasted him with it; but I wanted to give him every opportunity in order to find out what the basic A.L.P. vote was. We knew that the vote that Edmonds got was not the basic vote, and we wanted to know what was the best vote that the A.L.P. could get in Townsville South. However, every Roman Catholic, not only in Townsville South but in Townsville as a whole, knows of that incident and I will guarantee that if Mr. Trower is foolish enough to run again for political honours in Townsville he will not even get the votes of those Roman Catholics who normally vote for the A.L.P. No Roman Catholic, or for that matter no member of any religious denomination, likes to think his church is being used merely for cheap political purposes.

While talking of things the A.L.P. do and of the way they fight—as I say, you can always rely on them to sink to the occasion—I went over to the South Townsville School fete on a Saturday afternoon just prior to polling day. I was not invited but that does not stop me from going like anybody else. I like to go across and spend a few bob to help the school committee. When I got there, the chairman of the school committee, who is a very solid A.L.P.-ite named Bill Wilson, said, "You are here, Tom? Now

you are here, you may as well be in the official party." To do old Bill Wilson justice, once he knew I was there he treated me as the member for the district.

Later on, I found out who was in the official party. Believe it or not, the official party at the South Townsville School, which is in the middle of my electorate, comprised the hon. member for Townsville North and Mr. Trower, my A.L.P. opponent. On his way to the South Townsville School on that occasion, Mr. Trower got lost. He finished up at the Victoria Park Hotel and had to ask his way to the South Townsville School. I did not object to what had happened, and when I was asked to say a few words to the gathering, I did. Then they called upon Mr. Tucker and then on Mr. Trower. That is the way the A.L.P. fights. It is quite different from the way I fight.

Everyone knows the work I put into getting the Currajong School, which was taken out of my electorate in the 1960 redistribution. I always do the right thing and when they especially asked me to go to their fete, because the school is now in the electorate of the hon. member for Townsville North I did not go; I considered it would be politically unethical. I sent them a guinea to spend on the chocolate wheel but I stayed away. That is the sort of thing one would expect any decent member of Parliament to do. But not the A.L.P. They did not mind invading my electorate, even when, as I say, Mr. Trower got lost on his way there.

As I said earlier, the hon. member for Townsville North objected to being branded by the Premier as an associate of Communists. Incidentally, he made a rather remarkable statement which appeared in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin". He said, "I am not a Communist; I am a respectable citizen". I have no doubt that the hon. member for Townsville North is a respectable citizen, but the Communists in Townsville are not happy at the implication that no Communist can be a respectable citizen.

The people of Townsville know, too, that the hon. member for Townsville North reached a gentleman's agreement with Mr. Costello, whose name I mentioned previously—he is the district secretary of the A.W.U. for that area—that he would run for A.L.P. nomination for the seat of Townsville North and Mr. Costello would run for A.L.P. nomination for the Labour-in-Politics Convention. When this gentleman's agreement became known, the boys who run the Trades and Labour Council in Townsville—

Mr. TUCKER: I rise to a point of order. That statement is completely untrue and I ask for its withdrawal.

Mr. AIKENS: Very well, I will withdraw the charge of the gentleman's agreement. I will say that when nominations did come out for the Townsville North representative at the Bundaberg Convention, there were two

nominations, namely, Mr. Costello and Mr. Tucker, and the Townsville Trades and Labour Council, which, of course, is controlled by the Communists, organised night and day for Mr. Tucker to beat Mr. Costello. He cannot deny that.

I told hon. members what happened in Townsville South and about our old friend William Wilson, whom I previously mentioned as the chairman of the South Townsville School committee. He is a Labour man of many years' standing, a man who has given years of his life and endeavour to the A.L.P. He nominated as an A.L.P. candidate for the Labour-in-Politics Convention in Bundaberg to represent Townsville South. Those men who supported the hon. member for Townsville North against Mr. Costello went along to Mr. Wilson and said, "Pull out, Bill, or we will 'do' you like a dinner." Mr. Wilson said, "Why should I pull out? I have worked for the Labour Party all my life. I have given them the best years of my life. Why can't I nominate as the delegate to the convention representing Townsville South?" They said, "You nominate and God help you!" Bill nominated in good faith and the Trades Hall boys in Townsville dredged up a fellow named Bird. I have never seen him and would not know him if I fell over him, although I think that I know everyone worth knowing in Townsville. They ran Bird against old Bill Wilson and the same Communists and the same Trades Hall mob who organised with the hon. member for Townsville North to beat Costello, at the same time organised for Bird to beat Bill Wilson. Poor old Bill Wilson was defeated by 128 votes to 18. The people know these things.

Mr. TUCKER: He never even started.

Mr. AIKENS: Who did not start?

Mr. TUCKER: Wilson.

Mr. AIKENS: Bunkum! It was published in the Press—"Bird 128, Wilson 18." It was never denied. If he did not even start why should Bill come and complain to me at the Townsville Show just afterwards?

Mr. TUCKER: I don't believe he ever complained to you.

Mr. AIKENS: I should not be surprised if the hon. member believed anything. When all is said and done I am trying to help the hon. member, if he would only realise that. I am not attacking him. He should not work himself up into a state of frenzy. Does he not recognise sound common-sense advice when he is getting it? He should be grateful to me. As a matter of fact, at the Caucus meeting tomorrow afternoon he should move a motion of thanks for the assistance I am trying to give the A.L.P. I hope his performance at that Caucus meeting will not be as deplorable as what occurred at the Labour Party's Caucus meeting last Wednesday when it was decided that they would not fill in the questionnaires dealing with the salaries and allowances of members of Parliament, that

they would not give evidence before the committee, but that they would take everything by way of salaries and allowances that other hon. members could get for them.

(Time expired.)

Mr. CAMPBELL (Aspley) (2.37 p.m.): I join with other hon. members on this side in conveying my congratulations to the Treasurer on the presentation of his Financial Statement. With the utmost clarity the Treasurer has reviewed the State's economy. His Financial Statement reflects the prosperity that abounds in every section of the community. Naturally we do not take all the credit for this happy state of affairs, although we can fairly claim that it is largely due to the policy this Government pursues. We are indeed fortunate to have a man of the calibre of Mr. Hiley as State Treasurer. In his record term in that portfolio he has made a wonderful personal contribution to the State's progress. I could cite numerous examples of that. I refer briefly to his administration of the Department of Harbours and Marine. Through his activities he has greatly increased the efficiency of our ports, and harbour boards have benefited greatly from his wise counsel.

I refer also to the recent rationalisation and reorganisation of the generation and supply of electricity in Brisbane. It is now some years since the Treasurer drew attention to the peculiar situation that had developed over the years. At that time he pointed to the economies that could be effected by rationalisation and voiced the opinion that unless something was done by 1966 the Brisbane City Council would run short of the capital required to continue the expansion of the generation necessary to cope with the city's progress. I well remember the criticism that this proposal by the Treasurer evoked from the Labour Party particularly. At progress association meetings and similar functions, the Treasurer's proposition was savagely attacked. It was roundly condemned by spokesmen for the Labour Party and "hands off the people's assets" was the popular cry. They could see no merit in it at all.

Mr. Evans: They attacked it in the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Yes, they attacked it in the House. It was savagely attacked and the most inane arguments were advanced against it. However, the Treasurer's suggestion was acted upon and the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity established a committee composed of representatives of the State Electricity Commission, the Southern Electric Authority and the Brisbane City Council. After 12 months' concentrated study this committee produced an excellent report, which substantiated the Treasurer's forecast and made it quite plain that rationalisation was imperative if the electricity supply of Brisbane was not to be placed in jeopardy. The acceptance of this report by the Jones administration

at the City Hall posed a problem for the Labour Party, because it conflicted with the previous policy decision of that party and the proposals were held up for several months while the Labour Party wrestled with its socialistic conscience. However, the economic considerations were far too great to be dismissed and the Labour Party, with great reluctance, intimated to the State Government its concurrence in the proposal. It is estimated that the Brisbane City Council will benefit to the extent of some £400,000 annually as a result of this change. At the same time, it will be able to spend on other works and services funds that otherwise would have been required for electricity generation. Of course, it should not be overlooked that this Government has now accepted the responsibility for raising the capital for electricity generation in the State.

Mr. Evans: We are giving an extra £1,000,000 a year.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Yes, an extra £1,000,000 capital to spend on other work.

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The hon. member made his speech the other day.

Mr. Sherrington: We did not oppose it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I will ignore that remark and pass on to another matter.

I hope that, in due course, similar attention will be given to the question of transport. It is obvious that, sooner or later, the various modes of public transport in Brisbane must be co-ordinated. This might best be done by the Transport Commission's accepting the complete administration of Brisbane's public transport needs. Water supply and sewerage could likewise be the subject of a similar inquiry, for it would appear that, for water supply in particular, the community interest could best be served by a regional water authority.

Mr. Newton: Who wrote this for you?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I do not need any assistance in making these observations. Hon. members opposite should remember that the hon. member for Salisbury came into the Chamber with a brief from Alderman Clem Jones.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I rise to a point of order. I had no brief from Alderman Clem Jones. I wish to make that quite clear. I ask that the remark be withdrawn.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I will withdraw the remark, but I shall make further comments about it later.

When the Brisbane City Council is relieved of these extraneous undertakings, it might be appropriate at that time to conduct research into the City of Brisbane Act to see if the community might be better served by a subdivision of the city of Brisbane so

that real local government might prevail rather than the present establishment, which has the effect of being a city State.

Opposition members are always ready to criticise the Government and imply that if Labour were in power everything would be so much better. Well, Labour had many years in which to achieve this but it failed miserably.

As Opposition members have so much to say about education, what should be done about it and what they would do about it if they were in power, let us have a look at the record. For instance, I do not wish to detract in any way from your impartiality, Mr. Tooth, but you will know that those who are engaged in the teaching service of the Education Department can reflect on the years when they were employed during the regime of the Labour Government and make comparisons with the conditions prevailing today. Any honest teacher will be quite willing to do that and must be very happy with the consideration he is receiving under this Government's policy.

It is quite obvious that it was Labour policy to live from day to day and to take no heed of education requirements of the future. At least that is how it appeared in the electorate of Aspley, where no provision whatever was made by the Labour Party for school-site requirements. Although the area was developing at the rate of 500 families a year and that development had been going on for many years, because of the failure of the Labour Party to make any provision for school-site requirements the department has under this Government had to embark on a crash programme of acquiring sites to meet current and future demands.

Let me outline what has had to be done in the past five or six years. In the first place, it was necessary to acquire land for the extension of the grounds of the Aspley State School. These grounds were hopelessly overcrowded. The ground was most unsuitable for playground area, and the Government acquired four acres of an adjoining property to provide playgrounds for the children. Furthermore, it acquired 10 acres of land in Maundrell Terrace, Chermside, for primary-school purposes, 15 acres in Hamilton Road, Chermside, for high-school purposes, 10 acres of land in Kitchener Road, Kedron, for primary-school purposes and 10 acres of land in Rode Road, West Chermside, for State primary-school purposes. It acquired eight acres of land in Rangeview Street, Aspley, for primary-school purposes, on which has been erected the Aspley East State School, and a further three acres have been acquired for playground purposes. I have made no mention of the land on which is situated the Aspley High School; but, as that land has been known as the "Government paddock" for as long as I can remember, evidently it was acquired in the dim distant past. I have mentioned those sites to indicate the lack of preparedness of the previous

Government and the way it lived from day to day in these matters, making no provision for the future.

I want also to make brief comment on the department's policy in regard to high-school grounds and I only wish that funds would permit the same treatment being given to primary-school grounds. Approximately £5,000 has been spent on the grounds of the new Aspley High School, transforming what was formerly scrubland into a beautiful playground area. It will be a tremendous asset to the surrounding district. This school is already building up a fine tradition through the diligence of the principal and teaching staff.

I want to deal now with a few of the points made by the hon. member for Salisbury in his speech on Thursday night. It was a most curious speech, but one of the type that we have come to expect from him. The hon. member set out to speak on matters pertaining to the Brisbane City Council in the manner, as he put it, of a person interested in the State and its capital city. That is no reflection on him, as I think everybody in this Chamber is interested in the progress of Queensland. He purported to speak as a disinterested person taking a detached view of the subject.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I rise to a point of order. I made it quite clear that I was speaking on that matter because I was the chairman of the Public Works and Local Government Committee of the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I was quoting from his actual words when I said that he claimed to be speaking as a person interested in the State and its capital city. There was nothing in his speech but an apology for the actions of his political colleagues in the Brisbane City Council. He also said that in his opinion the Government, the newspapers, and the various organisations that have sprung up in the city fail to realise how much damage their attempts to destroy the Labour administration are doing to future administrations.

Mr. Mann: You would like to see the Labour council destroyed.

Mr. CAMPBELL: That is not my desire at all. All I say is that if that is a fair statement, the same thing applies to criticism of the State Government. This apparently will be Labour's theme at the next civic election. Apparently they will endeavour to cloak their misdeeds with this plea.

One would imagine from the hon. member's remarks that members of the Australian Labour Party in the municipal field are a happy band of brothers.

Mr. Sherrington: That is not so.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am glad to hear the hon. member for Salisbury acknowledge that that is not so.

Mr. Sherrington: I did not deal with members of the Labour council.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The fact that it is not so may lend colour to the hon. member's attempts to whitewash his colleagues in the Brisbane City Council.

Not everything about the Jones administration at the City Hall has been disadvantageous, and I suppose I should be the last one to criticise it. Let me say that the Aspley ward has had far more than its fair share of city council works expenditure. Indeed, the fear is that tenders will not be received for work in the Aspley area to complete what is planned before the next civic election. I am not complaining; I am merely making observations.

I cannot help contrasting the spate of activity taking place in the Aspley area in the last 12 months with the complete lack of action in the neighbouring ward of Nudgee, where residents complain bitterly about the lack of consideration for their needs. If there is a pothole in Aspley it is repaired immediately, whereas in Nudgee the people in some areas complain bitterly about the condition of their streets. Of course, the fact that Aspley is a key ward in the next civic election is not without significance. As I said, I should be the last to complain, because Aspley is really benefiting as a result.

The hon. member went on to give credit to the Jones administration for the success of its loan-raising programme. I am not disparaging the results it has achieved, but the hon. member for Salisbury knows that this success is not peculiar to the Brisbane City Council; it is the general experience in all public loan raisings. It is the direct consequence of the Federal Government's economic measures of 1961, which were aimed at channelling investment in the direction of public loan raisings. Despite what was said about the policy when it was implemented, it cannot be denied that it has been singularly successful in restoring public support for public loan raisings.

The hon. member went on to say that the Government had done much to hamstring the council in its water policy and so denied the people of the outer suburbs of Brisbane—

Mr. Sherrington: You do not deny that the Government has not co-operated with the council on that?

Mr. CAMPBELL: All I can say is that water reticulation in the Aspley ward provides no problems.

Mr. Sherrington: Aspley is not the whole of Brisbane.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I can go only by my own experience.

Mr. Newton: That is where you get your brief.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am not carrying a brief from anybody else, unlike the hon. member for Salisbury. Apparently the Jones administration works on the old theory of "Where there's a will, there's a way", and is doing everything possible for the people of Aspley. In this regard, the Labour Party seems to have completely disregarded the city council's requirement for a return on capital outlay for water extensions, because it has taken water to places in Aspley—

Mr. Sherrington: You still have the 10 per cent. as laid down in the ordinances.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am pleased to hear the chairman of the Parliamentary Labour Party's Works Committee say that, because I understood that was the principle. In spite of this, water is being taken three-quarters of a mile to people in Beckett Road, Aspley—and they are very grateful for it—to serve 10 or 15 homes.

Mr. Sherrington: They can get it by contributing towards the cost.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The hon. member's interjection reminds me of the experience of people in Albany Creek Road, which was the first of four extensions in this area. In the first extension people were required to contribute a proportion of the capital outlay, in the second they were required to contribute for a 4-inch main although a 6-inch main was installed, in the third, which was an extension of about one-third of a mile, no return was required and the connections were made, and in the fourth, which traverses about three-quarters of a mile right out into the wilds of Aspley—

Mr. Aikens: Where the blacks are bad.

Mr. CAMPBELL: They were, too, when I was a lad. In the fourth case, again no heed was paid to the requirement of a return on capital. I am not complaining about that; on the contrary, I am very grateful for it. However, it is the case that whilst in some parts perhaps it is not desirable politically to give these amenities, in others it is really necessary politically.

The hon. member has also referred to the council's proposal to levy an amount of £250 an allotment on subdividers to provide sewerage trunk mains and disposal plants. I point out that that refers to trunk mains and disposal plants and not to house connections. The subdividers complain about this levy for two reasons. The first is that they claim they can do the work more economically than the council. I am not arguing that point; I am merely stating it. The £250 an allotment is in excess of the cost of these works. Secondly, they have no guarantee that, having paid the £250 levy, the work will be put in hand.

There is one aspect of the council's numerous requisitions that seems to be overlooked. It seems to be generally believed that the subdivider bears the cost of these numerous

requisitions but the plain fact is that he simply passes the cost on to the purchaser of a block of land. This increasing trend is producing a number of anomalies in land ownership. Take the case of a block of land at, say, Gordon Park, purchased 25 years ago. When the person purchased that land at that point of time he paid for the actual land and possibly the cost of putting an earth street in front of it; he paid also for his water connection. That is about all he would pay, apart from the cost of the house erected on the land.

With the passing of the years, that street has been paved and kerbing and channelling have been provided, and ultimately, as has recently happened in the area to which I referred, Gordon Park, sewerage has come. All that the householder has had to pay for in that regard has been the cost of household connection; all other services were provided out of council funds. Because of the provision of these amenities valuations of the land have been increased accordingly.

Contrast this situation with the purchase of a block of land in one of the newer suburbs, say, Chermiside West. A person who buys a block of land in these new areas today pays for the land; he pays for the water, the kerbing and channelling, and the bitumen streets; he pays for the electricity mains supply to the estate, for the water mains supply, and for the drainage. Now the council wants him to pay this £250 levy for the sewerage mains as well as the additional £10 levy for park purposes.

Mr. Mann: You are on the side of the subdivider.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I assure the hon. member for Brisbane that I am not. I am coming to the point now. When I have made it I think he will agree. All these costs add to the cost of the land and are taken into account when its valuation is determined. They are all included in the sale price of the land. It is no wonder that the valuations in these new suburbs have increased, and the council must accept its share of responsibility in the matter.

Mr. Sherrington: Do you say that he pays for the electricity mains?

Mr. CAMPBELL: That is right.

Mr. Sherrington: He does not.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I beg to differ from the hon. member.

Because of this, the purchaser of land today is obliged to pay twice. He pays for all those amenities the cost of which is included in the price of his block of land and, because the costs are included in the price of his land, they are also included in his valuation and he is rated on the amenities for which he has already paid.

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. CAMPBELL: There is a gradual increase in local-authority requisitions on property owners, which is having a very serious effect. I am not out of sympathy with local authorities; I am merely pointing out the facts concerning these requisitions.

Mr. Aikens: Don't you think it is time the Government took action to stop that sort of thing?

Mr. CAMPBELL: The local authorities are public bodies and the people have the remedy in their own hands on polling day.

The hon. member for Salisbury went on to say that the Government is procrastinating in completing the draft legislation dealing with the Town Plan, and that it wants to forget that the Town Planning Committee is a Government committee. What utter nonsense! Of course it is a Government committee; the Government was required to legislate to give it authority. Apart from nominating two representatives on the committee, the Government's initial responsibility virtually went no further. It was an act of good faith on the Government's part in drafting the Act that it was rather loosely worded in order to give the committee as much scope as possible for inquiry. This Government wants to see the Town Plan become a reality. It is not like previous Governments, which did not have the courage to face up to the problem of providing Brisbane with a proper town plan. The Government at no time expected that it would become the political issue that it has since the change of administration at the City Hall. I suppose that is only to be expected when the Labour Party has a hand in these matters. Whilst, technically speaking, it is a Government plan, the plan largely reflects the thinking of the City Hall. After all, three of the five members who make up the committee are the top men in the City Hall, and much of the detailed work that went into the preparation of the plan was done mainly by council officials. The origin-and-destination survey which formed the basis of the plan was conducted under the jurisdiction of the Brisbane City Council. Incidentally, that was done by the C.M.O. So it is, in effect, a council plan and the Council will administer it when it is ratified. It is typical of the political tactics of the Labour Party to duck its responsibilities in any matter that might involve criticism, and the Jones administration at the City Hall has tried to do a lot of ducking with the Town Plan. Although it is some 15 months since the committee commenced its consideration of the objections, the Government has not yet received sufficient data upon which to base legislation.

The hon. member referred also to the proposal to levy £10 an allotment for park purposes. The objection to this proposal is that there is no guarantee that the person who pays this levy will receive any benefit from it, for who is to determine where the intended parkland will be? The present

Jones administration has not a very good record in regard to parks—at least not in the area with which I am acquainted. The Treasurer will recall that in about last April I made representations to him because of the lamentable lack of playing areas in the Stafford North and Chermiside West areas. He will recall that I suggested that consideration might be given to making building blocks available to provide small playing areas for children as there was no parkland in that area. I am very pleased to acknowledge the Treasurer's helpful assistance as a result of my representation and I propose to quote from a letter dated 29 May that I received from him. It states—

“Land owned by the Queensland Housing Commission which is now being made available for home sites to the west and east of Appleby Road was subdivided with the approval of the Brisbane City Council by a private land developer for residential use. However, as the Council did not require the subdivider to allocate any of this land for park or recreation purposes and as the parks and proposed parks indicated on the proposed Town Plan are some distance from the Commission areas, I am prepared to withhold building of houses on two allotments at the corner of Farrant and Giles Streets . . . and on two allotments at the corner of Maryland and Aldren Streets . . .”

This shows the Treasurer's wisdom because in the future Appleby Road will become a very busy thoroughfare and he wanted a playing area on either side of it.

The letter continues—

“The first two allotments abovementioned are to the west and the other two are to the east of Appleby Road, as shown on the accompanying locality plans, and if each of these areas were developed as a children's playground it would obviate any need for children to cross Appleby Road which is a main thoroughfare.

“The Housing Commission has advised the Brisbane City Council that the Commission is prepared to surrender the four allotments abovementioned so that they may be set apart as Reserves for Recreation and/or Park Purposes under the control of the Council as Trustee. The Council has been requested to advise whether it concurs with this proposal and on receipt of a favourable reply the Commission will take the necessary action to have the four allotments placed under the control of the Council for Recreation and/or Park Purposes.”

Let me repeat that the offer made by the Treasurer and the Housing Commission was very generous. I suppose the four allotments that have been made available represent a value of from £3,500 to £4,000. I was naturally delighted when the offer was made. We have formed a progress association in the area and have received considerable support from the residents of the district. At a

meeting on 23 August I was feeling rather pleased with myself when I announced the Treasurer's decision and said that all we had to wait for was the concurrence of the council, when everything in the garden would be lovely. You could have knocked me down with a feather when, after I had said my little piece and was beginning to sit back with a glow of pleasure, the alderman for the ward rose and said, in a rather hesitant way, “I have a bit of bad news. The council has decided not to accept these blocks of land because they are too small and are improperly drained.”

Mr. Herbert: No consideration for the kiddies in the district.

Mr. CAMPBELL: No consideration for the kiddies in the district. The peculiar thing about it is that the council had already approved these blocks of land as suitable for houses, yet for park purposes they were too small—and we can set that aside for a moment—and were improperly drained.

I was almost stumped for words when I received that information and I finally arranged for a consultation with the alderman and Mr. Ellis, the assistant manager of parks in the Brisbane City Council. During the next week we had a conference with Mr. Ellis on this problem and, on the question of the lack of size of the area, he said that the council was troubled because these playground areas were too close to adjoining houses. He intimated that if the Queensland Housing Commission would make available a couple more blocks of land the council might consider the proposition favourably. I had the temerity to suggest to the Treasurer that to comply with the council's wishes he consider allotting two more blocks for the playground areas on the eastern side of Appleby Road and one block on the western side. Alternatively it was suggested that four blocks be made available on the eastern side of Appleby Road. The Treasurer replied on 29 August and his first observation—with which I agreed at the time and still agree—was that the Housing Commission had acted generously in offering to make four allotments available for playground purposes. He added—

“I do not consider that any further burden should be accepted by the Commission in this regard.”

He went on to say:

“As the four blocks on the corner of Aldren and Ansford Streets” (on the eastern side of Appleby Road) “are preferred, I will arrange for the Commission to indicate to the Brisbane City Council its preparedness to surrender the allotments to be set aside. . .”

as park reserves, etc.

Again I thought, “Now we will make some progress.” So at the September meeting of this newly-formed progress association I again indicated the Treasurer's decision in

this matter and sat down. Again the meeting was advised by the ward alderman that the council was chary of accepting the alternative offer, not on the score that the site was too small, not on the score of poor drainage, but on the score of cost, and the alderman had the temerity to say, "It is a pity the commission did not level the land before handing it over to the council." The matter went to the Establishment and Co-ordination Committee of the Council, which considered it and referred it to the Finance Committee. That is where the matter now rests. I suppose the Finance Committee is deciding whether the Brisbane City Council will be able to find the few hundred pounds entailed in levelling the ground. Perhaps because of the council's expenditure on the Civic Square it will find itself unable to provide these amenities for the children of the people in this area.

I want to deal with another matter concerning the Lord Mayor's attitude to parks, and it affects the area of land in Chermerside known as the Hamilton Road Recreation and Playground Area. It is a block of land which is a residue of the Chermerside Army Camp. Over the years certain parts have been disposed of. More recently, in 1958, an area of the land was disposed of to the Methodist Church for an aged people's home. Another 350 blocks were set aside for War Service homes and the final residue of the old Chermerside Army Camp of 180 acres was to be sold by the Department of the Interior for building purposes. However, the Federal member for Petrie at the time, Hon. Alan Hulme, prevailed upon the Minister for the Interior not to cut it up and sell it for building blocks, for which the Commonwealth Government would have got a handsome sum running into hundreds of thousands of pounds, but to hand the land over to the Brisbane City Council for park and recreation purposes for the modest sum of approximately £15,000. Again, this was a very generous offer.

The organisations in the area requiring the use of the land negotiated with the Groom administration of the time for an allocation to develop the land for their requirements. Negotiations proceeded satisfactorily, though perhaps a little too slowly, and then, when the town plan was released, it was discovered, to the consternation of all these people, that 20 acres of the best portion of the area set aside for park and recreation purposes was marked "For residential purposes." The area so marked is very conveniently situated for transport, and the Boy Scouts, youth clubs, the progress association, and other local bodies had made plans to use this land.

A deputation waited on the Lord Mayor, Alderman Jones, but he remained adamant that he was going to sell this 20 acres of park land to provide funds to develop the remainder of the area, and only strong pressure of public opinion, supported by the advice received from the Federal Department

of the Interior that the land could be used only for park and recreation purposes, forced the Lord Mayor to change his attitude and as the result the zoning of the land was changed back to park purposes and the Town Plan was altered accordingly.

I must say that since that date people have found it very difficult to get any information from the city council of its intentions. It is suggested that an Olympic swimming pool is to be built in the area, but, as plans have been prepared for the building of one a couple of miles away at Kalinga, this might well be a bit optimistic.

I could say much more about what was said by the hon. member for Salisbury. If time permitted, I could deal with the disappointment felt by many people in Aspley at the town plan's dividing Aspley into a residential and a non-residential area. The township of Aspley has developed over the past 15 years, and it was expected that this progress would continue. The town plan has decreed that there shall be no further extension of the residential area in Aspley beyond Gympie Road and Little Cabbage Tree Creek. It is difficult to understand this recommendation of the Town Planning Committee because all the necessary facilities, such as water, transport, and abundant power, pass through the area.

I understand that the committee considers it desirable to use vacant blocks of land closer to the centre of the city before allowing this area to develop. Aspley has become a very desirable place in which to live, and there is a great demand for the beautiful building sites on the northern side of Gympie Road. I contrast them with the building blocks in the Stafford North area, to which I referred earlier. The land there is gravel-ridge country. When it has been cleared by bulldozer it is left like a desert, and it takes years and years to develop a garden. On the other hand, one can buy in Aspley a block of what was formerly farm land and have a beautiful garden in a year. Indeed, Aspley is fast becoming the garden suburb of Brisbane.

I think there is more in town planning than merely considering mundane matters such as the supply of water and electricity. I believe that aesthetic values should be considered, too, and I can see no reason why people in Aspley who own land suitable for use as building blocks should be denied the right to subdivide it. I find this prohibition particularly strange when in Bald Hills, a suburb a few miles farther out than Aspley, it is possible to subdivide land, and when there is a big project to subdivide a large area at Bracken Ridge, which is $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles farther from the G.P.O. than is Aspley. The prohibition has imposed quite a considerable strain on local organisations. For instance, churches have embarked on expansion programmes in the expectation that development in the next five or ten years will proceed at the same rate as it has in the last few years.

They have expended considerable sums of money, and they could be in serious financial difficulty if the district does not progress as they have anticipated. A number of shopkeepers are in a similar position. I find it difficult to understand why the Town Planning Committee has made this decision in relation to Aspley and has not applied similar restrictions in other areas.

I shall conclude by saying that I hope, and the people of Aspley hope, that when the Town Plan is amended in accordance with the objections that have been lodged with the committee, the very desirable areas of land at Aspley that are so suitable for building sites will be zoned as residential and not non-urban.

Mr. DUFFICY (Warrego) (3.28 p.m.): I wish to take advantage of this debate to direct attention to the land policy and some of the administrative actions of the Government.

I believe that land legislation is particularly important because by it, as distinct from other legislation, the Government of the day can bind subsequent Governments to a large extent. When Labour is returned to office, which is inevitable in the near future, in the first session of Parliament it can re-introduce price control and rent control. It can also, by amending the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, give workers such as those who are employed at Mt. Isa a measure of justice that was denied to them by the recent amendment of the Act. That can be accomplished if the Labour Government of the day thinks it is desirable, as I think it will. But I doubt very much whether a Labour Government can do anything to rectify the scandal of granting 51,000 acres to the King Ranch Development Company on special lease with freeholding rights. As I say, I doubt if we could do that, and I have no doubt at all that we would not be able to do anything about the alienation of land now in process as a result of the actions of this Government. It is true that land legislation cannot be rectified even if it is completely contrary to the policy of the incoming Government. This Government by its actions in land matters has, to a very large extent, bound subsequent Governments. That is why I say that land legislation is so particularly important.

I regret that the Minister for Lands is not in the Chamber at the present time, because during the course of my remarks I may be compelled to say some unkind things about him and his introduction of the Land Bill during the last session of the previous Parliament. I may also criticise rather severely the land policy of this Government, or perhaps it may be more correct to say its lack of policy. Despite the fact that I have taken considerable interest in land matters over the years, I find it completely impossible to follow the administrative actions of this Government in relation to lands.

I wish to mention some of these matters to demonstrate, to my way of thinking, the complete contradictions in the Government's approach to land matters. Nive Downs was a fairly large station in my electorate and, before its resumption, was managed by a man named Ross McLaren. He was in the prime of life and no-one could say that he was not completely experienced and a competent man in industrial and pastoral affairs.

When that property was subdivided for the purposes of closer settlement Ross McLaren was an applicant for the ballot. There should have been no doubt at all about his financial backing because he was backed by Primary Producers Ltd., which everybody knows is a very substantial company. It is a wool-broking company and its financial standing could never be doubted. Ross McLaren's application, as I say, was backed by Primary Producers Ltd., but he was rejected as an applicant for the Nive Downs ballot. A man who is also a friend of mine, with little or no pastoral experience but who was conducting an electrical shop in Charleville, was admitted to the ballot and was successful. I am not complaining at all about the fact that he was admitted to the ballot. What I am complaining about is that a man like Ross McLaren, who was sufficiently competent in pastoral affairs to manage the whole of Nive Downs before it was subdivided, was rejected from the ballot. I have never had a satisfactory explanation from the Government about that matter.

I turn now to the Mt. Morris block, which was resumed from the Mt. Morris holding. In that case a man 65 years of age, with very little experience in pastoral matters, was admitted to the ballot and was successful. He drew the Mt. Morris block. Within a short time because of either his age or his inexperience, he forfeited the block. The point I wish to make is that he was admitted to the ballot, was successful in the ballot, and that he was 65 years of age with little previous knowledge in this field, yet a man like Ross McLaren, who managed the whole of the property before subdivision, who had ample backing from a wool-broking firm, and whose finances could not be in doubt, was rejected from the Nive Downs ballot.

Mr. Davies: Any explanation?

Mr. DUFFICY: There is no explanation, and I challenge truthful contradiction of my statements.

Now we come to the Elmena block. The screening committee that I spoke about when the Land Bill was before Parliament reduced the number of applicants for that block to four. It was a friend of mine who drew the block. It may have been a coincidence but Tom Smith, who drew the block, was the manager of Elmena. I am not suggesting there is anything wrong with that. I am merely suggesting that it is completely

wrong that applicants should have been screened to the extent that only four finally balloted for the block.

In passing, let me say that I agree completely with what the hon. member for Gregory said in his Address-in-Reply speech. He suggested that at the present time one needs oodles of money before being accepted for a land ballot in Queensland. I would suggest that perhaps one needs not only oodles of money but also a little influence. During Labour's regime if a block like Elmena had been thrown open there would have been anything up to 1,000 or 1,500 applicants, all of whom would have been accepted and would have participated in the ballot. When Elmena was drawn there were only four applicants left in the ballot after the screening had taken place. I just do not know the reasons. A complete inquiry should be held into the administration of land matters by the present Government.

I do not wish to try to improve on the speech made by the hon. member for Mourilyan about the granting of 51,000 acres to the King Ranch Development Company. He explained the type of country and the conditions under which the special lease was granted to the company. However, I want to go a step further than the hon. member for Mourilyan and say that I can see no provision in the Land Act under which that lease could be legally granted. I make that statement definitely. I believe there is no provision in the Land Act to enable the Government to grant that special lease. If there is such a provision, the committee that considered the Land Bill when it was before this Chamber deliberately misled us. That is a fairly serious statement to make, but I will back it up in this way: there is only one clause in the Land Act under which that lease could have been granted, and that is Clause 205. This is what I said during the debate that took place on that clause. This reference is to be found at page 2093 of "Hansard" and anyone can refer to "Hansard" to see what I said—

"What the Minister says may be correct, but the unfortunate thing is that we on this side of the Chamber cannot read his mind or make any definite forecasts of what the Government may do. All that we can do is take the Bill as it reads. The Minister might well agree that certain areas of the brigalow lands are particularly costly to develop. After all, we do not know how long the present Minister will occupy that office, and there could be in future another Minister with an entirely different view on this matter, one who could be influenced by the actual words of the clause. They are—

'With respect to land which in the opinion of the Minister is abnormally costly to develop . . .'

In the opinion of the present Minister, or in the opinion of a succeeding Minister, certain brigalow lands might be very costly

to develop. I suggest that there is nothing in the clause to prevent the Minister from issuing a special lease . . ."

This is the point I wish to emphasise, because this 51,000 acres granted to King Ranch was granted under a special lease.

I continue with the quotation—

" . . . to a particular person or to a company or anyone else. Having issued the special lease, he could then decide whether part or the whole of it could be converted to freehold tenure and also decide the purchase price."

I suggest that is exactly what has been done in connection with King Ranch.

I went on to say—

"In spite of what the Minister might say about his intention in regard to small parcels of land, I suggest that there is nothing in the clause to prevent him from doing the things that I suggest or from converting an area in excess of 10,000 acres in the brigalow belt from special lease to freehold."

And that is what is being done, too.

I continued—

"I shall be interested to hear what he has to say."

The important thing is what the Minister had to say then, and I again quote from "Hansard"—

"Hon. A. R. FLETCHER (Cunningham—Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation): It will not be used in the brigalow belt. If the hon. member looks at subclause (1) (a) he will see that it says—

'the specific development of the land in order to render it fit for manufacturing, industrial, residential or business purposes'.

That is what it is for. There is no way in which we can apply it to the brigalow belt. It will enable us to deal with difficult areas round the various cities of the State, and it is a very necessary and useful provision."

It is unfortunate that there is not present in the Chamber a responsible Minister who can reply to what I want to put to the Government. The Minister for Lands is not here. Is the 51,000 acres that was granted to King Ranch a small area around some city? I suggest it is not. I remind the Committee that when the hon. member for Mourilyan was speaking in the debate on this matter, the hon. member for Clayfield interjected and said, "This is some of the best land in Australia." If it is amongst the best land in Australia it certainly could not be said of it, as the Minister said on that occasion, that it was simply for the purpose of developing certain difficult areas around the various cities in Queensland.

Later, the former member for Port Curtis, Mr. Burrows, said this—

"I want to point out the danger of this clause. It is not the present Minister whom I doubt, but, as I said, Ministers come and Ministers go. This gives the Minister unlimited power so far as area is concerned."

The Minister, Mr. Fletcher interjected—

"It does not. Read paragraph (a) of subclause (1)."

I want hon. members to take particular note of that. Then "Hansard" goes on—

"Mr. BURROWS: That is, 'The specific development of the land in order to render it fit for manufacturing, industrial, residential or business purposes.'"

Mr. Fletcher: That is right.

And he again emphasised that it did not apply to large areas of land at all; it applied only to small areas, difficult areas around cities. Nobody can say that 51,000 acres is a small area.

Let us continue and see what happened on this Clause 205, and, if I am wrong, let someone on the Government side contradict me. Clause 205 was the one used to grant 51,000 acres to King Ranch. When we got to Clause 206, I harked back to the previous clause, because I realised its importance, and said—

"When discussing the previous clause the Minister said that it might apply to swampy land or some very unimproved land, or something of that nature. . . I should now like him to explain why Clause 206 is included in the Bill. According to the marginal note, it is a completely new clause. I direct the Minister's attention particularly to the concluding portion, but I will read it all."

That is Clause 206, which I read on that occasion.

Mr. Davies: You are dealing with the King Ranch scandal?

Mr. DUFFICY: Yes. Clause 206 reads—

"A company registered under 'The Companies Act of 1961', or body corporate constituted by, under or pursuant to any Act or Commonwealth Act, with power to take, acquire, purchase and hold land or any estate or interest in land, or a Local Authority shall be competent to apply for, bid for, acquire and hold a special lease."

I point out that that clause was a new one put in the consolidation of the Land Act, and by virtue of Clauses 205 and 206 King Ranch was able to get 51,000 acres on a special lease.

I point out further what I said in that debate. Following the reading of that clause I continued—

"That is precisely what we were speaking about on the previous clause. It appears that for some reason the Government included in the Bill a provision whereby a company can acquire and hold

a special lease. I want to know why that special provision was included. I think it lends some weight to my argument that if in the opinion of the Minister a portion of the brigalow belt—"

(I mentioned that because legislation in connection with the brigalow land was to follow, and I shall link it up later with what might happen in the brigalow belt.)

"—was extremely difficult to develop—and after all, it is in his opinion only—there is nothing in Clause 206 to prevent a company from acquiring a special lease of, say, 10,000 acres of brigalow land. In accordance with Clause 205, which we have just discussed, the company could obtain a freehold tenure over that 10,000 acres. If there is any clause in the Bill to prevent that from taking place, I will be interested to hear the Minister's explanation. Failing a satisfactory explanation, I intend to divide the Committee on this clause."

That is what I said when the Bill was being discussed. I shall now quote the Minister's reply. He said—

"I think I told the Committee during the debate on the previous clause that there was in this no reference to the brigalow land."

I said, "No, but there is no exclusion," and the Minister replied, "Of course there is." He made it quite definite that that could not be done under any circumstances. The report continues—

"Mr. Dufficy: Where is it?"

"Mr. FLETCHER: There is the provision that it has to be for manufacturing, industrial, residential, or business purposes."

That was the Minister's reply, and I think it is very important to keep that in mind when we are discussing the special lease of 51,000 acres to the King Ranch Development Company.

The report continues—

"Mr. Dufficy: What is 'business'?"

The Minister conveniently evaded answering that question.

Let us now go a little further. I was concerned about this, and, in view of what has happened, I think I was entitled to be concerned. Later, when we were discussing Clause 207, which was two clauses later than 205, the one that I considered was very important, I am reported as having said this—

"I referred to Clause 205 (3), which provides that the restrictions imposed by Clause 180 do not apply to the conversion of a special lease to freehold tenure, whereas a restriction does apply under Clause 207 (3) (b), which says that the Minister may—

'issue to the lessee a perpetual town lease, or a perpetual suburban lease, or a perpetual country lease of land at an annual rental . . .'

I then pointed out the restrictions that applied under Clause 180—

“The land shall be offered in lots, the maximum areas whereof respectively shall not exceed—

‘town land, half an acre; suburban land, twenty acres; country land, two thousand five hundred and sixty acres.’

“However, in Clause 205 the restrictions on the conversion of special lease to freehold were specifically deleted by subclause (3).”

The report continues—

“Mr. FLETCHER: We went into that.

“Mr. DUFFICY: No, we didn’t; not to my satisfaction.

“Mr. FLETCHER: I cannot help that. Clause 205 is meant to cover difficult bits of swamp land, and so on, that we hoped somebody would improve for manufacturing, industrial, residential, or business purposes, and the area restrictions did not apply because the important thing was to get something done with them.”

I do not want to weary the Committee by quoting from the report any further, and I am glad to see that the Minister for Lands is now in the Chamber. Let me say that I am not casting any reflections on the integrity of the Minister. When he gave the interpretation to the Committee quite definitely, after it had debated this matter for a lengthy period, that Clause 205 of the Bill that he was presenting was designed only to deal with certain difficult pieces of land adjacent to Brisbane or provincial cities, I believed that he was expressing his honest and sincere opinion.

Mr. Aikens: And every member of Parliament had that impression, too.

Mr. DUFFICY: There is no doubt that the Opposition believed in the integrity of the Minister. I accepted his interpretation because I said this—

“When discussing the previous clause the Minister said that it might apply to swampy land . . .”

and so on—

“I think I agree with the interpretation of that clause . . .”

And I did agree. That was the impression that the Minister gave the Committee on that occasion and I would be the last person to say that he would deliberately try to mislead us.

But let me repeat again what I said prior to the Minister’s entering the Chamber. I believe that there is no provision in the Land Act whereby this lease could be legally granted to King Ranch Development Co. In support of that contention I have quoted at some length the advice the Minister gave the Committee when the Bill was being introduced. That advice was that Clause 205 of the Land Act could not be

used in any way to deal with large areas of land such as pastoral lands. The impression that the Minister gave the Committee on that occasion was that it was purely to cater for difficult industrial sites around Brisbane and provincial cities.

Mr. Aikens: The Minister specifically mentioned mangrove swamps along the coast.

Mr. DUFFICY: The Minister said exactly what I have quoted and I do not think he will deny that that is the impression he gave the Committee.

In view of that fact—and I accept the Minister’s interpretation—I am stating now definitely that the special lease granted to King Ranch Development Co. is in contravention of the Land Act and is a fit subject for a royal commission.

We have had royal commissions on pastoral matters before and I think the reasons for appointing them were no more serious than those I have indicated to this Committee today.

Let us now go a little further into this matter. I have here a copy of “The Australian Financial Review” of Tuesday, 1 October, 1963. I am not going to weary the Committee by reading all that appears here, but let me read this. It says—

“The Queensland story. Private scheme to open up brigalow scrub.”

Hon. members can read it; it is in the Library. It mentions a letter that was written by another foreign company—and, after all, King Ranch is a foreign company. This refers to another foreign company, a French company, which is now in communication with the Premier of this State. A portion of their letter is quoted with regard to certain suggestions, along the lines of the concession granted to King Ranch, relating to the brigalow lands in this State. I am not suggesting that a concession will be granted to these people, but what I am suggesting is that in view of what has happened with the concession granted illegally—I repeat, “illegally”—to King Ranch, every other company is entitled to apply for the same concession. If there is any matter on which a Government should be consistent it is a land matter. As I pointed out in my opening remarks, this Government, by its legislative and administrative policy, binds subsequent Governments for definite periods, possibly even into perpetuity if it is a matter of freehold tenure. We must have consistency in land matters, but consistency has been lacking with this Government. As I do not want to labour the point any further I conclude on this note: on the information given to Parliament by the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, who was the Minister responsible for the introduction of the consolidated Land Bill, there is no legal way that King Ranch Development Co. could have been granted a special lease of 51,000 acres with freehold rights. I say that very definitely. As I maintain

that what was done was illegal, I submit that it is a fit subject for a royal commission. I am not in any way suggesting that the Minister deliberately misled the Chamber when the Bill was introduced. What I am saying is that it is quite possible that certain outside pressures were brought to bear in this matter, and they were successful in overriding the better judgment of the Minister. I may not be wrong when I suggest that this action was taken against the Minister's advice. I am suggesting that if the present Government is going to hand out the public land of the State to foreign companies, as has been done in the case of King Ranch, at least let it have the intestinal fortitude to tell us in the Chamber what it is doing.

Mr. Ewan interjected.

Mr. DUFFICY: The hon. member can have a go afterwards.

Mr. Ewan: You are suggesting that the first action was illegal, therefore you mean to say that in another case it would be illegal.

Mr. DUFFICY: I am not suggesting anything of the sort. If the hon. member is silly enough to think that, that is his business. I believe that the only way in which King Ranch could have obtained a special lease of 51,000 acres would have been for the Government to get authority from this Parliament to grant it. I do not believe that there is any authority under the Act. I think the Minister for Lands will agree with me that though he may be the Minister responsible for land matters, after all he is bound by the legislation passed by this Parliament. The Minister for Justice is not a law unto himself; he is bound by the Acts that govern his department and govern the State generally.

Mr. Hanlon: Do you think the same pressure is being exerted on this Minister as was complained about by the hon. member for Fassifern?

Mr. DUFFICY: I do not want to go into that; the hon. member for Fassifern can speak for himself. I assure the hon. member that he is a very competent advocate. However, I do know that such a proposal was placed before the hon. member for Fassifern when he was Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, and he rejected it. The fact that he is not now the Minister may be attributable to his rejection of the proposal.

Mr. HOUGHTON (Redcliffe) (4.11 p.m.): Together with other hon. members on this side of the Chamber, I congratulate the Treasurer on the manner of his presentation of the Budget and the Financial Statement. The information they contain has been set out with great clarity and it is history in the making. As has been stated by other hon. members, this is the first Budget to contain revenue from oil production. I believe, too, that history will repeat itself in that it will

be found that the wealth from this commodity will be equal in value to that derived from wool. The financial position of the State will improve and in the years that lie ahead many benefits will accrue.

There are many aspects of the Budget to which I should like to refer. Firstly, I recently had an opportunity of proceeding to the North, as far as Townsville, on an investigation. It was illuminating, and a source of jubilation, to see how the people of the North in particular are developing this great State. Those who are not developing it are anxious to participate in development similar to that in other parts of the State. These are the things that provide a great stimulus to us all, as Queenslanders, for we are living in one of the most exciting periods in the history of this State.

There are many alarming things, too, and I should like to refer to one of particular concern at the moment—juvenile delinquency. Many of us have been shocked by the reports of teenage lawlessness, delinquency and vandalism in various parts of Queensland that come under our notice from time to time. The time has arrived for us to evolve a plan and accept the challenge of youthful wrongdoing. This is a challenge that we must accept as citizens, and as the Government of the State. It is a challenge to the Government and a challenge to parents. Today we are rearing the finest crop of young people that the world has ever seen. Boys and girls are healthier, better informed, and more mature for their years than any youngsters previously born in this great country. Most of them are law-abiding youngsters, but there is grave teenage delinquency which presents a problem and a challenge to us all. I refer to the youngster who has committed one or more criminal offences and has been classified as a juvenile delinquent. Before we can have a completely wholesome society this boy or girl must be converted into a decent and law-respecting person like the vast majority of his brothers and sisters. While juvenile law-breakers are only a small minority of the nation's youth, they have been increasing steadily in number in recent years but currently they are committing crimes at a rate out of all proportion to their number. I think you will agree with me, Mr. Gaven, that unfortunately statistics show that juvenile crime is on the increase in this part of the Commonwealth as in other parts.

Some people think the newspapers exaggerate juvenile crime or that it is confined mainly to the larger cities. This is not the case. Statistics reflect a disturbing situation because from coast to coast, in small communities as well as in big cities, juvenile delinquency is on the rise and it calls for effective and immediate measures to remedy it.

Mr. Davies: Do the statistics take into account the increase in population?

Mr. HOUGHTON: We have one juvenile on my right.

Right now the percentage of teenagers in our population is comparatively small. This, of course, can be attributed to the low birth-rate that was evident during the war years. But with a new generation about to enter the teenage group, following World War II., the problem could be gravely accentuated with that increase in the number of teenagers.

We can prevent teenagers of our day from becoming law-breakers. The problem is capable of solution if only we tackle it along the right lines. We must first of all explore the reasons behind the rise in juvenile delinquency. While the great majority of boys and girls are fine specimens, an increasing minority every year displays anti-social, lawless and even vicious characteristics.

A prevalent idea is that juvenile delinquents come mainly from slum areas and poverty-stricken families. This is decidedly not true. Families in modern, well-to-do circumstances produce delinquents just as those families in the lower-income brackets do. Nor is it true that most young criminals are sick children. As a rule they are healthy, bright and physically strong, and just as capable as those who do not commit such crimes.

Our studies of the backgrounds of thousands of juvenile delinquents indicate that, rather than being the victims of economic circumstances or illnesses, most of them are the products of disruptive influences that have attacked wide areas of our society during the last generation and especially since the end of the war.

No child is inherently bad. He is made what he is by his upbringing and his surroundings and it is thus apparent that something has gone wrong with the environment of a good many children or we should not be confronted with the problem of delinquency.

One thing that has gone wrong is that the age of debunking has seriously undermined the traditions, customs and standards of adult conduct. For a generation the public has been exposed to attempts to destroy, deflate, or besmear formerly universally-accepted concepts that concern us all. Pictures in newspaper columns, the movies, radio and television programmes, comic books, and even school and college textbooks have all been considered, and their targets have included everything from patriotism to conventional moral codes, and from national heroes to our business institutions and our system of justice.

The minds of only a relatively small minority have been corrupted by such evil ideas, it is true, but we must face the fact that some have been, and when children grow up among adults who refuse to recognise anything as fine, good, or worthy of respect, it is not surprising that a certain number fail to develop high moral standards, or even to distinguish between right and

wrong. Many of those who show little concern adopt, when charged or challenged, the catchcry "So what?". As citizens and as members of Parliament, we must accept that challenge. The same cynical attitude is displayed by many juvenile delinquents and those exposed to the influence of adults who show little respect for anything, or who rationalise the blackest of crimes as due to psychological disturbances for which the wrongdoers are not really responsible. Youngsters do not learn to recognise any real difference between good and evil. They see no reason why they should not do anything that they feel like doing.

Juvenile delinquency is always rooted in adult delinquency, and only through a general acceptance of higher moral values can we solve the problem entirely. In my judgment, the easiest way to bring it about is through a return to religion. For several decades the general trend has been away from the age-old belief that man is God-centred and responsible for his thoughts and behaviour to a higher power as well as to his fellow men. The resulting materialism has emphasised the values of expediency, shirking responsibility, and selfishness.

Right now, I, with other hon. members, am happy to say and observe that there are many indications of a spiritual re-awakening in this country, including an increase in church membership and attendance. I feel sure that if we were all to join in this back-to-God movement and train our children to respect the Ten Commandments and the moral laws laid down by all the great religions, we would soon have delinquency under control.

Another constructive step that we must take is to tighten the ties that hold families together and improve the living atmosphere in millions of homes. There is always a cause and effect in relationships between delinquents and the homes from which they come, which are of paramount importance in determining the cause. The majority of juvenile offenders come from homes in which living conditions are unwholesome. Comparatively few come from homes in which conditions are fair, and almost none come from good homes, but what makes a home good or bad is not always easy to determine. Almost invariably parents are to blame for the development of young criminals. When a child goes wrong, we usually find that he has been exposed to neglect, unhappiness, insecurity, parental conflict, drunkenness, or other bad influences in the home.

How can we become better parents? Experience and observations indicate that a person's financial circumstances, education, or I.Q. rating have little to do with his qualification for parenthood. We have found that good parents are—

1. Parents who try to understand their children and find time to cultivate their friendship and love;

2. Parents of integrity who face facts and live by the truth;

3. Parents who live within their means and give their children examples of thrift, security, and stability;

4. Parents who are industrious and teach their children that most of life's good things come only from hard work;

5. Parents who have worth-while goals in life and seek to have their children join them in their attainment;

6. Parents who have common sense, a capacity for friendship, and a sense of humour;

7. Parents who live in harmony with each other and do not quarrel in the presence of their children;

8. Parents who have ideals and a compelling urge to serve rather than be served;

9. Parents who are unswervingly loyal to their children but who can express righteous indignation and chastise them when it is necessary. (The old proverb "Spare the rod and spoil the child" is as true today as it ever was); and

10. Parents whose decisions are controlled not by what their children desire but by what they need.

In reviewing thousands of cases, we have found that men and women who possess these 10 qualifications almost never have delinquent children, and one of the most effective measures that could be taken to check juvenile crime would be for thousands of fathers and mothers to pattern themselves more nearly on these standards of parenthood.

The first requirement on the list is especially important because what every child needs most is attention. Some busy men who are carrying heavy responsibilities tell one wistfully that they do not have enough time to spend with their children or to take them into their confidence. If parents have the confidence of their children they can often prevent them from becoming law-breakers.

The two essential remedies for juvenile crime that I have suggested—acceptance by adults of higher moral values and finer standards of parenthood—are of such a broad and general nature that we cannot expect to solve the entire problem quickly or at one stroke. But, while working towards these great objectives, there are several other steps we can take to reduce delinquency at once.

One of these is to stop molly-coddling juvenile criminals. It is against the instincts of the average Australian to get tough with children; but the time has come when we must impose sterner penalties and restrictions on young law-breakers for the protection of the law-abiding. I do not mean that I would favour imprisoning every boy and girl found guilty of a minor offence. I agree with those judges who hesitate to send juveniles to penal institutions or reform schools, which neither reform nor rehabilitate youngsters; but it is imperative for those same judges to impose

much stricter conditions on the release of juvenile offenders because, time after time, those freed under slack supervision or in custody of their parents promptly return to their criminal ways. Juvenile criminals who are just as vicious and dangerous as older law-breakers are permitted to remain at liberty simply because they are minors. This not only permits them to continue to commit crimes, but also breeds contempt for the law by other juveniles with whom they associate.

Another practical step in helping to control delinquency would be the finger-printing of juveniles. I believe that the finger-printing of all juveniles arrested for serious crimes, just as we finger-print adult criminals, would be a deterrent. In many States the finger-printing of juveniles is prohibited by law and in others it is frowned upon by juvenile authorities. That is because professional apologists have maintained that a youngster's future could be jeopardised if his finger-prints are recorded on police files. That strikes me as an unsound argument because, if an errant child becomes a decent citizen, the chances of his youthful misbehaviour being held against him in adult life are virtually nil whether he is finger-printed or not, and the protection of the public demands that young offenders be made easily identifiable to law-enforcement authorities, if only for the deterrent effect it might have upon them.

Our present law-enforcement organisation of co-operating local, State and Federal agencies, is competent to handle the problem provided that police officers are not required to keep hands off juvenile cases except when arrests are called for. For too long the idea has prevailed that young law-breakers would be tainted by any contact with the police. In fact, a cult has developed which holds that only psychiatrists and social workers are capable of doing anything to prevent or control delinquency.

I have a high respect for the value of the work done by psychiatrists and social workers in rehabilitating young offenders—we need more of these experts—but in every community police officers are still the front-line fighters against crime of all kinds. They know the extent of local delinquency and its trends, and also its focal points. They are usually acquainted with the ringleaders of juvenile gangs and with the conditions contributing to delinquency. By simply making it easier for the nation's police to suppress juvenile crime, and to prevent it, we could take an important step towards solving the problem.

Another needed measure is that of making parents everywhere financially liable for property damage caused by their children, as they are now on occasions but not on every occasion. This could be especially helpful against the wave of vandalism that has been sweeping many places throughout Queensland. Pressure also could be brought to bear upon the parents to become better

parents, by giving more publicity to the misdeeds of specific children. As a rule, the police, the courts, and the Press co-operate in shielding the identity of juvenile offenders. This is right and proper in the case of first offenders or those guilty of trifling misdemeanours, but when a delinquent repeatedly breaks the law or commits a vicious crime, his identity should be revealed to the public. If the names of more delinquents appeared in the Press, their parents would often be shamed into making them mend their ways quicker than the process of law seems to do at present.

Some parents have no sense of shame, it is true, and when that is the case we should take stronger measures in order to make them realise and fulfil their responsibilities. More court verdicts like that, and more State laws to make such verdicts possible, are badly needed. If a few more delinquent parents went to gaol or paid for the destructive acts of their children, there would be far fewer child delinquents in our prisons and reform schools.

Still another step we can take to keep boys and girls from becoming criminals is to provide them with more wholesome outlets for their youthful energies and high spirits. Ordinarily one cannot suppress youth in the community. One must realise that it was the youth of this nation that saved us from the ravages of war on two occasions and I feel we should be very grateful to them. I am sure I have the support of every member of this Committee in expressing gratitude to the youth of the nation, which has helped protect us during two world wars.

In previous generations youngsters had more work to do to keep them busy. In most families the girls had to help their mothers cook, clean, wash, iron and sew; the boys were required by their parents to chop firewood, care for domestic animals, cultivate gardens, and perform many other daily chores. In our modern mechanised era the children have been relieved of most of these chores. Some of them have been getting into trouble simply because they have had too much idle time on their hands. Consequently, if communities throughout the nation provided more wholesome recreational activities for their young people juvenile delinquency could be curtailed.

More support should be given to those civic leaders who in their activities serve the requirements of young people. More assistance should be given through various channels. The churches provide constructive recreational programmes for youths, and in that way they are playing their part. As a member of some of these organisations, I commend the various boys' clubs, the Y.M.C.A., the Police Boys' Club, the Boy Scouts, the Girl Guides, and other bodies for the part they are playing in the relief of this scourge. These and kindred organisations deserve much stronger financial backing.

The money we spend in supporting such fine crime-prevention agencies is trifling compared with what we spend on the control of crime. Several of the steps I have suggested for fighting juvenile delinquency require community action. Such reforms can be brought about by an aroused public opinion. If more law-abiding citizens in every community will demand greater efficiency in controlling juvenile crime, and more parents will display a greater appreciation of their responsibilities, we can greatly reduce such crime.

There is something that we not only can do but must do. The time has passed when we can afford to coddle youthful criminals or regard the menace which they represent as a temporary post-war phenomenon. I can sum it up in three ways. First of all we need the provision of harsher penalties to eliminate the scourge that has sprung up. Secondly, the police must be allowed to perform their duties unfettered and free from all influences. Unfortunately there seems to be an apathetic approach by some members of the Police Force. The Police Force does an excellent job in my area, even though we have received a great deal of adverse publicity about vandalism. No other city in the Commonwealth would be as well controlled and regulated by a mere handful of policemen as is Redcliffe. There is a group of people who come down from the city—the Inala Rockers or Shockers, whatever you call them, and others from the Sandeate area. They are bright youngsters, and they know where the weakness lies—in an inadequate Police Force. To protect the 33,500 law-abiding citizens in the area, apart from those who visit Redcliffe, we have only 14 policemen. I have the highest regard for our police officers, but we are trying to get gallons out of pint pots. The Redcliffe police are as efficient as those in any other part of the State, but there are not enough of them to carry out the necessary duties. Yesterday, I noticed that they have over 5,000 files to attend to, without criminal reports and so on. That gives some idea of the vastness of the book-work that must be performed by the police in that area. The volume of traffic has increased considerably and that alone warrants the establishment of a traffic department in the area.

Finally, I advance my suggestion for solving the problem of juvenile delinquency. I consider that the introduction of compulsory military training would do it. All hon. members must agree with me that compulsory military training provides discipline. The Leader of the Opposition, as an ex-serviceman, knows only too well that no organisation can survive without discipline. Even though he may not support compulsory military training, he must know in his mind, and in his heart, that discipline is necessary, and I am sure he agrees with me that compulsory military training would provide a cure because he realises that, even in his own home, there must be discipline. The sooner we get back to compulsory training,

and the sooner we instil discipline in the minds of these healthy young children, through compulsory training, the quicker will we provide a curb for the delinquency we are experiencing.

This problem is not associated only with boys. Some girls, too—admittedly they are in the minority—need someone to guide them on the right road so that they may become the future mothers, and useful citizens of the community. When I enter some of the public conveniences I am ashamed and horrified by the writings on the walls. They are bad enough in the men's section, but sometimes in the ladies' conveniences they are a darn sight worse. I am bewildered, amazed and dumbfounded about the thoughts and teachings of some of these people who write on the walls. It is bad enough for boys to do it, but it is alarming when females are associated with it. It gives cause for the greatest concern, and for the taking of remedial action by us all.

A great deal of publicity has been given to the city of Redcliffe for not doing anything to assist juvenile delinquents. Unfortunately the delinquents come from distant parts. If they lived in Redcliffe they could participate in all types of sport. The citizens of Redcliffe have acquitted themselves very well in the field of sport. We have international representatives in hockey, boxing and football, and we take great pride in that fact. In Redcliffe, every sport is available. There are marvellous swimming facilities. Every known avenue is available on the playing field for a person who wants to let his hair down, or to get rid of his surplus energy. Furthermore, Sunday entertainment is available. There is no need for these people to be delinquents; they can join any of these organisations that provide an outlet for their surplus energy, and at the same time encourage them to become good citizens. All these facilities are available to these boys and girls who will become the men and women and the parents of tomorrow.

We must face up to our responsibilities. I feel sure that if we give them the lead, perhaps the Government might give consideration to subsidising youth organisations throughout the State. I know the Treasurer never has enough money to meet all the State's needs but the Commonwealth can find ways and means for defence, and to make a man a soldier, so it should help to make him a good citizen by subsidising youth clubs, which do an excellent job for the welfare of the community. If you have good citizens, you have good cities, towns and everything else, because that is the basis of every-day living.

Mr. HERBERT (Sherwood) (4.46 p.m.): I want to use the time available to me in this debate to discuss sex education. Probably owing to our inborn prejudices, this is a matter that is often extremely difficult to discuss in polite society. I feel that it is a

pressing problem, which certainly warrants closer consideration and a lot more study than has been given to it.

I think I have some right to speak on the matter because for some time I have been State president of the Queensland branch of the Father and Son Welfare Movement of Australia. This is an interdenominational organisation specialising in sex instruction for adolescents. But before going into details of the organisation I should like to quote a small section from the editorial of the 12 October issue, just to hand, of the *Medical Journal of Australia*. This editorial gives us a considerable amount of food for thought. It says—

“This month the Federal Marriage Act becomes law. Like the uniform Divorce Act that was introduced earlier, its main aim is to stabilize marriage. The Divorce Act contained clauses that attempted reconciliation and encouraged the efforts of marriage guidance counsellors. Even those who doubted the wisdom of some changes agreed that uniformity of grounds for divorce and attempts to preserve marriage were welcome. The new Marriage Act is approved by clergy, marriage guidance counsellors and social workers as a measure that will prevent hasty marriages and restrain girls under 16 and boys under 18 years from entering into a marriage that must almost inevitably fail. Welcome as this law is, it can only restrain the immature in years and give others a little longer to think. There are many other important factors that affect the stability of marriage. Can any of these be influenced by laws? The N.S.W. Education Department is conducting an inquiry into sexual behaviour of teenage school children in schools, and, though the Minister says that these things have always happened parents are becoming increasingly aware that there has been a wide-spread deterioration in morals. In both South Australia and N.S.W. education authorities are asking if more sex education is the answer; and if so, how it can best be effected. The community is looking to schools to do a task that parents are failing to do, and many are asking anxiously if the extension of co-education is a good thing at a time when teenagers are more difficult to control than in the past, and the shortage of teachers is serious.”

The editorial continues much longer in a similar vein but the point is held in that section, and particularly the reference to co-educational schools.

In Queensland now, every child has a right to secondary education. Children who come from Roman Catholic families have a choice of educational systems; the rest of the community have no choice at all. The Roman Catholic church provides excellent segregated schools at the adolescent level but the remainder of the community have to accept education at a co-educational high school. In the metropolitan area this has most point.

I am not going to enter into a discussion on whether co-educational schools are better than segregated schools. There are educationists who will argue either way and you can work up an argument and still come to no conclusion at the end of an hour's debate; but there is no doubt that there is a division in the community. There are people in the community who would prefer to see their children go to segregated schools, and those people have very little opportunity. There are G.P.S. schools in the metropolitan area for boys and for girls, but they are now so heavily booked that it is impossible for families with children now at 7th Grade standard to enrol them at segregated schools for next year.

The only alternative is co-educational high schools, and I think that the time has come for the Department of Education to consider very carefully the provision at certain points in Brisbane of boys' high schools and girls' high schools for children of parents who believe in that type of education for their children. That could be done quite easily at a minimum of expense by taking over some of the primary schools in the inner city area that are at present under-used. With the extension of industrial activity, there are schools in inner areas with surplus rooms, and I think they could be used for this experiment to find out how many parents would be prepared to take advantage of it. I think that we might get a surprise at the response.

Whether or not that attitude is right or wrong is another matter, but there is no doubt that there are many parents who would like this choice of schools.

Mr. Davies: That is the position at Maryborough. It is the only one in Queensland.

Mr. HERBERT: The hon. member for Maryborough has far more practical experience in this through his own electorate than I have. He says that children in Maryborough are segregated at high-school level, but there is no similar opportunity for Brisbane people who feel that their children are in need of segregated education, unless they had the foresight to enrol them at a very early age at one of the few G.P.S. schools. I do not wish to discuss the pros and cons of the matter, but I put up the proposal as there are parents who would like it.

I wish to devote the rest of my time to a discussion of the Father and Son Welfare Movement. I should like to thank the Government for the subsidy of £1,000 a year now being paid to the movement for its work. Many people are still unaware of the details of it, what it does, and how it operates. It is controlled by a council composed of representatives of most of the major churches, doctors, psychologists, social workers, and other people in the community who have an interest in the problem.

We believe that the best way to provide sex education is not through ordinary lectures in school. If an adolescent is provided with the biological details, he is also probably provided with the urge to experiment, and I do not think that that is particularly desirable. The best system, of course, would be for every child to be told by his parents the facts in the right way, but the plain situation is that the ordinary parent does not himself know the facts, let alone be in a position to pass them on to his children.

The system adopted by our organisation, from which we get the name "Father and Son Movement", is to conduct segregated audiences of fathers with their sons and mothers with their daughters. They are given preliminary lectures and shown films. When the ice has been broken, the children are in a position to ask further questions later in their homes. It is particularly interesting to note that the parents often ask more questions than the children. It is, of course, the old story; an insufficiently-educated parent would pass insufficient knowledge to his children unless there were an organisation such as this one to step in and fill the gap.

To gain audiences, there are two avenues. One is by means of the churches or community groups, and the other is through school committees. We have had some remarkable results from our work with high-school committees. I should like to read a very short quotation from the annual report on the movement's operations last year. It was given by Lt. Col. George Garlick, who was the head of the Salvation Army in Queensland. Since his retirement from that position, he has done a remarkable job as field officer for the Father and Son Welfare Movement. He said—

"The past year has seen a definite increase in the Movement's work. Quite a number of spoken and written words of appreciation have been received for the illustrated lectures and the manner of their presentation. It is quite common for parents to ring up after a series of lectures in a certain district, expressing regret that they did not know about the lectures, and asking when and where the next series will take place.

"The following details give some idea of the year's progress in these presentations of film and lecture programmes for (1) Parents and Adults, (2) Parents and their boys or girls, also (3) for Teenage young people of both sexes. During the past year—51 centres in Brisbane and other districts have been visited; 207 audiences have been addressed, with an aggregate attendance of 17,355; centres visited have included Toowoomba, Ipswich, Boonah, Gympie, Caboolture, and northern centres as far as Mackay and Bowen.

"The support of Church and Education leaders has been most gratifying.

"In addition to lectures, some 31 Church Services have been conducted, with estimated attendances of over 1,600. Religious Instruction has been given in State Schools to over 1,100 pupils. Women's meetings, Rotary, Men's Societies and Youth Fellowships have been addressed.

"There is an ever-growing urgency for this work to widen in scope. As the Movement's wise, realistic approach in lectures to all ages is realised, both parents and the young people themselves appeal to us for instruction. The need for increased financial support is clamant if this vital Christian teaching about life is to be extended throughout the State."

As I say, that report was on last year's activities. Since then we have broken all attendance records, and the hon. member for Maryborough will recall that recently, in a three-day series of lectures in that city, we established an attendance record for a country town when we drew audiences of well over 1,000. The hon. member took the chair at one of the meetings, the mayor took the chair at another meeting, and there was a separate women's meeting. Our field officer is now in North Queensland visiting centres as far north as Cairns. This service has been made possible by money made available by the State to promote the work of the Movement.

In the segregated audiences we have fathers and sons separated into two divisions according to age, and similar lectures for mothers and daughters. Two other separate programmes are offered if sufficient people are interested in them. One is a parent's meeting. Very often it is held first so that the parents will realise just what is in store for their children. Many parents will not allow their children to attend lectures unless they know what is in store for them when they take the youngsters with them. Very often in country towns there is a final teenagers' night without the attendance of parents. We believe that the attendance of parents is vital because it is not possible to give children the whole story in one night and when the ice is broken they can ask questions to improve their knowledge as they develop. For parents who are not too sure of the facts themselves and for parents who want to give their children the correct instruction, we have a series of guide books graduated according to age. They cost only a couple of shillings and many of them are sold to parents who require them. In many cases parents do not attend lectures and use the books alone. That happens frequently in families in which their is either no father or no mother. If a friend or relation is not willing to take the children to one of the lectures, all the remaining parent can do is utilise the guide books. We find that this is an answer that very many people have been looking for.

It is not everyone who can do this work, and this is where we have extreme difficulty. In other States at the moment the Movement

is desperately looking for people who can do the work. The ordinary citizen will not listen to sex instruction unless it is given by a doctor or a minister of religion. We cannot afford to pay a doctor the sort of money that would be necessary for this sort of work. We had a voluntary system before we put on a field officer but it was not particularly successful because the medicos concerned had other demands upon their time. But now Colonel Garlick manages to fit in very well because of his clerical background.

But we still have some difficulty. People do not read very far into the material and do not realise that the title refers to the Salvation Army. I think difficulty often arises because people are frightened they will get a lecture from an ex-Indian Army officer, and wonder just what is in store for them. We have Colonel Garlick with us at the moment and when he decides to give up I do not know where we will get our next lecturer. That is a problem for the future, and it is one that faces the other States.

In New South Wales the Movement is in a much stronger position than here because it also handles marriage guidance and draws a Federal subsidy for that work. The handling of the Father and Son Welfare Movement, sex instruction, with marriage guidance, is under the one roof in New South Wales. Here they are two distinct organisations, although Mr. Fischer of the Marriage Guidance Council is also a councillor of our organisation and we work very closely together because there are certain aspects of the work of each organisation that cut across each other.

I urge every member of this Committee, if the Father and Son Welfare Movement is moving into his area, to take part in the meetings it holds. It is a great help to the organiser if he can have his series introduced by the local member of Parliament, because many people would be convinced that if the local member was satisfied with it, it would be a good thing to attend. That has happened in very many cases in the metropolitan area; we have had many members attend. In country areas we have also had considerable support.

Mr. Knox has been of invaluable help to the organisation and is at present vice-chairman. We are a little worried about the fact that we have a couple of members of Parliament in executive positions on the organisation, but it is extremely difficult to get people outside to accept responsibility in this field.

For many years we were extremely fortunate. Rev. Professor Peter, a well-known Presbyterian theologian, was the original president in Queensland, and he held the position for many years. Unfortunately for me, I was vice-president when he accepted the post of Director of Religious Programmes for the

A.B.C. in Sydney, and I was landed with the position of president without looking for it.

Since then I have become greatly interested in the extension of the work, which would not have been possible without Government subsidy. We charge an admission fee for the programmes to try to cover as much of our expenses as possible, but you cannot cover the expense of a field officer with a car and all the other facilities necessary with 2s. at the door. However, whether or not the money is at the door, our object is not to get the money from people coming to us, but to offer them assistance. Very often people with several children, particularly if they are attending high school, have to watch every penny and they are not able to support us financially.

Apart from the Government subsidy, we have a system of membership of the movement for interested people. It costs two guineas a year or ten guineas for life membership of the organisation. That brings in a certain amount of money from interested individuals. In addition, the Father's Day Council, which conducts the Father of the Year dinner, this year very generously made a donation of 50 guineas. Originally all its proceeds went to Legacy but it has offered us a share this year. That will be an important supplementary income that will help us in the work we have to do.

At the moment we have room in Queensland for additional field officers if we can afford to pay them or if we can find men who are capable of doing the work. The number of clerics who are prepared to handle this specialised work is extremely limited and it will probably happen that, when we have the money, we will have difficulty in finding the staff to take it on. Most of it is night work with a certain amount of office work during the day. Men taking it on have to be dedicated to it, a quality which is rare in this age. My purpose in having these remarks recorded in "Hansard" is that we still find many people who are not aware of what this movement does, or how it does it. Although the Department of Education has circularised all the schools so that it is known that the movement has complete Government backing, we still find head teachers who are suspicious. Very occasionally they will not co-operate even though they are satisfied that the movement has complete departmental authority to use school property and facilities.

When we are running a session in an area every child is given a letter to his parents a week or a fortnight beforehand so that they will have details of the project and what will be done when the meeting is held at the school. We have been astounded to find in some areas that so many people have attended that we have been unable to accommodate them. It is usual to find more fathers and sons attending than mothers and daughters. Very often we have been unable to cope with their numbers in the room that

has been allocated. There is a tremendous demand for this instruction. Quite frankly, the letters we have received from grateful parents over the last 12 months have amazed me. I did not realise how much this work was needed. I came into it after the Committee on Youth Problems in 1958. I was prompted to take an interest in this work by what I learned of the Father and Son Welfare Movement at that time. It was not until I got on the inside of the movement that I realised just how widespread sex ignorance is in the community. I feel that this organisation gives the answer. I would vehemently oppose the introduction into the schools of a system of sex education as part of the normal teaching. It is not normal teaching. If it cannot be done by parents it has to be done by specialists in the presence of parents. That is what this organisation sets out to do.

In that regard I have a few comments to make about our educational system, particularly the new one. An examination of the new system reveals that biological studies stop at the sexual reproduction of the frog. They do not go any further than the frog because I think the authorities are afraid to tell students about human bodies. Actually they deal with every detail of the human body other than the reproductive system. Possibly this concentrates the curiosity of students on the one section that is deleted from the new programme for secondary schools.

The fact that this movement is supported by church and educational authorities should be sufficient recognition of its worth. I invite any hon. member, or anyone else, who is interested in this subject to discuss the matter further with me, as I think it is the answer to many of the problems we face today.

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) (5.10 p.m.): Right from the first page of his Financial Statement the Treasurer deals with the State's finances. It is interesting to note that on this occasion he has adopted an entirely new way of presenting his Financial Statement in advancing reasons for the State's present financial position. On the first page the Treasurer makes an appeal on behalf of the Government. There is no question about it, the Government has dedicated itself. We hope that this dedication will overcome the problems that have been confronting the State during the past three years. As the number of children leaving school this year is greater than that of last year, it is to be hoped that some of the projects contained in the Financial Statement will be put into operation so that we may have a rosier picture for the children this year than we had in 1962-1963, when there were many unemployed people in the State. As the Opposition, we will be very pleased if the Government immediately introduces some of these schemes to relieve the problem. A number of the matters mentioned in the Treasurer's

summary are developmental works to be carried out by a continuation of the Loan allocation by the Government for 1963-1964. It is true that other schemes that are included could overcome the problems as the seasonal work falls off in particular industries. If these projects are put into operation we should have some security for the people of Queensland generally.

It is interesting to note that again we have been blessed with favourable seasons and people on the land have not had to contend with the problems of drought that have occurred in past years. More and more people on the land are using the assistance offered under the Farm Water Supplies Assistance Fund. I have spoken to people in farming areas about this scheme and they say that it assists them. However, they say there is one thing wrong with it, in that they are asked to start repaying the loans immediately without a breathing space to gain some benefit from the scheme. One knows from hire-purchase dealings that harsh and hard as those companies may be, they allow a month or six weeks to elapse before repayments commence. The Government should give some consideration to this suggestion for the benefit of the man on the land.

When one looks at the great work carried out by workers in building the Moogerah Dam and the Leslie Dam, one appreciates the very important part played by such dams in overcoming the problems created by drought. These dams contain huge volumes of water, and when the gates are opened a great deal of it courses down the streams to provide adequate water supplies for the farms along them.

This Government believes in conciliation and arbitration and has accepted the 10 per cent. marginal increase granted by the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and the principle of three weeks' annual leave. In past Financial Statements presented by the Treasurer we have found that usually, while the Government may have accepted such matters, it has used them to cover up a financial deficit. On this occasion we notice that the Government has accepted the marginal increases and the three weeks' annual leave, and has gone even further in the summary by making provision for increased salaries and wages for its employees. While it has accepted these things, let me point out that sometimes workers in the physical field miss out when agreements are reached with Governments for increased wages and amenities for other classes of workers.

It is interesting to note in the Financial Statement an indication from the Treasurer that the benefits to be derived from the finding of oil in Queensland will not be felt until close to the last few months of this financial year. Whatever the Government has in mind, this source of revenue will not be available to

it immediately so it is to be hoped that it has some other source in mind for the money to carry out developmental works.

The Treasurer indicates in the Financial Statement that it is the intention of the Government to increase the exemption from succession duty but I suggest the matter warrants further consideration. On today's costs the average block of land, dwelling and necessary furniture can run into £4,000 or £5,000. The way it reads to me, there may be some intention to increase the figure further and, if that is done, it may meet the situation; but what concerns me is the position of the public servant in Queensland who has paid into a superannuation fund. Today we find many people retiring after 20, 30 or 35 years of service to the State and after paying into superannuation funds ever since their introduction. I had a particular case drawn to my attention illustrating what could happen under the old system and it may have some bearing on the present system. People are good enough to pay into superannuation funds to provide protection for themselves in their retirement, or for their widows, and they die shortly after retirement. In other cases people pay for years and die shortly after retirement—not only the person who has paid into the superannuation fund but his widow also. A man could have £2,500 in a superannuation fund. Add to that his own estimate of the value of the estate, making a total of about £6,600. Succession duty, charged at 5½ per cent. on £4,200, would be about £228. Another £9 would be payable for probate duty. It goes to show what amounts can be paid out when persons have contributed considerable amounts to assist themselves and their wives on retirement. A study of the tables shows that in 1957-1958 succession duties amounted to £3,138,006, which amount increased to £4,861,423 in 1962-1963, representing an increase of £1,750,000.

Whilst I know that the Treasurer is endeavouring to tackle the problem on an overall basis as it affects everybody generally, I ask him to give some consideration to the particular problems of those who have been paying into superannuation funds. After they have made their services available to the State over a number of years, this has a very serious effect on contributors or their widows. I am aware that the Treasurer intends to cover certain aspects of this matter as outlined in the Financial Statement, and I feel that thought should be given to this aspect when the whole question is being considered. What he has in mind in relation to the superannuation fund, I do not know, but this is something that will have to be looked at by the Government in the near future. It seems that certain approaches have been made in some quarters on this subject, and I bring the matter before the Treasurer to see if something can be done.

Mr. Walsh: Do you think that that should be done before the big landholders are relieved of land tax?

Mr. NEWTON: Yes. I think that this is something that should be considered immediately. The information available to me shows that it is having a serious effect in cases brought to my notice.

On the subject of housing, I feel that the contributions of the hon. members for Warrego and Gregory deserve some consideration, particularly their references to the providing of homes for our aged citizens. It is true that every time this subject is introduced it is said, "The Commonwealth Government is subsidising church organisations in making homes available for these people."

Mr. Walsh: State Labour Governments were doing that long before the Commonwealth Government did it.

Mr. NEWTON: I am fully aware of that. It is true, however, that there are people who are never happy in an institution of any kind, whether it be charitable, Government-run, or otherwise. Since being elected to this Parliament, I have found that this matter is being raised constantly with me. It is true that the Queensland Housing Commission did have a scheme for the provision of one-bedroom maisonettes, which provided our senior citizens with yards and all that they required. Unfortunately, changes are made under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement each time it comes up for renewal, and eventually this work was abolished.

Mr. Hiley: It has not been.

Mr. NEWTON: The Treasurer says that it has not been. Probably they are being built at Inala. I do not know.

Mr. Hiley: We are building one-bedroom flats, and plenty of them.

Mr. NEWTON: It is true that one-bedroom flats are being provided. I know that the Treasurer has only recently vacated the Housing portfolio, but I raise it because he will be fully aware of what I am going to say. Members of the Opposition do not know what role the Treasurer will play in the field of housing in future. It is possible that when housing or housing loan conferences are convened both the Minister for Works and Housing and the Treasurer will attend them.

As I said, it is true that flats are being provided. But where both the husband and wife are pensioners, they find difficulty in making ends meet, firstly because of the rent that they have to pay—in some cases it is in the £4 or £5 a week bracket—and secondly because of the cost of gas and electric light. I know that our hands are tied because we have not the rental rebate system that applied under the 1946-1956 agreement, and I agree that it is better to have these people occupying one-bedroom units than two or three-bedroom units, which could be better occupied by people with children.

Another problem was mentioned during the Address-in-Reply debate; it was also referred to by the hon. member for Gregory in this debate, and I believe that it is very important. I noticed that in the Financial Statement the Treasurer indicated what he intended doing to improve sub-standard accommodation in country areas. As I have said on many occasions in this Chamber, I do not believe that we have overcome the problem of sub-standard accommodation in the Brisbane metropolitan area, particularly in the outer suburbs. I have here an article that appeared in a recent edition of "Sunday Truth". It relates to a particular place in my electorate of which I spoke in this Chamber and drew to the attention of the Minister for Justice when legislation to lift rent control was under consideration. Nothing was done about it at the time—incidentally, it is the worst example of sub-standard accommodation I have ever seen—and the rent was raised from £5 to £7 10s. a week. I know that there are a number of instances in the metropolitan area, because I have been approached by many people who have been told by building inspectors of the Brisbane City Council that they have to do something about the dwelling on their piece of land. Of course, they do not expect merely to race in and get a Housing Commission house. They endeavour first to raise finance to enable them to build a house on the land. In some cases, because of their age, it is not possible for them to get a loan to replace a sub-standard dwelling, and the Government then has to provide a Housing Commission house if it can. I believe that we should give further consideration to this matter.

As the Treasurer no longer controls housing, I should like to say how much I have appreciated the time, assistance and co-operation that he has given me on the matters that I have raised with him. My last interview with him lasted about an hour, and the reply that I received from him, which dealt with many problems, has assisted me greatly as the representative of the Belmont electorate. It has made it easy for me to explain to people living in Housing Commission areas in my electorate the actual position as laid down by the Minister.

I do not intend to deal with a great number of matters because I shall have an opportunity to do so when we are discussing the Estimates; but before I leave the subject of housing I want to clear up a point connected with a question that I asked the other day. It dealt with the engagement of more drainers by the Housing Commission to carry out work connected with bailer sumps and absorption trenches. It is true that the Treasurer replied but he got away from the subject and on to the subject of earth drains in the Broadwater Estate project. It is also true that these matters are not always raised with the Treasurer or the Commissioner. Immediately problems dealing with bailer sumps and absorption trenches are brought to my notice they are taken up with

officers of the department. However, there would not be any record of such approaches as it is usually done by means of a phone call.

The type of soil in the project and the number of houses involved cause this problem to arise continually. I say honestly and sincerely that if it was not for the assistance presently given us by the Brisbane City Council, which is giving us the go-ahead to hook directly into storm water drains, this would be a very serious problem.

The reason I raise the matter is that, particularly in the Carina and Mt. Gravatt projects, the problem is caused by the nature of the soil. We know quite well that one does not have to go far down before striking rock or clay. Thus an absorption trench is useless and will not do what is required of it with the waste water from the houses. I want to make it quite clear that that was my reason for raising the matter.

The other point that I thought should be given some consideration—and I hope it will be—is that from time to time I have raised the matter of providing houses for workers close to their places of employment. I am very concerned about the industrial area around Hemmant. It may be in the electorate of the hon. member for Wynnum, whose electorate adjoins mine, but I have been endeavouring for some time to get further State rental homes in that area, particularly for people working at the abattoir, the powerhouses, the bacon factories, and in other industrial development that has taken place in the area.

I have raised this matter on a number of occasions because these people are not working from 8 in the morning till 5 in the evening. In the main they are shift workers, and as such they must live close to reliable transport. In the Wynnum-Manly area there is reliable transport in the form of the train and bus services which allow these people to get to their places of employment for the various shifts.

I should like now to deal with the provision for education in the Financial Statement. The problem the Government faces in providing the secondary schools that are required as a result of the change in syllabus that is to come into force with the start of the 1964 school year is quite clear to each and every one of us; but I am wondering whether we are safe in concentrating on one particular aspect of our education system, in view of the number of children who are today either starting school or passing from primary to secondary schools. As far as the Belmont electorate is concerned, I know this is a step in the wrong direction. In his Financial Statement the Treasurer says—

“The concentration by the Department on the provision of Secondary accommodation will not, however, be at the expense of Primary education as additional classrooms will be made available in those areas which are developing rapidly.”

Although that is contained in the Treasurer's report on behalf of the Government, that is not the position at all. Prior to Christmas in most cases when the Department of Education was asked about the provision of additional classrooms, health services rooms, storerooms or other additions necessary at primary schools, the reply from the department was that they were sorry that what was asked for could not be provided in 1963-1964 but would be considered again in the 1964-1965 financial year. We could get further and further behind in the provision of additional classrooms required at primary schools. I fully realise the need for more secondary schools and we must not forget the contribution of the hon. member for Bulimba, who drew attention to the importance of the further development of technical education to keep pace with the new syllabus in secondary schools.

The Treasurer makes an appeal on the first page of his Financial Statement but it must be remembered that with the changing of the syllabus parents will be making their contribution under the new scheme. With the new system, as a family man, I will have two children attending high school next year. Although they will be attending a State high school I will have to meet heavy costs for uniforms, textbooks, and fares to and from school. In many instances parents will need to provide bicycles for their children. In that regard we appreciate the check that is made by police officers on bicycles ridden by students so that they can bring any defects to the notice of parents. To send a child even to a State secondary school costs me about £100 a year. With the 7th and 8th grades proceeding to high school next year, this is a matter that must be given some consideration. I realise that it has been taken into consideration to a certain extent because I received from the Minister for Education a circular in which he pointed out that additional scholarships would be granted. Again, of course, that benefits only the person on or near the basic wage. I should say that any book giving census figures would show that 65 per cent. or 70 per cent. of the people would be on an income of about £16 a week. There are some in the £20 a week bracket but they are only the top-grade tradesmen.

We must take into consideration the burden that parents will have to bear with the changed system next year. I fully appreciate the difficulties that will have to be faced by many families in all electorates. It is about time that we had a five-year plan for the changing of syllabuses in our education system, whether in the primary, secondary or technical field. Since 1956 there have been several syllabus changes in the various fields. In many homes that I visit in my electorate I have seen heaps and heaps of books that have become obsolete and useless each year instead of being handed down from one child to another. That imposes a terrific burden on the parents. The syllabuses should be so regulated that books

may be passed from one child to another in a family. While it may not be possible to hand down all the books in secondary, commercial, academic and industrial education, it should be possible to hand down certain books. This would partly relieve the terrific expense incurred by parents because of changing syllabuses.

Mr. Harrison: They may be handed down if they are the right books.

Mr. NEWTON: I have already said that they may be handed down if they are the right books, but, because of the continual changes being made many books cannot be handed down because new ones are taking their places.

I have stated time and time again, and I do so now, that an approach should be made to the Commonwealth Government by the various States on the subject of education. Only recently I received a letter from the Parents and Citizens' Association informing me that they were convening a combined meeting of State school organisations to add support to the Queensland Council of State Schools Organisation in its endeavour to gain Federal financial aid for primary, secondary and technical education in this State. They pointed out that they believe these meetings ought to be held because the Commonwealth Government should face up to its responsibility for education.

While one hon. member opposite has said that we are possibly asking the Federal Government for too much financial aid on certain aspects—and I probably could agree with him on some things. I believe that on the subject of education, the Commonwealth Government has a responsibility to the States and should convene a meeting of the State Ministers for Education to look into the matter and see if it can agree to make grants available, such as for housing and other purposes, to assist to combat this problem. It is not only a problem of today; it will assume major importance in the years to come. One has only to study the Queensland Year Book to realise the number of children in the various age groups who are coming forward, and to learn just how much must be done in the field of education if we are to meet the requirements of today and the future.

Mr. Campbell: Do you suggest that the Commonwealth should take over the responsibility?

Mr. NEWTON: No, I do not suggest that at all, but I do suggest that we might work out a scheme similar to the other Commonwealth-State agreements under which the Commonwealth provides a certain sum of money direct for a particular department. The State body deals initially with the finance made available possibly with a view to arriving at what the hon. member has suggested. I have made that statement here previously. That is my view. I believe that the present system is wrong.

Only recently some relatives of mine came up from Sydney and they explained to me the system of schooling down there. It is entirely different from ours. As we have been a nation for so long, it is difficult to understand why some move has not been made by State Governments towards a uniform educational standard throughout the Commonwealth. If there were, we should have no worry with children travelling from one State to another. It goes even further. The same should hold for technical education. We strike trouble in the craft unions, when we get onto diploma sections, with certificates issued in the southern States just as Queenslanders going south have with their certificates issued here. Some certificates issued in other States are considered to be of a higher standard than ours. That is wrong; we should have a uniform standard throughout the nation.

It is interesting to note that further hospitals are to be built throughout the State. Again I am concerned at a number of matters affecting the health and welfare of the people and organisations that are doing something to help. In this regard, firstly I thought more provision might have been made in the Budget for the ambulance by increasing the Government subsidy by at least 5s. Last year we conducted, with Government support, a door-knock appeal for the ambulance. I took part in it. I was not always able to get new subscribers though in most cases I was able to get small donations. I point out, however, that the subscriber to the Wynnum Ambulance Centre—and I am one—has to pay £2 a year. The door-knock appeal had television support and the subscription advertised for the metropolitan area was possibly one the centre can just manage to operate on. But it is different in Wynnum. One would think the position must be serious when the Government feels it necessary to do something about a week-end drive.

Mr. Hughes: The Government didn't feel that at all. We on the committee felt it.

Mr. NEWTON: If the hon. member on the committee felt that way, he made sure that he got in touch with every member of this Assembly to see what he could do for the drive. Let us put it quite clear that way.

However, many of the difficulties could be overcome if we had more hospitals near the outer areas of Brisbane. I have spoken before of the importance of a hospital for Wynnum and surrounding districts. To date we have not managed to get one. Such a hospital would mean a considerable saving to the Wynnum Ambulance Centre. Under the present system—and I know this to be a fact because I have a letter that was received by us within the last few days—an endeavour is being made to have people returned home as quickly as possible after undergoing a major operation or receiving other treatment in the hospital instead of

having them stay in hospital for further treatment. This places a great burden on the ambulance brigades in these centres, because they are transporting people backward and forward each day for treatment. I know for a fact that in the Wynnum area alone two ambulance vehicles leave each morning with people sitting up but who are unable to travel by bus. They are transported by ambulance for treatment at the Princess Alexandra Hospital or the Brisbane General Hospital. The same thing applies each afternoon.

Recently I had some experience with the Princess Alexandra Hospital because my lad was unfortunate enough to get involved in an accident. Whilst there I saw these ambulances arrive in the morning. After X-rays had been taken, or dressings or whatever was required attended to, the patients were moved to a certain section marked "Ambulance Transport Patients Here". There they lay on stretchers or sat in wheel-chairs waiting for ambulance transport back to their areas.

If this new scheme of turning patients out quicker is to be introduced, I feel that the Government has some responsibility in the matter. This applies not only to adults; according to the letter that I have, it applies also to children. A greater burden will be placed on ambulance brigades in all centres of the State, and I feel that some consideration should have been given to this matter in the Budget.

Another thing that I think would greatly assist hospital services is the extension of clinics to the outer parts of the metropolitan area. We understand that something is on the way for the electorate of the hon. member for Salisbury—

Mr. Sherrington: Because of good representation.

Mr. NEWTON: Because of good representation, as the hon. member says. We hope that that comes to fruition, because anyone knowing the distance from Inala to the General Hospital or the Princess Alexandra Hospital will realise that it will overcome many of the problems of people living in that area. I raised this matter with the Minister for Health during the last term of Parliament, and he said that this area would receive consideration along with others on the outer perimeter of the metropolitan area. Although that was the Minister's reply, no progress has been made. Again I draw the attention of the Government to the importance of establishing clinics in outer areas, particularly Mt. Gravatt and Carina, to serve quite a number of electorates adjacent to those districts.

I have also been wondering for some time why the Government has not done something to increase facilities at the Princess Alexandra Hospital for the treatment of children by establishing a children's hospital in the same grounds. I feel that this would greatly reduce the problem of transporting children

to hospital and would at the same time provide on the south side of the city facilities equal to those available on the north side. The Children's Hospital now caters for the whole of the metropolitan area.

I am sure that if the Australian Labour Party had remained in office plans for these things would have been well under way. We realise the importance of providing free hospital services throughout the State, and we would have taken all of these things into consideration. I also feel that the provision of a maternity hospital in the same area should have been considered. This would provide for people on the south side the hospital facilities now available on the north side and would overcome many of the difficulties at present facing people in the metropolitan area.

If a maternity hospital and a children's hospital were established there, there would be no problem of direct transport from out-lying areas. If the Government cannot provide an immediate extension of outpatients' clinics in outer areas, the provision of these facilities would overcome most of the problems now confronting people in the various electorates on the southern side of the river.

In discussing the extension of our system of free hospitals in Queensland, it is interesting to note that many building-trade workers at the South Brisbane Auxiliary Hospital are faced with dismissal. In fact, a number of painters were dismissed from the project on Friday last. This is of great concern to members of the Opposition because, apart from the provision of maternity and children's hospitals at South Brisbane, wards are also required to enable aged people to receive treatment for various complaints, and a reply given by the Minister for Health to a question asked in the Chamber indicated that two such wards are to be built at the Princess Alexandra Hospital. We are alarmed when dismissals take place because we wonder whether these plans will be carried out.

Mr. Sherrington: It could be a move to get rid of day labour.

Mr. NEWTON: I say again that I hope it is not. Day-labour employees have played a very important part in the construction of hospitals, particularly in the metropolitan area, and have done a splendid job. Places such as Beaudesert and Wynnum come under the jurisdiction of the South Brisbane Hospitals Board, and day-labour employees are not worried about having to travel to those places because they know that they are doing a service to the community by providing hospital facilities. They have proved over a period of years that they can carry out the projects at a price that enables an amount over and above the estimated cost to be returned to a pool. This is very important where contracts for hospitals, Housing Commission houses or public works are being undertaken by day labour, because any funds

returned to the pool can be used to provide other amenities for the people of Queensland.

The Financial Statement also mentions that a number of new police stations are to be built by the Government in various parts of the State. After listening to the speech of the hon. member for Redcliffe, I believe that new police stations are needed in the metropolitan area, and a new police station in the Belmont electorate, for which I have made representations, is long overdue. However, the Minister in charge of police has indicated, after consulting with the Commissioner of Police, that it is not warranted at this stage. As I pointed out, during the term of the last Parliament, between 1960 and 1963, I raised with the Minister in charge of police the question of having created a new police district in the Belmont electorate. At present there is no police station in the electorate. In my representations I pointed out that I considered the distances to the police stations at Camp Hill, Holland Park, Morningside, Wynnum, and Cleveland to be far too great to provide the service necessary to ensure the safety of the community, and to deal with the many problems that occur in my electorate.

During the term of the last Parliament a sub-inspector in the South Coast police district carried out an investigation of this matter and my views were sought. At that time consideration was being given to the creation of a new police district with a police station situated in Creek Road, Carina. Had that plan been carried out, I feel it would have given us the required service between the Camp Hill police district and the Cleveland police district and would have catered for the area where there is, so to speak, a missing link.

I have again raised this matter with the Minister in charge of police during the term of the present Parliament, and I have received a final decision to the effect that the position has been exhaustively examined and that the Commissioner felt that it was not necessary to create a new police district or to provide a police station in the Belmont electorate. He thought that the position could be quite adequately met by making sure that the adjacent stations were appropriately staffed.

The policy of the Government seems to be that there is need for a new police station in the Upper Mount Gravatt portion of the Belmont and Mount Gravatt electorates, but I feel that a similar position exists in the area between the Camp Hill police station and the Cleveland police station. A new police station is required in this area.

The Government's present policy is to maintain mobile patrols in these particular areas but in an area such as the Belmont electorate, which contains built-up areas and areas that are not built-up and where patrol cars have to travel from one area to another, the position would be satisfactory if enough

patrol cars were stationed at adjoining stations, or in the police districts covering the areas concerned; but under the system at present operating, with these mobile patrols trying to keep order in the community, particularly amongst young people, and to prevent damage to property, they are too sparse to provide efficient cover for the areas. The Belmont electorate contains a number of main highways out of the city with minor highways linking them and it is often found that when an accident occurs on these highways and the police station is telephoned, it is not always easy to get a patrol car to the spot immediately. I feel that if a police station was established in the Belmont area and a man was on duty all the time, when these accidents occurred there would at least be someone there to contact the patrol car and inform its occupants that an accident had occurred. The mobile patrol could then make whatever investigations were necessary.

Recently the people of the Belmont district witnessed the laying of the Moonie pipeline through that area. Their thoughts were that had the pipeline been a water line it would have made them very happy. Following my representations during the last session of Parliament it is true that we have been provided with a very up-to-date primary school in the Belmont district, but even with the catchment area provided by the big building we still have to purchase water for children attending the school, which is only eight miles from the G.P.O. I raise this matter again tonight. Negotiations have been going on between the Department of Education and the Brisbane City Council. It would appear that no large sum of money is involved. When Cabinet met in Maryborough the Treasurer spoke about the return to the Government in oil royalties. If it cannot be done earlier, I hope that some of the money returned to the Government in oil royalties can be used to provide water to this school. It is a growing school in the metropolitan area and it is not only for drinking purposes that water is important. It is hoped that in the near future we will get new toilet blocks, and if the town water supply has been connected a septic system can be installed. In this way the children will have an added safeguard in the event of a hepatitis outbreak in the metropolitan area in the summer months. All I am asking is that they be given the same amenities as are available at other primary schools in the metropolitan area.

Hon. G. W. W. CHALK (Lockyer—Minister for Transport) (7.23 p.m.): It had not been my intention earlier in the debate to enter into deliberations on the Budget. As most hon. members are aware, the Railway Estimates will be introduced following the present debate and we will occupy probably three days in discussing the ramifications of the Railway Department. However, statements have been made by hon. members opposite which, I believe, call for a reply at this time. Because of that, rather

than take up time allocated to debating the Estimates of the Railway Department and the Department of Transport, which are very vital and important departments to the Government, I choose now to enter into discussion on three or four matters that have been raised earlier in this debate.

I propose to deal first with that portion of the debate introduced by the hon. member for Ipswich East, who expressed surprise at what he termed "the undemocratic action of the Government in depriving Crown employees of the right to serve on local-government bodies." In fact the hon. member went on to say—

"This action stays the Government for what it is, namely, a very undemocratic administration."

He then continued—

"In spite of the protestations of its members that they believe in democracy and that they are scrupulously fair, is it the first step towards eliminating the adult franchise in local-authority elections and towards re-introducing the property franchise that prevailed before the Labour Party became the Government in this State?"

This subject has also been the basis for a newspaper attack on the Government. I admit quite candidly that, in the last week or so, I have received numerous protests from certain unions because of this decision.

Mr. Davies: Has the Minister read "The Maryborough Chronicle"?

Mr. CHALK: If the hon. member will listen he will hear.

Let us analyse this decision: firstly, it is true that the greatest number of Crown employees involved are railwaymen. It is therefore reasonable, I suppose, to expect that the principal attack upon the Government for this alleged undemocratic action should be aimed at my department and I do not shirk from the responsibility of replying. However, let me make it clear to this Chamber, and to the people of Queensland, that this decision was a Cabinet decision—a Cabinet decision to enforce the regulations laid down within the Public Service and the Railway Department—by a Labour Government. And let me make it clear that it applies to all Crown employees whether they be members of the Public Service or the Railway Department.

Mr. Lloyd: Do not mislead the public.

Mr. CHALK: Let us examine how and when it was introduced. Let us see how Labour brought it in and how it administered it. Perhaps then the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who so positively interjects, the hon. member for Ipswich East, other Opposition members and the unions, who are hailing this as so much regrettable interference with the freedom of the individual, might hang their heads in shame. They

would do so if they are genuine in their present outcry. Let us see exactly how it came about and how Labour implemented it.

Actually, the history dates back to 1946 when the late Mr. McCracken, the then Public Service Commissioner dealt with the question of the candidature of officers of the Public Service for municipal elections. He stated in a memorandum to the Director-General of Education—

"That, since 1939, permission to accept nomination had not been recommended by me but in some instances . . ."

and this is in 1946—

". . . departmental approval, without reference to this department, had been given to officers to accept such nominations."

Mr. Lloyd: What has that to do with it?

Mr. CHALK: I know the hon. member is terribly impetuous, but I ask him to listen.

That statement by Mr. McCracken was submitted to the Labour Party Cabinet, and its decision in 1946 was to the effect that the Public Service Commissioner's wishes were to be complied with. Between 1946 and 1957, when this Government came to office, there are records of at least 20 high-ranking public servants, capable men who could administer the affairs of local authorities, being given written refusals by the Labour Government.

Mr. Houston: Name them!

Mr. CHALK: I can name them. These refusals involved labour agents, school teachers, land rangers, clerks, Agricultural Bank inspectors and Main Roads officers, and involved—and let us publish this—the following municipalities and shire councils—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member for Hawthorne that cross-firing in the Chamber is not permitted and I ask him to refrain from it. I also warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that his interjections are becoming too persistent and will not be tolerated.

Mr. Lloyd: What do you mean by that?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I repeat my warning to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. CHALK: I proceed to point out to the Committee that the 20 refusals, which are recorded in the files of the various departments of the State, included men who wanted to be on the following municipalities or local authorities: Southport, Mundubbera, Cairns, Hinchinbrook, Springsure, Quilpie, Townsville, Aramac, Toowoomba, Johnstone, Cleveland, Banana, Bundaberg, Stanthorpe, Etheridge and Cook. Those men were refused by a Labour Government the right to take their places in local authorities of the State, and yet we have howls from the other side that we are implementing an undemocratic policy.

Let us go a little further. There were, as always with Labour policy, one or two intrigues within the decision itself because a mere handful of members of the Public Service (four, in fact) were able, either for political favours or otherwise, to get permission from the Labour Party—from the Cabinet in three instances and from the the Treasurer in one; I mean Mr. Larcombe when he was Treasurer. Those four men were able to circumvent this decision of the Labour Party, but what of the other rank and file? Did they get an opportunity? The first of the four men so privileged was Mr. C. E. J. Richards of the Toowoomba Mental Hospital. He received Cabinet permission to be on the Toowoomba City Council. Mr. B. Creedy, who was an officer of the State Government Insurance Office, Cairns, also got special Cabinet permission. Mr. J. A. Sherriff, an inspector of the State Government Insurance Office at the time in Townsville, got permission from the Treasurer of the day, at that time Mr. Larcombe, to accept such a position. The last was Mr. J. J. O'Brien, Secretary of the Hospitals Board, Warwick. He also got the rubber stamp of the Cabinet in 1952.

Mr. Davies: How many railwaymen?

Mr. CHALK: If the hon. member for Maryborough will be patient he will hear all about railwaymen, too.

On 20 May, 1950, still under a Labour Government—this party that protests so much at the present moment about this alleged undemocratic action—a deputation from the Queensland Teachers' Union waited on the then Minister for Public Instruction, the late Mr. Devries. They asked for the abolition of the Public Service regulation restricting officers nominating for municipal elections.

This deputation waited on Mr. Devries and he also took the matter to Cabinet. On 17 October, 1950, with Cabinet confirmation, Mr. Devries advised the union that their request was not approved. Again there was confirmation of this alleged undemocratic action. Who gave birth to this alleged ugly duckling of which we hear so much from the Labour Party at the moment? Who mothered it from 1946 to 1957, from what might be described as birth to teenage? It was none other than the party sitting in Opposition at present and who are so loudly condemning it. If hon. members opposite had continued to be the Government of the day, they would have brought their child to full manhood.

Let us now go back and deal with the position in the Railway Department. As far back as 1939 the then Minister for Transport, Mr. Larcombe, advised Labour stalwart Mr. T. L. Williams that Station Master W. Andrews at Rosedale must comply with the decision of Cabinet if he continued as chairman for the balance of the term of his council.

On 26 October, 1939, Rule 31 of the book of rules, by-law 308 of the Railway By-laws, was amended to provide—

“Every employee heretofore or hereafter elected to, or holding the position or office of mayor of a city, mayor of a town, or chairman of a shire council, shall forthwith upon his election thereafter to any such position or office apply for and obtain leave of absence without pay from the Commissioner for the full term of his occupancy of such position.”

In other words, if an employee became the mayor of a city, he was given some protection. If he applied to the Commissioner and was granted full leave, he could carry out his duties as mayor for the time in which he was in office, and then return to the department.

Mr. Baxter: What was the date of that?

Mr. CHALK: That was 1939. The set of circumstances as written down by the Public Service Commissioner and endorsed by the Labour Cabinet continued onwards and until 1949 the position apparently remained the same within the Railway Department. Then there was some alteration. That alteration was first brought about on 14th October, 1949, when the then Minister granted approval for leave of absence to attend harbour board meetings to a driver named Weldon, of Bowen. That was the first recorded break-through in 12 years in the Railway Department. On 24 October, 1951, departmental approval was given for leave without pay to attend harbour board meetings for a wagon builder named Malone, also at Bowen. That position continued, but in 1952 the present Leader of the Opposition, who was then Minister for Transport, decided to go the whole hog and deleted what was then sub-paragraph (b) of Railway Regulation or Rule 31. He took that out and cast the onus of making future decisions onto the Commissioner for Railways, but at the same time applied the rule of Cabinet and took away, if so desired, what might be termed the rights of the Commissioner.

As I see it, the whole situation is that certain members of Parliament and union officers are raising this issue in an endeavour to condemn the Government for a certain line of action that it has taken at the request of many members of the Public Service and many members of the Railway Department. On the one hand, we have men who are engaged for 40 hours a week on a fixed-time basis—9-to-5 men, or whatever one might like to call them. They are in the Public Service; they are in the Railway Department. As the rule has been applied by the Government between 1957 and the present day, we have taken what might be called a reasonable, lenient approach and many railway employees have, because of that action, been elected to local authorities.

What is happening today, however, and what is causing consternation among Crown employees, is that some are getting the plums and others are getting the crows.

Mr. Houston: Which union complained?

Mr. CHALK: I will present my case in my own way. I did not say that a union had complained. I said that members of the Public Service and members of the Railway Department had complained. The situation is this: if we apply what has been more or less the rule since the Government came into power, we will give a clerk or some other 9-to-5 employee of that type time off without pay. Admittedly, as a member of a local authority he will receive three or four guineas a day, a fee to which he is justly entitled, and nobody decries that. But what is the position of roster employees in the same department? We have evidence showing that time and again they have requested their roster clerk to so arrange their roster that they can get their 40 hours a week in and have their time off at a time that will enable them to attend local-authority meetings and so get an extra three or four guineas a day, plus inspection and mileage fees, a right that is denied to other Crown employees working a 40-hour week. Do not hon. members think that brings the "crabs" within the department—I will use the slang term—

Mr. Davies: In what centres has this happened?

Mr. CHALK: The point of the matter is that we have clerks working in certain offices who are engaged in local government and who are denied payment for their day off to attend meetings while the same clerks are being asked by employees on roster to arrange the roster so that they can attend meetings during their time off. But it goes even deeper than that.

Mr. Lloyd: Don't they work only so many hours a week? They work to the roster.

Mr. CHALK: They work to the roster, and we are not denying that. But are you going to upset the working position of two men so that one gets the benefit of it and one does not?

Let us analyse the position a little further. It goes deeper than that. There is also the position of the roster man who is rostered for local-authority work, having his roster so arranged that he works within close proximity to his depot; on the other hand the man who is not on the council has to accept the long-distance working roster and therefore finds himself away from home on many evenings so that the other man can attend local-authority meetings.

That is one of the reasons why this matter has been brought forward and why there is unrest amongst many men within the department. The Government has therefore approached the matter on the basis that we do not deny any railway or Crown employee

the right to take part in local government if he so desires, provided it is so arranged that his activities in that direction are outside his normal working time.

Let us make it quite clear to the public generally that we will encourage men to do that, but we are not going to have a set of circumstances under which men are working side by side, one rostered off to suit his requirements and getting in addition three, four, or five guineas a week, while the other man loses his whole day's pay. All that the Government has done is to make this fact quite clear.

Mr. Lloyd: Why did you re-word the regulation to give it rigid application when they would not be able to do it?

Mr. CHALK: The actual wording of the regulation was to make it applicable so that there would not be any misunderstanding of the Government's desires. So far as that is concerned, I can cite one or two cases that occurred in Labour's time. There was the case of a staff clerk in Townsville who was told by the Labour Government administrator that he had to make up his mind; he either had to be a member of the railway staff or follow his calling as an alderman. Admittedly he chose to be an alderman. The hon. member for Townsville South is not here tonight. One could not embarrass him, but I know that both he and a man named Illich joined the Townsville City Council and they so arranged their rosters—the hon. member for Townsville South does not deny it—so that they got all the short running out of Townsville while other employees had the Charters Towers and Hughenden runs.

Mr. Houston: Would you disagree with that being in operation today?

Mr. CHALK: I am disagreeing with the re-rostering of an employee so that he can take the benefit of it, and that is exactly what we have set out to prevent.

Having said that, I hope I have cleared the air in the eyes of the public, if not in the eyes of hon. members opposite, and that I have shown the reason for the present position. We are only following a policy that was laid down, but it is being rigidly applied so that we can ensure that all men are treated fairly.

Mr. Marsden: What about the Ipswich workshops? There is no rostering there.

Mr. CHALK: That is quite true, but previously if a member of the local authority was on the Ipswich workshops staff, he could get the time off and it was deducted from his pay. He in turn drew his allowance from the Ipswich City Council. On the other hand a man who was an engine-driver in Ipswich could so arrange his roster with the approval of the roster clerk or someone else so that he got his 40 hours a week and was still able to attend local authority

activities and draw his extra £3, and sometimes £6, a week in expenses. In his interjection the hon. member for Ipswich West is bringing in one of the very things that have been the reasons for this decision. Some of the protests have come from within the Ipswich workshops.

Mr. Lloyd: There is not one engine-driver on the Ipswich City Council.

Mr. CHALK: I did not say there was.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. CHALK: However, have a look at those who have now nominated for the council.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind hon. members on my left that they have an opportunity to speak in this debate. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has already spoken. I ask them to refrain from these persistent interjections.

Mr. Davies: A Forestry worker living in Maryborough serves on the Burrum Shire Council. They meet in the day-time once a month. Will he not be able to nominate?

Mr. CHALK: He can nominate but he will not be able to take his part in council affairs in his employer's time. It applies to all sections of the community and to all employees of the Crown.

Another matter that I wish to refer to is a statement by the Leader of the Opposition about what appeared in "The Australian Financial Review" and what he termed the "contradictory statements by Government members". He linked the Premier, the Minister for Education and myself. He referred to statements made by me on my return from Malaya. He spoke about what the "Review" had to say on the findings in the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report, and on what I said publicly concerning Government policy on road and rail transport. I make it clear that I make no apology for the utterances I have made about public transport. I am thrilled to think that "The Australian Financial Review" in its 80-page supplement, half of which admittedly was advertising, found room for nine pages dealing with the Queensland Railways. The "Review" reporter did, however, I believe, endeavour to make some capital out of the fact that I refused to present him with a copy of the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report. He then went on to state in his article that by some mysterious means he obtained—legitimately, he pointed out—a copy of the summary of recommendations and conclusions. He then went on to publish what he described as the report, and dealt with major achievements. All hon. members know that this report was tabled in the House in full. Three copies were placed on the table for the inspection of all members of Parliament. Each member of Parliament at that particular time received a copy of

the recommendations and summary of the consultants. No doubt the writer of that article had every opportunity to make a review of that report. Consequently there can be nothing mysterious about it. However, I believe that the Leader of the Opposition was desirous of capitalising on the following statement published by the "Review" under the heading "Dilemma over transport aims"—

"Ford Bacon and Davis, U.S. consulting engineers, claim that the Government is competing with itself by providing two means of general transport—the Government-operated railways and the main roads system . . ."

It then draws attention to a statement made by me in this Chamber when I said—

"The programmes of the railways and the road authorities are not antagonistic in that they dovetail into an overall policy defined by the Government."

I stand by that contention. I believe that this Government is going places with its railways and roads-policy. I ask hon. members to remember that Ford, Bacon and Davis were asked to give the Government an unbiased, straightforward report on what would cure the ills of the Railway Department. We did not ask for anything that would be in any way tempered to fit in with any other activities in this State. We asked for what might be termed a bottle of medicine to cure the railways, and I believe we have got it. Whatever the "Financial Review" might say, let me say that if a patient takes a full bottle of medicine when it is given to him he usually dies, but if he takes it in sips he is cured. That is exactly what this Government is doing in relation to this report. It is administering the medicine so that there is co-ordination between road and rail. I believe that there is clear evidence that by this policy we will place Queensland in the forefront of the States in the Commonwealth.

Let us go a little further and see what the Leader of the Opposition had to say about my visit to Malaya. He accused me of making contradictory statements. If he had accused me of making a controversial statement I should have accepted it because, on my return to Australia, I made a statement that was not pleasing to some manufacturers. However, there was nothing contradictory about it. I said—and I repeat it—that Queensland manufacturers cannot become complacent if they are to obtain business in Malaya, or Malaysia as we now know it. Business cannot be obtained for this State by remote control from here. I said that manufacturers must be up in the area and, in many cases, they must have subsidiary companies there. There is an ever-increasing demand for almost all kinds of commodities amongst the 10,000,000 people in Malaysia, but there is also an ever-increasing number of salesmen from the various countries of the

world combing the area. Further, a democratic Government is at present in power there and it believes in private enterprise and is doing all within its power—just as this Government is doing all within its power in Queensland—to establish private industry in Malaysia. It is offering exceptional opportunities to manufacturers to come to that land, to bring their know-how, their technical men, their machinery and their raw products. They are asking, if possible, for the manufacturing to be carried out in that land. They are offering terms in the finding of finance; they are offering land, water and electricity; they are advancing all of these inducements to people to go there and manufacture. Our manufacturers cannot, therefore, hope that there will be a continuance of the markets that they have today because this offer, which is open to Australians or Queenslanders to go and establish themselves there, is open also to Japan; it is open to the millionaires of Hongkong; it is open to the other countries of the world; and in fact they are going there. That is why I have said—and I repeat—that it is necessary that we look at this area firstly, as a means of export, to get into the territory but then to go in and help establish industry under our own name, establish ourselves there, send our technicians and supply our raw materials. If we do that, we will go a long way towards assisting this State to develop. If we do not, very shortly those markets that were available will be lost.

I think I should also make very brief reference to one or two matters raised by the hon. member for Townsville North. He spent most of his time endeavouring to condemn the basis on which finance was obtained for the Mt. Isa Railway Project. It has been my responsibility to administer the affairs of this project and I can assure the Committee that, during the period that the project has been in hand, we have poured into North Queensland the sum of £17,728,000 actual money paid and we have commitments already for about another £5,000,000, making £22,589,000 in all. That money is being spent in North Queensland for the betterment of the people generally.

Mr. Bennett: Not nearly enough!

Mr. CHALK: I agree with the hon. member and I hope that this Government's policy of developing the North will continue at the present speed because it is considerably greater than when Labour was in power, and that is the vital point. The hon. member for Townsville North comes into the Chamber and decries all this. We have had our arguments, both within the Chamber and outside, as to the basis on which this money was obtained. That argument is known history. But do not let us bring into the Chamber knockers from the North who want to do all they possibly can to decry this project. The work is being carried out at a much cheaper figure than the original estimate, and all credit to those who

are associated with the engineering side, the administration and the actual men in the field. But when someone comes into the Chamber and is prepared, for some political kudos or otherwise, to condemn a project like this, I really and sincerely wonder what his interest is in this State House.

Mr. TUCKER: I rise to a point of order. The Minister says I condemned the project. I ask him to have a look at the report of my speech to see that I did not condemn it. I condemned the method by which the money was raised as opposed to that in other States.

Mr. CHALK: I am prepared to accept the hon. member's explanation because I believe that was the basis on which he raised the matter. What I am saying is that the argument on finance is over. Whether we like it or not, we on this side of the Chamber have from time to time said we were not as pleased as we might be. We were at least thankful that we were able to get the money and carry on with the project. I believe that we should do everything possible to see that the project continues, and that this time next year it will be almost finished. It will be a means not only of developing North Queensland but also of providing considerable national wealth to the Commonwealth, which is exactly what we need.

I wish also to refer briefly to the remarks of the hon. member for Townsville North regarding the Cairns workshops. I do not deny that the Government has been faced with a responsibility in relation to the activities of railwaymen at Cairns. We have done our utmost to ensure that during this transitional period the least number of people will be affected. It is true that dieselisation is here, and I believe that every honest railwayman accepts the fact that it is his security for the future.

Because it is here, it is necessary to make changes in many workshops. This transitional period has to be gone through. We could purchase more diesel-electric locomotives tomorrow and put them into operation to help the economy of the country, but what of the men employed on steam locomotion? What the Government has done, and will continue to do, is ensure that there is a reasonably steady change from one method of locomotive power to the other. If that is done, we will inconvenience the smallest possible number of our employees.

I repeat that we have to regard Cairns as a depot for medium and light repairs. Steam locomotives will move from the far northern portion of the State. There will be dieselisation and rail-motor operations at Cairns. In Townsville steam operations will be carried on for a long time yet and the workshops there will continue to function under the present system. We must, however, look ahead, just as we have had to look ahead in Cairns. We feel that the Cairns workshops will continue as a medium and

light repair depot for wagons. It will be a servicing and running centre for the maintenance of rail motors and will provide a service centre for diesel-electric locomotives and "Sunlander" air-conditioned trains. It will be what might be regarded as a small repair centre for general mechanical equipment. That is all that we can do at Cairns, and we therefore had to make offers of transfers to Townsville to a number of employees.

I agree, and have so told the Commissioner for Railways, that the time factor in these transfers was not sufficient for married men, and that has been adjusted for the future. Make no mistake about it, as time goes on we will also have problems at Townsville, and it may be necessary to move some men from the North to the South. What the Government is endeavouring to do, however, is ensure that this transition comes upon us steadily and does not cause considerable disruption.

I want to deal finally with the remarks of the hon. member for Aubigny and the Leader of the Opposition concerning the activities of Napier Bros. at Dalby. I assure hon. members that the Government will do all within its power to help the Napier organisation to survive. I believe that we have given clear evidence of that to date. But when men who were members of the A.L.P. and men who are now members of the A.L.P. get up in the Chamber and charge the Government with not doing everything that it is possible to do, I think it is time to have a look and see exactly what was done when they were the administrators of Queensland.

In 1945 the present hon. member for Bundaberg, who was then Minister for Transport, at least went some way towards helping Napier Bros. by giving them a special quotation on freights rates for the movement of unprepared iron and steel from Brisbane to their siding, Natcha. He gave them what were then A-class rates—a special concession. But what did the Leader of the Opposition do, this man who condemns the Government for allegedly crucifying Napier Bros., when he was Minister for Transport? He increased rail freights on eight occasions, and on each occasion he raised Napier Bros.' freight rate. Between 1948 and 1956 he raised it from 29s. 9d. a ton to 77s. 6d. a ton. This is the man who has the audacity to say in this Chamber that we are not helping Napier Bros.

What did this Government do when it came into power? The very first thing it did was grant Napier Bros. the same freight rate on both forward and return journeys. In 1960 the Government was forced to make one increase in freight rates in Queensland—one increase during the six and a-half years that I have been Minister for Transport compared with eight increases during the term of office of the previous Minister—but it exempted Napier Bros. We did all we possibly could to assist them. The rate on unprepared iron and steel in less than

truckload lots was also set by previous administrators at 154s. 6d. a ton. In April 1962 the present Government, to help Napiers survive, reduced the freight rate to 110s. a ton, and also, as I have said, reduced the return freight. They were previously paying 154s. 6d. a ton between Dalby and Brisbane; we reduced that rate to 77s. 6d. a ton.

That is clear evidence of what the Government is doing to assist industry to decentralise. It is clear evidence that we are well aware of the circumstances and are prepared to do our utmost. But we cannot give a greater freight concession to an industry in Dalby than we give to an industry in Brisbane on the actual operations between Brisbane, we will say, and Rockhampton or Cairns. A concessional freight rate has been applied by this Government between Brisbane and Cairns, and Brisbane and Mackay, or whatever the case might be, but records show that such a rate was refused to Napier Bros. by the previous Government. Therefore, we have given them concessional rates far in excess of anything that was ever offered by the Australian Labour Party when it was in power, both between here and Dalby and for the return journey, and we have also given them the benefit of other concessional freight rates applicable to industries of a similar nature operating in Brisbane.

So I say that we have done as much as anybody could possibly be expected to do to help this industry survive, yet Mr. Diplock, who is now, I believe, chairman of directors, made reference in this Chamber to the fact that we were supposed to be exploiting this industry. He said it was cheaper to send goods by ship from South Australia to Townsville than it was to rail them from Dalby to Townsville. I do not deny that. Shipping freight rates are entirely different from rail freight rates: but what I do want to say to the hon. member for Aubigny is that at the very time he was making this charge and claiming that his company was losing business, I received a letter from the company, dated 2 September, 1963, and signed by the secretary, which has this to say—

"At the present time, this company is receiving concessional freight rates to the following northern towns: Maryborough, Bundaberg, Mackay, Bowen, Townsville, Innisfail and Cairns.

"In the last six months our volume of consignments to Mackay and Cairns has increased."

Now we are accused by the chairman of the company of not giving sufficient freight concessions. He says that his company is being put out of business because shipping freights from the South are cheaper, yet the secretary of the company on 2 September writes and says that the company's business is increasing. The letter continues—

"We shall be obliged, therefore, if you will give consideration as to whether you are in a position to further reduce the concessional freights applying to these centres."

In other words, they are giving us more business and because of that they are asking for more concessions. That is quite understandable because where volume increases costs can be cut down, and I tell the Chamber tonight that I am going to examine this proposal.

Mr. Houston: When did you get that letter?

Mr. CHALK: The date on it is 2 September, 1963. I am going to have a look at it because we as a Government will do all within our power to help decentralise industry, and, in this particular case, to help this industry to survive.

I have occupied my time dealing with matters which possibly would otherwise have been dealt with on the Railway Estimates and I hope I have placed before the Chamber, and the people of this State, the views of the Government on the matters I have raised.

In conclusion, I compliment the Treasurer on the part he is playing in the administration of the affairs of this State. This Budget is one that has been worked out principally by the Treasurer with his senior officers, and they have done a mighty task. They have presented to the people of this State a programme for the future and, as one who believes in Queensland and that Queensland will go forward, I am sure that the Budget that has been presented to this Chamber will ensure the furtherance of this State and the betterment of its people.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (8.19 p.m.): It has been rather amazing for me to listen to one of the alleged senior Ministers of the Cabinet speaking in such an excitable fashion about matters that would normally be dealt with in the normal routine of events but which have been precipitated into the discussion this evening, no doubt by his own troubled conscience.

The hon. member for Aubigny, who is the Leader of the Q.L.P. and its sole member in this Chamber, has been attacked and I shall leave his defence to himself. The Leader of the Opposition, too, has been attacked in his absence. I think the Minister deliberately chose this time when he knew that the Leader of the Opposition would be absent with the Premier at a very important function. I am amazed that a responsible Minister would attack the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the major party in this House in such a fashion on statements made previously by him. I refer in particular to Napier Bros. No doubt the decisions by the Leader of the Opposition as the then Minister for Railways were made taking into consideration the fact that at that time there was serious inflation throughout Australia. I have no doubt that the Leader of the Opposition, in his own good time and in a suitable and effective fashion, will deal with the scurrilous and empty charges of the Minister for

Transport—charges that were deliberately made in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition.

I shall deal with the allegations made initially in the Minister's speech and concerning which, as I have said earlier, his conscience has severely troubled him. His hatred of railwaymen and workers is growing in cancerous proportions in his soul and heart. Although he does everything deliberately to thwart any action of the ordinary man in the community, particularly the railway worker, he endeavours to placate the public conscience by bringing before this Committee spurious arguments that perhaps, to some little extent, are plausible, but which are in fact untrue in substance.

Let me assure you, Mr. Hooper, that we intend to place on record the correct and exact wording of the respective Weekly Notices made pursuant to By-law 619 so that the public can read it. We will then be satisfied that members of the public have the correct impression, not a misdirected version given to them by the Minister in an endeavour to mislead and deceive them.

Weekly Notice 52 of 1952, made pursuant to By-law 619, reads as follows—

“Employees nominated for or elected to offices with Local Authorities.

“A. No employee shall, without the permission of the Commissioner, engage in any employment outside the duties of his employment by the Commissioner.

“B. An employee shall not accept nomination for election as Mayor or Chairman of a Local Authority or as Lord Mayor or Alderman of the City of Brisbane unless he shall first have ascertained from the Commissioner that, in the event of his being elected to such office, sufficient leave (without pay) will be granted to him to enable him to discharge the duties thereof.

“C. An employee shall not accept nomination for election as an Alderman (other than Alderman of the City of Brisbane, for which provision is made under subclause (b) hereof) or Town or Shire Councillor unless his Head of Branch, with the approval of the Commissioner, has first notified him that he is satisfied that the carrying out of the duties of such office will not interfere with such employee's Departmental duties.

“D. An employee elected as Mayor or Chairman of a Local Authority or a Lord Mayor or Alderman of the City of Brisbane and who has complied with the requirements of subclause (b) hereof may be allowed leave of absence without pay during the whole period he continues to occupy such office, but notwithstanding the provisions of any other by-law, such leave of absence without pay, in excess of a period of three months, shall not, for any purpose whatsoever, be counted as service with the Commissioner for Railways.

"E. An employee elected as Alderman (other than as Alderman of the City of Brisbane) or Town or Shire Councillor and who has complied with the requirements of Sub-Clause (b) hereof may be allowed time off without pay to attend the Council meeting, provided that no extra cost would be incurred by the Department on account of the granting of such leave."

That is the end of that Weekly Notice.

Mr. Davies: That is under a Labour Government.

Mr. BENNETT: That is under a Labour Government and clearly and obviously is discretionary in its application.

Now we have the typical Tory legislation, partisan and paltry in its outlook. It is headed, "Instruction to Railway Employees". It is Weekly Notice No. 40 dated 3 October, 1963. I ask hon. members to bear in mind that it came out on the eve of the impending city council and local-authority elections to be held throughout Queensland.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: If hon. members opposite would talk one at a time instead of all together like a lot of galahs I would be able to listen to one of them, but I cannot listen to them when they all speak at the one time as three of them are now doing.

The instruction says—

"A. (i) That in future an employee of the Commissioner for Railways will not be granted leave of absence or time off to attend to the duties of any office which he might hold as a member of the Council of a Local Authority.

"(ii) That in respect of an employee whose duties are subject to roster, the roster shall be prepared without regard to the fact that such employee holds office as a member of the Council of a Local Authority and a roster shall not be modified in any manner so as to facilitate or enable the attendance of that employee at a meeting of the Council of a Local Authority of which he is a member.

"B. That with respect to an employee presently holding office as a member of the Council of a Local Authority, the foregoing determination shall apply as from the expiration of his present term of office."

Underneath that we find this—

"The foregoing information is hereby brought to the notice of all employees so that an employee contemplating candidature at any future Local Authority elections may be fully aware thereof."

It is amazing and outstanding to think that in modern times any Government claiming some semblance of democratic principles should seek to disentitle one large section of the community from any opportunity

of public representation. I think it is the most signatory and retrograde step to be taken by any Government in any part of the democratic world. I do not believe that any fair-minded Government would even conceive such a plan, let alone put it into operation.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not mind interjections. I like to answer sensible interjections but I will deal adequately with inane interjections. However, the Minister for Transport will not answer even a sensible and decent question. He roars like a bull throughout the whole of his speech, and then, having spoken for an hour, he sits down and wants to interject while someone else is speaking. I wish he would act like a gentleman. The hon. gentleman will not answer any questions so I propose to deal with him in the same fashion as he deals with other hon. members.

Mr. Dewar: You were not in the Chamber when the Minister explained that the policy was initiated by the Labour Government.

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister for Labour and Industry has interjected. I did not propose to deal with him this evening but seeing that he has poked his nose into this argument, after coming away from dealing with the feminine ties which occupies so much of his time, I must say that I have been most alarmed to find that he shares with the Minister for Transport his utter contempt and hatred of railway workers. That was manifest from his remarks at Ipswich this week about Ipswich development. In effect, he said that the Liberal Party had no regard for the Ipswich district and that he had no intention, as Minister for Labour and Industry, of endeavouring to direct industry to that area, obviously because the district had returned to this Parliament, to the Federal Parliament, and to the local authority, A.L.P. representatives. So these two Ministers are doing their best to kill industrial areas of that nature.

Let me say that the weekly notice issued under the Labour Government was one that provided for the exercise of a discretion. It is perfectly obvious that, in order to have suitable and proper control of railway and other governmental and Public Service instrumentalities and departments, it is necessary, of course, for the head of the department to exercise some proper control. I believe that legislation as provided by the A.L.P. Government in years gone by made provision for that control, which was exercised only in certain emergent circumstances. In other words, you cannot run a country by hard-and-fast and strict legislation. This Government has found that out on many previous occasions. The Minister has found it out himself with his own legislation, which he claimed to be good and right and proper—the State Transport Facilities Act—and

lawyers in this State have shot peas through several holes in it and will continue to do so.

In order to have correct legislation with effective control, you must make provision for discretionary powers. At the same time, you must have a lever to bring that control into use when necessary. So we had the rule, under an A.L.P. Government, of exercising control over employees of this type; at the same time we allowed for a discretion to be exercised in an elastic fashion so that, whenever possible, no Crown employee, no railway employee, or member of the Public Service, was disentitled to engage in public representation unless it was impracticable or almost impossible for him to do so or in the adverse interests of the particular organisation in which he was working. There are, of course, certain emergent circumstances that can readily be brought to mind that would disentitle a public servant or a school teacher, or a railway worker for that matter, to representation on a local authority or other public body. I could name several. One is the one-teacher school. It would be idle to suggest that the head teacher, or the only teacher at a one-teacher school, should be entitled to take a day off and leave the children to their own resources while he goes away to represent the area on a local authority or on some other public instrumentality. It would be stupid to make provision for that. Therefore you could not have a strict, hard-and-fast, mandatory type of legislation or weekly notice saying that all employees must be entitled to public representation. You must reserve some discretionary power to restrain those who would want to go away and leave their own responsibilities to the detriment of the community. So Labour wisely and properly made that discretionary power available.

But that is not so any longer. Pursuant to By-law 619 and By-law 254, the legislation now says that the employee will not be granted leave. That is mandatory on the Commissioner. His discretion has been cut away entirely. No longer will the employee be granted leave. Furthermore, it says that when it becomes necessary to rearrange a roster under any conditions, that employee seeking to have the roster rearranged has no chance of getting the leave and the Commissioner has no discretion to allow him to be given that leave in the interests of public representation.

It is certainly a shocking ruling, and it alarms me to think that we have a Government prepared to make it. They speak so glibly against totalitarianism, socialistic legislation, and socialism generally, yet they are prepared to socialise public representation to such an extent that the ordinary man has no chance of gaining public office in a local authority. They have socialised it so that the only people who can attain office are men on the land, the landed gentry, and the fellows who live most of the time on

the South Coast and can spare the time to drive to Ipswich, or wherever it may be, once a month to represent a shire in the local-authority field.

The Government was going to do wonders with its Bill of Rights. Under this ruling, the only class with any rights will be that is commonly referred to as the idle rich. I do not refer to them with complete derision, but it is harking back to the days that one can read of in any political science textbook when only the idle rich had the opportunity to gain public representation. Whilst I am prepared to concede that there are amongst them a number who have intelligence and ability, it is normally the hard-working man, who is fully occupied, who knows the difficulty of earning a living, who has a family of his own and knows life's problems, who is the most suitable for public representation, and that is the category being excluded from it by this ruling.

I know that it will exclude several railway workers at Ipswich. Whilst the ruling was directed at all Labour-controlled councils in Queensland, it was directed in particular against the Ipswich City Council. We have evidence of the antagonism and animosity degenerating to pure hatred engendered in the minds of the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Labour and Industry because the Ipswich district has the impertinence to return A.L.P. representatives in every field. They are endeavouring to eliminate them.

It is significant that we have here the Mayor of Redcliffe and the Mayor of Rockhampton, who are very anxious about their future tenures of office in the local-authority field. They know the feelings of their localities, and they know that A.L.P. candidates in them are strong, capable men of ability, with the necessary qualifications to control civic affairs in their areas. These hon. members are applying pressure to the Government to stop A.L.P. representatives seeking the endorsement of the public.

Mr. Houghton interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: That shows how little the hon. member for Redcliffe knows about his own area. He thinks that because there is no railway line at Redcliffe, there are no railway workers living there. I can tell him that there are at least 50 railwaymen that I know personally living at Redcliffe. He has probably never heard of them. That shows the extent of his thinking and the lack of logic in his mental make-up. He thinks that because there is no railway, there must be no railway workers. How stupid can one be!

There are then the various committees to be considered. There are the various apprenticeship boards and the Electrical Workers' Board. They are all public offices in which normally people in this category of public servants are entitled to serve. They will now be denied that opportunity. Who would be better qualified to sit on apprenticeship and

trade boards than workers who have themselves served their apprenticeship and worked under the control of those boards for many years?

Mr. Davies: They get allowances too, do they not?

Mr. BENNETT: They get allowances.

Mr. Houghton: They do not get as much as a barrister gets.

Mr. BENNETT: They at least earn it honestly, unlike some other people. The Mayor of Redcliffe had certain land re-zoned for commercial and business purposes and then acted as commission agent in the deal. He was getting his salary as an alderman and his fee as a commission agent too. Barristers get their fees for honest work, not by working rackets. In many cases real-estate agents get into local authorities so they can earn a quick quid.

The Minister said that between 1946 and 1957 there were 20 refusals by A.L.P. Governments. Although most of the things that the Minister told us were completely erroneous, I must assume that the figure of 20 is correct because we have no means of checking his statements. He did not mention one name, nor did he mention one request that had been refused. If the figure is correct, that is 20 refusals by Labour Governments in 11 years, or fewer than two a year. One could well understand that there might be many legitimate grounds for refusal, such as a man being at a one-teacher school or a health service being jeopardised, and so on.

I am sure that the Queensland Teachers' Union will deeply regret the Government's decision. I say quite frankly and without equivocation that I definitely do not believe the Minister's statement that he is being inundated by protests from public servants and others, and I challenge him to produce the names, occupations and addresses of those who have protested. If he is bona fide, I suggest that he should be prepared to do that. I know that he will not. To use the vernacular, I think they are all furphies, brought out of a hat like a magician's rabbits, in order to bolster up his illogical arguments.

Certain comments have been made about the forthcoming local-authority elections. It is well known that many railway workers, particularly in Ipswich, have sought endorsement for plebiscites, and it is strangely significant that the decision was made before the completion of the plebiscites and at a time when the ward system is being introduced in Ipswich. The Government anticipated that it would be horribly embarrassed by the results of the election in Ipswich under the ward system, knowing that the A.L.P. would win every ward, because amongst the railwaymen, school teachers and other public servants there are men of ability and integrity, self-sacrificing people who desire to serve

the community as members of a local authority. But because the preponderance of them happen to be of A.L.P. thinking, this Government is prepared to stifle their ambition, to kill their public spiritedness, to thwart their ideas of public development and local authority service, and service to the public in other fashions, because they do not happen to support the Government's thinking. Thirteen of the 22 who have nominated in Ipswich come under the ban to be placed on them by this proposal. In other words, 13 of the present 22 nominees will now be disqualified.

A claim has been made, too, that these people cause a certain amount of jealousy amongst their fellow workers because of the expenses or emoluments they receive. Every local-authority man in Queensland will laugh the Minister to scorn on that claim, and that includes even his own Tory supporters who are public representatives. Why, this Minister and other Government members are at present claiming that they cannot live adequately on the salaries they are receiving as public men!

Mr. Chalk: We are not all barristers. We have not all been in court all day.

Mr. BENNETT: I am here in this Chamber much longer than the Minister for Transport is. He spends most of his time acting like a playboy, running around to social functions instead of getting down to work for the railwaymen and refraining from closing down branch lines. He is so much of a social climber that he enjoys the ceremonial incense instead of the practical application. I repeat my allegation, which seems to be such a sore point with the Government, that by appointing a salaries tribunal hon. members opposite are claiming that their salaries are insufficient to meet the demands of public representation. I am not making any comment about that, but at the same time this deceitful Minister says that those Crown employees and railway employees who are serving the public by way of council or local-authority representation are arousing bitterness and jealousy among their fellow employees because of the expenses or emoluments they are receiving. They are receiving a mere pittance, and any local-authority man knows that they are out of pocket because of the services they render. They are making not only a public and personal sacrifice but also a financial sacrifice in the service they give to the community, and I am shocked that the Minister should come into this Chamber and deride their efforts by claiming they are doing it purely for personal gain, that they serve on local authorities for the profit they make. We know that with the few miserly shillings they get they are out of pocket because of their efforts. They do not arouse the jealousy of their fellow workers at all. As a matter of fact, most of their fellow workers—I should say the vast majority of their fellow workers—would say they are not

prepared to make the sacrifice these men are making. They admire them for their services and they respect them for the money and time they put into their public representation, and they would not be prepared to squeal or clamour for their return to their work. They know that their fellow employees are spending in the public interest the pocket money that is spent otherwise by those who do not serve as representatives of the public. In other words this Minister has made a vicious, unwarranted attack on the ordinary wage-earner—the man on the basic wage who is prepared to spend from his wages a certain amount in order that he will have the satisfaction and the pride of serving his local authority. He does not serve to make a profit out of the small amount that he is paid in attendance money.

The decisions made in those 20 cases, of course, were individual decisions dealing with each application. We have not been informed of the circumstances or the name of any one individual, but I have no doubt that there was justification for their refusal because of the particular and peculiar circumstances of the time. I have no doubt that every Public Service Commissioner, Commissioner for Railways and other officer called upon to exercise his discretion in these circumstances would do so readily in favour of the applicant if it were at all possible for him to do so. No doubt it will pay the respective Commissioners now to say, "This is the end of your public life. You must go back to your job. You are not allowed to be like any other section of the community and give vent to your self-expression and ability by public service." It reminds me of Tom Hood's "Song of the Shirt." This is the attitude the Minister adopts to the ordinary man, particularly the railway worker, whom he hates. By every decision he makes this is what he says to them in effect—

"Work—work—work!

"From weary chime to chime;

"Till the heart is sick and the brain benumbed

"As well as the weary hand."

He does not want them to have any interest in life other than to sit over their machines or to do their ordinary day's toil. He does not want them to have even one-tenth of the opportunity he has for self-expression, for getting some feeling of confidence and some self-satisfaction out of the knowledge that they are serving their fellow man well. He also says that it is wrong that rosters should be re-arranged. From my knowledge of men in all walks of life you do get the nark here and there.

Government Members: We have them here.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Sherwood runs around and makes a nark of himself with the staff at Parliament House. We have narks everywhere but fortunately they are in the extreme minority. We have

the big nark in Cabinet—the Minister for Transport. He is the nark to the ordinary worker.

Mr. Sullivan: Get on with your speech and tell us something. Get off his back.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member is another one who always wants to attack the railway worker. I have sat here on many occasions and listened to him. I have heard him advocate the abolition of the railways even in his own district. He said they should be completely eliminated.

Mr. Sullivan: That must have been a very rare occasion. You are not here very often.

Mr. BENNETT: I admit that I normally walk out when the hon. member is speaking because he gives everyone a headache. But I have noticed on the other hand that he sticks around when I am making my speech.

Dealing with the change in rosters, I believe that in any big community and in any organisation that has a large work force the re-arranging of rosters is in keeping with custom and practice. It certainly encourages mateship, and the man who has to seek a change in the roster for his own benefit has a sense of gratitude for many mates—perhaps for people whom he did not know to be mates until he made the request. However, this is to come to an end and it will prevent people from exercising their feeling of mateship and camaraderie in the organisation in which they are serving. It binds them closer together and gives them a pride in the organisation in which they are serving and gives them a feeling of loyalty one to the other and to the job they are doing. I believe that to cut out this opportunity of doing good and of being able to be charitable, one to the other, is depriving them of some of the finer things in their lives and in their work, things they have enjoyed for over a quarter of a century.

I believe that if the Minister received any protests—and I do not believe he did because he did not give any particulars—he should have dealt with them in the manner they deserve and said, "If you are going to be a squealer and cannot fall in with your mates and cannot show some decency, for which the law makes provision, and if you cannot live in the community and be one of the community, you had better get out." That is what he should have said to that type of man. The hon. member for Maryborough has drawn my attention to—

Mr. Smith: Junior counsel.

Mr. BENNETT: Whether one is junior counsel or senior, so long as one is sincere and believes one has a certain amount of satisfaction.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: If the hon. member applied for a position around the courts his job would be cleaning the toilets for the prisoners.

The hon. member for Maryborough has drawn my attention to the case of Mr. George Hooper, who lives in Maryborough, in the suburb of Tinana. He works in the Huon Forestry Section and I am reliably informed by the hon. member that he is a very valued employee and overseer. He was elected to the Burrum Shire Council, which meets once a month in the day-time. That necessitates his absenting himself from work once a month during the day-time, and of course under the discretionary Labour ruling he would get permission. Although he is a respected and able employee and is well regarded on the Burrum Shire Council, he will have to make the sacrifice I mentioned earlier. He takes pride and joy in his work and the people in the area appreciate his efforts. However, he made a grave mistake—and this is one of the reasons for this decision—so far as this Government is concerned, and stood against Jack Pizzey as the Labour candidate. Having stood against Jack Pizzey he considerably endangered his tenure of office. It was decided that he should come into this category and no longer be given an opportunity to serve. By virtue of this decision he will have to resign. He is experienced and qualified in this type of work but his services have been stultified by this Government, because that will be one of the effects of this property-franchise representation introduced by this decision. As has been said, this is a negation of our fundamental concepts and democratic principles. Over the years, from time to time we have amended the legislation to take sole franchise from the landed or property interests. We were not taking it away from them entirely but giving it to all sections of the community. This legislation will mean that, while everybody will be entitled to a vote at a local-authority election, only the landed gentry in the main will be able to serve on country councils. So it is well to be understood that in places like Ipswich and even in Redcliffe (where they are seriously, in the local-authority world, dissatisfied with their representative) and certainly in Rockhampton, the people who are now being given the opportunity in the franchise to exercise their vote will not want to do so because in effect their vote has been taken away from them. They vote either for the Country Party No. 1 candidate or for the Country Party No. 2 candidate. If they do not like either of those two, they have the further choice of the Liberal Party candidate; but in many instances they have no chance of voting for their own A.L.P. representative. So it can well be claimed that they have been disfranchised from local-authority representation.

Furthermore, they are reduced to the indignity that the State Electoral Act will apply to them so that they will have to cast a vote or be subject to a penalty even though they are dissatisfied with all the Country Party or Liberal Party representatives who come before them.

In the brief time at my disposal I wish to make some short reference to the impending decision to hold an early Federal election. The decision has been germinating for some time and, when the "Telegraph" last night reported the latest unemployment figures, it was abundantly clear to everybody that the decision would be made tonight because they were trying to put up a smoke-screen on employment to deceive the people. Let us be quite clear. If the true figures for Queensland were published, in spite of the fact that this is perhaps the best time of the year for employment—from the climatic and seasonal point of view and from the point of view of juniors and seniors being absorbed in their public examinations—the real figure would be 5 per cent. unemployed in Queensland. And while our figures have been reduced by a paltry 600-odd, the figures elsewhere have been reduced by some 5,000 or 6,000.

It was obvious to anyone that there would be a Federal election when the wool levy was discussed by the Country Party, who did not want a Federal election, but have been commandeered into conducting one by the force of the Liberal Party throughout Australia and in the various State Parliaments. Although the Country Party in this Assembly pretends to be the major party, the Liberal Party is the little tail that is wagging the dog. The wool price and the condition of the wool industry were so unsatisfactory that Sir William Gunn stamped around the countryside, "copping" rotten eggs, flour bombs, water bombs and sugar and so forth which spoilt his good suits, in an endeavour to raise some enthusiasm and financial support from the wool barons of Australia. Because of the parlous condition of the wool industry the Country Party did not want an election and, because of the dissension in the wool industry through the submissions made by Sir William Gunn they decided that no Federal election would be necessary. So what did the Liberal Party do in their electoral skullduggery and their political hypocrisy? In order to win over the Country Party and persuade them to their way of thinking on a general election, they decided that the taxpayers would offer a subsidy of 50 per cent. to the wool industry.

Mr. Ewan: So they should.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Roma says, "So they should." I am not going to enter into an argument on that, but it is rather significant that what might be regarded as the section of the community in most comfortable financial circumstances is being subsidised by the ordinary taxpayer. The railway workers who will be thrown out of the Ipswich City Council, the public servants who will be thrown out of the Redcliffe City Council, and the ordinary public servants who will not have a chance of serving on the Rockhampton City Council, are being asked, as taxpayers, to subsidise the wool industry by this 50 per cent.

There is one other reason why the Federal Government, in its skulduggery and political chicanery, has decided to precipitate a Federal election. It has decided that the Tory Government in England has no chance. It is infamous, decadent, and immoral. I do not know which is worse, the Queensland Government or the British Government, but certainly the British Government has no chance of survival. The Federal Government knows that this is going to be a great blow for the Tory supporters throughout this country, so they are rushing headlong into a Federal election in order to avoid the pending defeat of the British Government and, in turn, their own defeat next year. However, they will still be defeated in spite of their manoeuvrings.

Let it be borne in mind that constitutionally when a party has the numbers in politics it can do anything. To be quite frank about it, I must concede as a lawyer that it is numbers that count and a Government with the numbers can do what it likes. It can ride roughshod over constitutional principles, and even rules and regulations, and that is what this Government and the Tory Government at Canberra do.

According to the fundamental decent concepts of political science, there must be a real issue before an early Federal election is precipitated. There is now no real issue at all on which to fight a Federal election except the Government's fear that its slender majority of one will be whipped away at any time and its knowledge that an early election will give an opportunity to have a chop at Queensland's only Senator who will be contesting the election for the A.L.P., namely, Senator George Whiteside.

There we see at Federal level the same type of political thinking as operates here. This Government is doing its best to get rid of A.L.P. representatives in local authorities, and Sir Robert Menzies is doing his best to get rid of Senator George Whiteside. He is, however, making a great mistake and he is in for a great shock.

The Warwick by-election is pending and I, with many other A.L.P. supporters, have spent a certain amount of time there. People in that area are concerned about the ailing dairying industry. They believe that some rejuvenated system of research and organisation is needed in the Department of Primary Industries. They believe that their needs are being sadly neglected at present and that the Government is pursuing more assiduously, if it can pursue anything assiduously, the interests of the sugar industry, because they say that "Big Ernie" Evans can stand over the Government whenever he likes. The expression used in the country is that "Big Ernie" Evans told them they must have a sugar commission to investigate the circumstances of the sugar industry. They said, "Our own western representatives in the

Country Party are so weak-kneed that they are not prepared even to clamour for a commission of inquiry into the dairying industry." I was told at Warwick that the dairying industry is suffering a severe setback. It is staggering and startling to find that the annual butter consumption per head of population has fallen from 32.9 lb. in pre-war years to 26.2 lb. today.

Mr. Sullivan: How much margarine do you eat?

Mr. BENNETT: Margarine and other synthetic products are being pushed by business interests in the Tory world. Members of the Liberal Party are prepared to assist in the production and disposal of margarine at the expense of butter and cheese produced by the dairy farmers. At the last meeting of the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation it was announced that its membership had decreased by 30 per cent. and production had decreased by 10 per cent. in the last eight years. During the same period Australian production increased by 16 per cent., so there was a total deficit of 26 per cent. in Queensland. The industry is in a very doubtful position because of the probable loss of markets in the United Kingdom, and the Government is doing nothing to promote sales in new markets. When hon. members on this side of the Chamber advocate that we should dispose of these products in certain countries we are called a lot of Communists.

I had prepared many notes for this debate, but I wish to refer particularly to a unanimous decision of the Full Court of Queensland, one of whose members was a former Government member of this Assembly.

Mr. Ewan: What is wrong with that?

Mr. BENNETT: There is nothing wrong with it. The decision was a very wise and sound one. I wish to make it clear that the court was not persuaded by any submissions of mine. I had nothing to do with it on this occasion, although I usually persuade the court satisfactorily and suitably. As I said, the decision was unanimous, and Mr. Justice Hart, of recent fame in this Chamber, shared in the decision and found that the top glamour detective of Queensland was guilty of perpetrating a fraud on one of the courts of Queensland. That was the decision of the Queensland Full Court, the highest court in this State, and His Honour Mr. Justice Hart found that the fraud was deliberate. That is perhaps one of the most serious offences that anybody in Queensland could commit, and it is even more serious when it is committed by an allegedly trusted police officer.

Even the Minister for Transport has had to accept, with much bitterness and chagrin, the decisions of the Full Court, which usually are against him. But, lo and behold, the Commissioner of Police does not accept the unanimous decision of the Full Court and

say that he will act appropriately because committing a fraud on the court is a serious offence under a certain section of the Criminal Code. He does not accept the decision with equanimity, but tells the public, the Government and members of Cabinet that he is not accepting it and will have the decision of the Full Court investigated departmentally. What a shocking impertinence from any public servant, or any other person in the community! He said that he is not prepared to accept the unanimous decision of the Full Court, that he will have the matter departmentally investigated.

There have been many occasions in the past when this Commissioner has suspended policemen and dismissed them from office. On some occasions, no doubt, his actions have been justified; on many other occasions they have been vitriolic and vindictive. On this occasion, when there has been a decision of the Full Court, the Commissioner is not prepared to accept it; he does not even suspend the police officer concerned. He is still acting as a police officer, and no doubt preparing evidence to put before the court. Of course, no court will ever again accept his evidence. What is more, this particular officer glamorises himself by dragging some poor individual, draped only in a little towel, almost stark naked, from a building. He is not arrested—he still has not been charged—yet this officer assaults him by dragging him from private premises—

Mr. Smith interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: No action has been taken and I know none will be taken. He drags him out from private premises and either arranges, or had pre-arranged, for a weekend newspaper to make an incursion into this individual's privacy and dignity by having a photograph taken; or alternatively, the other serious claim is that the Police Department itself took that photograph, which may have been necessary for police purposes but which is pornographic when published. The other claim is that Detective Glen Hallahan arranged for the police photographer to go from the police photographic records and to select the photograph he wanted and publish it in "Sunday Truth".

Mr. Smith: He should have been suspended, should he not?

Mr. BENNETT: That is the extraordinary conduct that is being tolerated by the Commissioner. I know that he not only tolerates such conduct but also encourages it because of his social activities at the Majestic Hotel, where he is wined and dined by those who want advance police information so that they can influence public opinion and the court's decision long before a case ever gets into court. This particular case will never go to court because the police are not prepared to prefer any charges. They plaster that man's photograph, almost in the nude,

on the front page of the "Telegraph" and he is not, and will not be, charged with anything.

The Minister is doing nothing about it. The previous Minister in charge of police was never game to discuss police affairs. I cannot say too much about this particular aspect because the Minister claimed on one occasion that a certain matter was sub judice. It is, of course, still sub judice and if the Commissioner has his way it will be sub judice until he retires.

(Time expired.)

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (9.19 p.m.): First of all I should like to apologise for speaking at this hour. I did not expect it would take the hon. member who has just resumed his seat from half past 4, when the court rose, until after the tea adjournment to get here to speak. When he did speak we were entertained by what might be called the most psycho-neurotic speech I have heard for a long time. The main trouble with him was that he had nothing to say and, unfortunately, he kept on saying it for the whole hour. The main burden of his complaint was with the Minister for Transport and on the question of a Federal election. While he castigates the Federal Government for wanting to bring on a Federal election 12 months earlier than is necessary, on the grounds that it is a waste of public money, I remind him that within three months of the last Federal election the Leader of the Labour Opposition, Mr. Calwell, was crying out blue murder, saying, "The position is not clear enough. Let us have another election." If the truth be known the real reason for the scream at the moment is that there are so many Federal Labour Party boys who are experiencing their very first Parliament, and they now see that their time for superannuation purposes might be cut short by an early election.

Mr. Davies: Are you going to put any ads. in the paper with a hammer and sickle over Parliament House?

Mr. RAMSDEN: We have not decided that yet, but it was quite a good advertisement last time.

I now want to address myself to the subject of tourist activities. I notice in the contingencies subdivision of the Estimates dealing with the Division of Tourist Activities, that for publicity and special tour organisation the record amount of £56,050 has been allocated. The amount has been increased year by year since this Government took office in 1957, when the amount allocated was £7,500. In 1953-1954 the expenditure on tourist publicity in Queensland was £122,811. In 1956-1957 it jumped to £154,251. In the last financial year, 1962-1963, the expenditure was £302,813, almost a 100 per cent. increase since we became the Government. It is rather important to note that, because tourism has taken its place in Queensland as the seventh industry,

and year by year it is growing in importance. The Tourist Bureau, under the very capable direction and leadership of the Director-General, Mr. Wilson, is facing up to the ever-increasing demand for better facilities and better services. Most of the descriptive pamphlets have been rewritten and reprinted, and produced in a more convenient pocket size.

Tourism will grow quite naturally, even if we did little or nothing about it. Visitors would come here in any case, but whether they would come back again or urge their friends and relatives to come here would be problematical. The Tourist Bureau, following the Government's policy, has paid special attention to group tourist activities. I instance the recent visits of groups from the Frankston Teachers' College of Victoria, the Burwood Teachers' College of New South Wales, and the Scotch College of Adelaide. I have had the privilege of attending many functions as vice-chairman of the Parliamentary Tourist Committee. Without exception, on every occasion our hospitality, friendliness and basic understanding of our visitors has been such that it has sent them back to their own States or countries anxious to return here themselves and to tell others what we, in Queensland, have to offer. I believe that we can go much further if we set to and find out what type of tourists we are attracting and what they are actually looking for in Queensland. Recently a friend of mine returned from a tour of the U.S.A., Canada, the Philippines and Japan. Knowing my interest in tourism, she brought back with her this interesting questionnaire which every visitor to the Philippines is asked to fill in so that he or she can assist the Board of Travel and Tourist Industry.

I should like to place on record the questions that are asked because I believe they could be of interest to our own bureau. It will be noted that this inquiry is strictly confidential; it can be anonymous, if necessary. It will be used only for statistical purposes and will be not used or released in any way that would permit the tourist to be identified. It consists of 18 main queries, some of which have subsidiary queries. For instance, it asks first of all—

"1. How many times have you been to the Philippines before this trip?"
It continues—

"2. Which of the following gave you information about the Philippines that helped you plan this trip?

- Travel folders
- Brochures
- Guide books
- Magazines and newspapers
- Air or shipping line
- Travel agent
- Other, write in"

"3. Who made arrangements for this trip?

- Self/Member of family
- Travel agent
- Carrier
- Employer/Employee
- Other, write in

"4. What was the purpose of this trip?

- Holiday/Pleasure tour
- Visit to friends/relatives
- Attend to business
- Attend meeting, conference
- Official/Professional duties
- Study
- In transit/change plane
- Other, write in

"5. With whom are you travelling?

- Alone
- With family
- With friends/relatives
- As member of delegation
- In organised group tour
- Other, write in"

I know some hon. members opposite would not like to say whom they were travelling with. They would object to answering that question.

The questionnaire continues—

"6. Which of these activities did you enjoy?

- Sightseeing
- Visit to historical places
- Festivals, Pageantry
- Native dances, art
- Photography
- Social life
- Sports
- Night life
- Other, write in

"7. What cities or towns did you visit?
.
.
.

"8. Can you state three things which you like most?
.
.
.

"9. Can you indicate your income from all sources?

- Under \$5,000
- \$5,000 to \$7,499
- \$7,500 to \$9,999
- \$10,000 to \$14,999
- \$15,000 to \$19,999
- Over \$20,000

"10. Can you tell us your occupation?
(Please write in ink)

"11. How long did you stay in the Philippines?
. days
. a few hours
(Check if less than 24 hours)

"12. Where did you stay?

- Hotel
- Apartment/Rented home
- With friends/relatives
- Other, write in

"13. How much altogether did you spend? (Include expense of family or immediate party; exclude fares to and from the Philippines.)

\$

"14. How many persons does this expenditure cover?

.

"15. Can you give approximate figures as your expenditure on

Accommodation \$

Meals and drinks \$

Shopping \$

Fares within Phil. \$

Other \$

"16. Do you consider the Philippines more or less expensive than expected?

More expensive

Less expensive

As expected

Other, write in

"17. Have you any comments about this trip?

"18. May we know your

Nationality Country of residence

If you have no objections, may we have your name

THANK YOU FOR YOUR
CO-OPERATION."

Mr. Hughes: Don't you think that is an impertinence and an invasion of rights?

Mr. RAMSDEN: Not at all. I have already said it is a voluntary form and can be anonymous.

At the beginning, I said this questionnaire is sent out and may be used anonymously, and I have also stated that it is used only for statistical purposes. I am informed that it helps the Philippines tourist industry considerably. By the questions asked it gives the Philippines authorities a real insight into exactly what a visitor is looking for when he visits that country.

I suggest that the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau might give very serious consideration to the printing of a similar confidential questionnaire adapted to Queensland conditions. It could be distributed to interstate travel agents, tourist bureaus in other States, and our overseas agents. When the information has been collated we can make a real, and more or less scientific, approach to providing what the tourist to Queensland wants. Such a questionnaire would, in a very short time, provide us with the answers to our accommodation problems, the sort of activities, tours and interest our visitors require and then, by applying our energies as a State to meeting these requirements, we would give an added impetus to the great tourist industry.

Recently the Minister for Labour and Industry introduced me to one of the leading United States travel agents, a Mr. R. W. Hemphill, president of Hemphill Travel

Services Inc., operators of Hemphill World Cruises. His travel service operates from Los Angeles, California. I had a very informative hour-long conversation with this gentleman and his wife about what the tourist is looking for and what we must provide if we are to continue to attract overseas tourists to Queensland. Mr. Hemphill was on his way to Mount Isa and Alice Springs, not just to have a look for himself, but because he said the things that Americans wanted to see were the real Australia—the interior, the kangaroos, the koalas, the platypus and other things they could not see in the States. Because of his interest in the North and the West, I brought the hon. member for Flinders in to meet him, and the hon. member was able to tell him many things he wanted to know prior to going north and west for the first time.

There are two things I remember Mr. Hemphill emphasising that we must do if we wanted to attract the American tourist. In the first place, he said, it was useless advertising our beaches in the United States. "They are not going to come half way across the world to lie on sand or swim in water, which they can do at home. They are going to come across the Pacific," he said, "to see your indigenous flora and fauna. They will come to see your kangaroos, your koalas, your Barrier Reef and your hinterland but they won't come out to rough it! In other words, they will not come unless they have a comfortable, clean, modern room to stay in, where there is a good bed, air-conditioning, and a good table, not of luxury foods but of good, solid Australian food."

He told us that the American tourist was quite prepared to rough it during the day-time as he moved from place to place. He did not mind being taken in a jeep as he moved from place to place, or going on horseback, if necessary; but when he came back to his hotel or motel at night he wanted to be assured of the maximum comfort he could obtain.

And so, advised this leading world-travel agent, it is no good waiting for the tourist to come before we build our modern hotels and motels for, if we do that and the tourist comes and is not comfortably bedded down and accommodated, he will enjoy what he sees; he will enjoy his tripping about; but he will not enjoy his nights and his rest, and he will never come back. Indeed, what is worse, he will not advise anyone else to come here either.

The hotel or motel must make a gamble and be prepared to open up and have a couple of lean years while providing first-class accommodation so that, when the overseas tourist does come to that town or city, not only will he enjoy his tourist activities in the day-time but he will also feel at home at night. Then probably as well as wanting to come back himself he will certainly become an unpaid travel agent selling our Queensland tourist commodity for us.

If the bureau can issue a questionnaire designed to survey the Queensland tourist field, I feel sure the information derived from it will enable the hotel or the motel or the residential to build according to the standard required and, furthermore, to build where people from overseas, Americans and others, want to go and want to stay. I very seriously commend the questionnaire idea to the Director-General of the Tourist Bureau in spite of the ribaldry with which it was received in this Chamber.

Now I turn my attention to another subject, which, although not a pressing one at the moment, will become so, I believe, in the next few years, possibly within the lifetime of this Parliament. Hon. members will recall that on 18 April, 1961, the Hon. G. Freeth, Minister for the Interior in the Federal Government, moved a motion for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into, and report on, the voting rights of aboriginals. The motion moved was—

“(1) That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report on—

(a) whether the entitlement to enrolment and the right to vote presently conferred by the Commonwealth Electoral Act, 1918-1953 on persons referred to in section 39 of that Act should be extended with or without qualifications, restrictions or conditions to—

(i) all aboriginal natives of Australia, or

(ii) aboriginal natives of Australia included in particular classes, and, if so, what classes;

and, if so—

(b) The modifications, if any, that should be made to the provisions of that Act relating to enrolment or voting to provide for enrolment and voting by aboriginal natives or any particular classes of aboriginal natives.

“(2) That the Select Committee consist of seven members, four to be appointed by the Prime Minister and three to be appointed by the Leader of the Opposition.

“(3) That every appointment of a member of the Committee be forthwith notified in writing to the Speaker.

“(4) That the Chairman be one of the members appointed by the Prime Minister.

“(5) That the Chairman of the Committee may from time to time appoint another member of the Committee to be Deputy Chairman, and that the member so appointed act as Chairman of the Committee at any time when the Chairman is not present at a meeting of the Committee.

“(6) That the Chairman or the Deputy Chairman, when acting as Chairman, shall have a deliberative vote and, in the event of an equality of voting, a casting vote.

“(7) That the Select Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to sit during any adjournment of the House, and to move from place to place.

“(8) That the Committee report to the House not later than the 31st day of October, 1961.

“(9) That the foregoing provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the Standing Orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the Standing Orders.”

On the motion of Mr. Calwell (Leader of the Opposition) the following amendment was made, after debate:—

“Paragraph (8), at the end of the paragraph add the following words:—‘, and that any member of the Committee have power to add a protest or dissent to the report.’”

The motion, as amended, was agreed to.

The Select Committee that was subsequently appointed consisted of Mr. H. G. Pearce (Chairman), Mr. C. E. Barnes, Mr. P. G. Browne, Mr. P. Howson, all appointed by the Prime Minister, and Mr. K. E. Beasley, Mr. A. S. Luchetti, and Mr. J. N. Nelson, appointed by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Calwell.

The Committee travelled some 22,000 miles to obtain evidence from aboriginal people, welfare officers, clergy, school teachers, pastoralists, policemen, and others who had interested themselves in aboriginal affairs. Evidence, either oral or in writing, was taken from 327 witnesses, of whom 142 were descended from the original inhabitants of Australia.

The Committee met in the Australian Capital Territory, the Northern Territory, and all the mainland States of the Commonwealth. As a result of its investigations it made the following recommendations:—

“(1) That, because the aboriginal people in New South Wales and Victoria have long been integrated into the Australian community, early administrative action be taken so that the compulsory provisions of the Commonwealth Electoral Act relating to enrolment and voting be applied to them.

“(2) That wherever it is relevant for the Commonwealth Electoral Office to act upon the definition of an Australian aboriginal, that definition should be that which is the practice in the Northern Territory, namely, a person entirely of aboriginal descent.

“(3) That early action be taken by the Commonwealth Electoral Office to inform aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander servicemen and ex-servicemen, and people entitled to the franchise under the terms of the Attorney-General's memorandum to

the Commonwealth Electoral Officer of 25th January, 1929, of their entitlement to be enrolled and to vote."

The next recommendation is to be found at paragraph 77 of the report, and it concerns the right of aboriginals to vote at Commonwealth elections. It reads—

"Your Committee recommends that the Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918-1961 be amended to provide—

(1) That the right to vote at Commonwealth elections be accorded to all aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander subjects of the Queen, of voting age, permanently residing within the limits of the Commonwealth.

(2) That, for the time being, the enrolment of aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders be voluntary, but when enrolled, compulsory voting be enforced."

The final recommendations are in paragraphs 82 to 85. They read—

"82. Your Committee recommends that the matter of enrolment should not be left to welfare officers, private persons, organisations, or political parties and recommends that the administrative procedures of the Commonwealth Electoral Office be altered to provide for specially qualified electoral officers to receive personal applications for enrolment at places accessible to aborigines.

"83. It is recommended that the voluntary expression of a wish to enrol by an aboriginal to such officers, should be sufficient for them to help in the completion of an enrolment card.

"84. It is recommended by your Committee that a penal provision be inserted in the amending Act in respect of the use of duress or undue influence on aborigines in the exercise of their franchise.

"85. It is recommended that the procedures of voting and the structure of the Parliament be explained to aborigines on government settlements and on missions and other convenient locations. In this connexion well prepared visual aids and publications would be helpful."

On 15 and 16 June, 1961, this Select Committee of the Federal House met in Brisbane. It sat at the Cherbourg Aboriginal Settlement on 17 June, at Palm Island on 19 June, Townsville on 20 June, Cairns and the Mona Mona Mission on 21 June, Thursday Island on 22 June, and finally Weipa and Townsville again on 23 June.

I shall not mention any other places where the Select Committee met in other States of the Commonwealth because my interest in this subject relates entirely to the aboriginal question in Queensland, and it is the evidence given in Queensland at the places I have mentioned that relates to the problem here. However, I do want to

mention that evidence and submissions were heard and received from a range of witnesses extending from either Communism or the ultra-left to Anglican priests and public servants. Amongst some of the experienced and expert witnesses were people such as Mr. Con O'Leary, at that time Director of Native Affairs; Mr. Radford, Principal Electoral Officer; Reverend J. R. Sweet, Secretary of the Aboriginal and Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church; Mr. George Sturges, Superintendent of Cherbourg; and Mr. Roy Bartlam, Superintendent of Palm Island, both of whom I know personally and for whose experience, knowledge and integrity I have the highest regard; Sub-Inspector J. B. Chambers, at that time Protector of Aboriginals in the Townsville District; Mr. Keith Spence, Manager of the Aboriginal Hostel at Aitkenvale; Venerable Archdeacon C. G. Brown, Superintendent of St. Paul's Mission to the South Sea Islanders, Moa Island, and Archdeacon of Carpentaria; Right Reverend S. J. Matthews, Lord Bishop of Carpentaria; as well as such well-known native people as Mrs. Sylvia Cairns, Reverend Boggo Pilot, and the late Mr. Jeffrey Doolah.

It is interesting to note that of all the States Queensland has the third highest number of full-blood aboriginals.

Mr. Evans: And they are not recognised for tax-reimbursement purposes.

Mr. RAMSDEN: That is correct. Western Australia has the most, with 43.6 per cent., Northern Territory is next with 29.8 per cent., and Queensland, as I say, is in third place, with 19.5 per cent. of the total aboriginal population of the Commonwealth, which means that we had in Queensland—I am pleased that the Minister for Mines and Main Roads interjected—at 30 June, 1961, the date of the last census, something of the order of 10,325 full-blood aboriginals. When we add to these some 7,944 half-bloods and a further 8,009 Torres Strait Islanders, we see that the Commonwealth Select Committee on Voting Rights for Native People refers to the voting rights of some 26,278 people in Queensland, plus a further 1,120 full-bloods and 20,050 half-bloods exempted under the Act from the control of the State Department concerned—in other words, a total coloured population, exempted and unexempted, of 47,448. Not all of these, of course, would be of voting age. According to the 1962 Queensland Year Book, the latest issued, the total number of full-bloods has been slowly decreasing. For instance, full-bloods have declined from 14,000 in 1921 to 9,100 in 1947, excluding Torres Strait Islanders. On the other hand, half-bloods have been steadily increasing in number. For example, in the same period they increased from 3,090 in 1921 to 7,211 in 1947, again excluding Torres Strait Islanders.

Following the conclusion of the deliberations of the Select Committee to which I have referred, amendments were made in 1962 to the Commonwealth Electoral Act, which now provides for all aboriginals, including Torres Strait Islanders, to vote in Federal elections. The Federal Act, following these amendments, now provides for voluntary enrolment for our native people, but when they do choose to enrol, then, as with the white population, voting is compulsory. So far, of course, no similar provision has been made in our Queensland legislation. It is because I believe that, within a short period of time, this State will have to take cognisance of the Federal Act and the rights and privileges that it confers on our coloured people that I am speaking on this subject tonight.

In 1961-1962, through the Department of Health and Home Affairs, Queensland expended £803,529 on her coloured people; in 1962-1963 that amount had increased to £805,136, and a study of the Education Department's Estimates for this year shows an estimated expenditure of £860,317 on the native population of Queensland. Incidentally, I commend the Government for transferring the Native Affairs Division from Health to Education, for if these people are to ever take their full and proper place in the national life of Queensland and Australia, they will only do it following higher and better education than we have been prepared to give them in the past.

I said that sooner or later—perhaps sooner than we think—the State may have to bring its electoral legislation in regard to the native people into line with that of the Commonwealth. Mr. Luchetti, a member of the Commonwealth Select Committee, when questioning a superintendent of one of our settlements in Queensland, asked in paragraph 1280 on page 88 of the Minutes of Evidence in Part II of the Report—

“Would it not be an interesting situation, if, following our report, the Commonwealth granted the vote to the people here (i.e. on the settlement), but the State retained its present opposition so that they would not be eligible to vote in the State elections?”

The superintendent replied, “It would be most interesting!” The interesting situation spoken of has not yet arisen, because since the amending legislation no Commonwealth election has been held. But the Federal election on 30 November next will be the first to take place in which those of age of these 47,500 people who desire to do so, will be casting their first vote and experiencing a taste of electoral responsibility. Then, after that taste and that experience, the interesting situation spoken of will arise if no provision is made for them to vote in State elections. I believe that now that the Commonwealth has legislated as it has

in this regard, the State, whether it likes it or not, will have to legislate along similar lines to give our native people the franchise.

It would be quite irrational if the native people could cast a vote for the National Parliament, with its many and dangerous international responsibilities, and yet were denied the right to vote for a State Parliament which cannot possibly do too much of a dangerous nature because the Commonwealth holds the purse strings. I am not the only one who thinks Queensland will now be forced to take cognisance of the franchise bestowed on aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders.

On page 65 of Part II of the report of the Select Committee on Voting Rights of Aboriginals, Minutes of Evidence, Mr. Beasley, another member, in paragraph 730, is quoted as asking a reputable public servant who gave evidence this question—

“If the Commonwealth is to proceed to legislate to provide full voting rights for all people of the aboriginal race, or other people partly of aboriginal race at present excluded, do you think any State Government could retain restrictions, or do you think that the State restrictions would be untenable?”

The answer was—

“You have heard the Mission restrictions criticised here. You know the Mission procedure and you would know that voting rights would cut across that existing procedure. It is a matter of State law whether those existing restrictions are all necessary or not. It is a matter for me and for you at State level, but very definitely to impose a Federal law on top of existing State restrictions would cause conflict.”

Then, in paragraph 731, question 7, this question was asked—

“But it would be a Federal law relating only to the Federal electorate?”

The answer was—

“Yes, but take people going into settlements, for instance. Immediately all that gets thrown into the discard.”

The next question in paragraph 732 asks—

“You think, in other words, that the position of the States would become untenable if they had to follow the Commonwealth?”

The answer is, “That is right.”

The policy of Governments in Queensland, irrespective of their political flavour, has been clear and purposeful. Their aim has been, and still is, the ultimate assimilation of all native peoples, full or mixed bloods, into the community life of the State. But nothing in that policy can be said to be an impetuous forcing of people to change their environment while they are unwilling to accept the

responsibility of full citizenship. I appreciate that in some quarters, particularly amongst left-wing groups who are attempting to stir up trouble with and among our native people, Queensland is said to have a restrictive and harsh policy for aboriginals. I do not believe that to be so. In fact, one aboriginal on a settlement gave evidence to the Select Committee that the Queensland Government was too soft and spoonfed the native people too much.

On the last occasion that I was in Western Australia, which has the largest native population of all the States, I asked the Hon. Roy Abby, M.L.C., to take me to see the way the natives in that State were living. He took me out to Beverley, where he lived, and there, on the outskirts of the township, were three or four galvanised-iron huts. In these fairly primitive huts resided a number of aboriginal families. I said to Mr. Abby, "Do all of your aboriginals live in conditions like these, or have you got settlements?" He said, "No, we have no settlements. Some are in worse ones." In other words, Western Australia had no settlements like Palm Island or Cherbourg, and I mentally thought how much more protected and better cared for were our natives in Queensland than those I saw on the outskirts of Beverley.

Prior to the war I lived in a mid-western village near Dubbo, in New South Wales. Every week I used to drive into Dubbo, and as I crossed the Macquarie River I was ashamed to see the squalor and misery in which the natives lived under odd sheets of rusted iron and bags. One could see the same thing on the Murray, at Mildura in Victoria. When people from Victoria or the other southern States tell me, as they sometimes do, "You people in Queensland deserve to be castigated because of your harsh restrictions on the natives", I compare what I saw at Beverley, Dubbo and Mildura with the comfortable living quarters, the health organisation and the social security that I saw our natives enjoying at Cherbourg and Palm Island. I know in my heart that although in Queensland we may be somewhat restricting the freedom of unexempted natives, at least we are not giving them the unrestricted freedom to earn money by the sweat of their limbs only to be robbed of their earnings by their unscrupulous fellows, whether white or native; the unrestricted freedom to roam from town to town in search of work, having nowhere to sleep, with empty, gnawing bellies; on the contrary, we are restricting their freedom to ensure that whilst they themselves want our protection we will give it to them and protect them not only from parasites who would prey on them, but even from themselves.

(Leave to continue speech tomorrow granted.)

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 9.56 p.m.