

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 15 OCTOBER 1964

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BALD HILLS ROAD, SANDGATE, FOR HOUSING COMMISSION.—Mr. Dean, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Lands,—

Has his Department acquired land at Bald Hills Road, Bracken Ridge, Sandgate, on behalf of the Queensland Housing Commission from the firm of Barkley Investments (Qld) or any other investment company? If not, does his Department intend to acquire land in the locality referred to in the near future?

Answer:—

“My Department has not acquired land at Bald Hills Road, Bracken Ridge, Sandgate, on behalf of the Queensland Housing Commission, nor do I have knowledge of any intention by my Department to acquire land in that locality.”

REVENUE FROM SALE OF PROPERTY, CLOSED RAILWAY LINES.—Mr. Lloyd, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

What revenue was received in the last financial year from the sale of equipment and land resulting from the closure of Railway lines?

Answer:—

“The amount involved is £107,442 6s. 2d. I would point out to the Honourable Member, however, and to other Honourable Members, and also for the information of the public, that this amount does not actually find its way into Railway revenue, but after deduction of any expenses involved in the disposal of the assets the residue is returned to the Loan Account and the Loan Account reduced accordingly.”

THURSDAY, 15 OCTOBER, 1964

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

QUESTIONS

ISSUE OF UNIFORMS TO PRISON OFFICERS.—Mr. Coburn for Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) Is it a fact that the usual issues of uniforms and boots for staff employed at State prisons are well behind schedule and, if so, is there any particular reason for this?

(2) If the issue of uniforms and boots falls too far behind schedule as to become farcical, will prison staff be paid cash in lieu of uniforms as has been done in the Railway Department?

Answer:—

“There has been some delay in the issue of uniforms to prison officers. This is due to several factors, including the change to a new type of uniform, and re-organisation of the Tailor Shop. The issue of boots to prison officers is not behind Schedule. Action is now in hand to overcome the delay in the issue of uniforms.”

TRAFFIC-PATROL POLICE.—Mr. Bennett, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

(1) Is he aware that on Monday, October 12, 1964, no traffic patrol policemen were available for duty in the inner city?

(2) Was this absence of patrol men responsible for the traffic “snarl” and congestion that occurred at the corner of North Quay and Turbot Street, which lasted for over one hour and inconvenienced thousands of workers?

(3) Is he doing anything to bring the numbers of traffic patrol men up to the required strength?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) “These are matters coming within the purview of my colleague, the Minister for Mines and Main Roads who administers the Traffic Acts.”

(3) “The strength of the Police Force including the number who perform duty on motor car and motor cycle patrols is constantly under review. Furthermore, as a

result of the re-arrangement of the Police Force presently taking place, it will be possible to allocate some additional personnel to traffic duties."

JUVENILE CRIME.—Mr. Bennett, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

Will he give full particulars of juvenile crime, including the number, type and places of offences for the years 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963 and to September 30, 1964?

Answer:—

"The exact extent to which juveniles commit crime is of course unknown, and consequently the only information which can be supplied is in relation to the number of juveniles who in a given period appeared before courts or were cautioned (in lieu of court proceedings), and the number of offences in relation to which they so appeared before court or were so cautioned, together with a dissection of the types of offences for which juveniles appeared before court or were cautioned. It is not possible without hours of work to pinpoint the exact places in Queensland at which the offences, the subject of court proceedings or warnings, were committed. I do not propose to utilise police manpower to do this. However, I table a statement containing certain statistical information concerning juvenile crime as at June 30 for the years 1960 to 1964. It is not possible to give figures for the period July 1, 1964, to September, 30, 1964. It is worthy to note from this statement that there has been a decrease in the last twelve months regarding the number of juveniles before the court and cautioned and the number of offences. Juveniles in these cases refer to persons under twenty-one years of age. I would also refer the Honourable Member to the information contained in annual reports of the Director, State Children Department."

Paper.—Whereupon Mr. Dewar laid upon the Table of the House the statement referred to.

AWARDING OF BONUS PAYMENTS BY INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION.—Mr. Hanlon, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

In view of his claim on October 13, 1964, that certain unions have preferred "to by-pass the Commission with the obvious intention of the destruction of the present system of industrial arbitration", why did his Government in 1961 amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to legislatively by-pass the Commission by forbidding it to award any further bonus payments, providing that such bonus payments should be a matter for negotiation between employer and employee, and allowing the Commission only to reduce or abrogate, but not increase, bonus payments existing at the time of the amendment?

Answer:—

"The circumstances and reasons associated with the 'amendment' referred to were explained, considered and debated during stages of the passage of the Bill concerned through this Chamber. For the information of the Honourable Member, I also point out that under the present Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts, 'bonus payment' is defined as—A payment by way of the division of the profits of an industry or undertaking, being a payment in excess of a just wage including all proper allowances such as are ordinarily and usually prescribed by an award or industrial agreement. Reference to this definition in the light of the Parliamentary Debate and a studied observance of what constitutes a 'bonus payment' should, of itself, be an Answer to the Question of the Honourable Member."

INCREASES IN BASIC WAGE AND SALARIES OF INDUSTRIAL COMMISSIONERS.—Mr. Hanlon, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

What are the respective increases in the following since August 3, 1957, in (a) the State weekly basic wage for adult males (Brisbane), (b) the weighted average minimum weekly wage rate for adult males in Queensland as prescribed in awards and determinations, (c) the salary expressed per week of the Judge of the Supreme Court who performs the duties of President of the Industrial Court and (d) the salary expressed per week of a Commissioner of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission or, as known prior to the 1961-amendment, a member of the Industrial Court?

Answer:—

"(a) I lay upon the Table of the House a statement containing this information. (b) It is not clear what information the Honourable Member requires as awards of the State Industrial Commission do not prescribe weighted average minimum weekly wage rates. However awards of the State Industrial Commission do contain cost of living parities which at August 3, 1957, were as follows:—

	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Southern Division—		
(Western District)	7	4
Mackay Division	5	6
Northern Division—		
(Eastern District)	10	0
(Western District)	17	4
As from February 2, 1959, the foregoing parities were increased as follows:—		
	<i>£</i>	<i>s. d.</i>
Southern Division—		
(Western District)	10	6
Mackay Division	9	0
Northern Division—		
(Eastern District)	10	6
(Western District)	1	12 6

In some awards the cost of living parities vary by a few pence. (*c* and *d*) This information is obtainable from the Estimates for the respective financial years which are available to the Honourable Member."

Paper.—Whereupon, Mr. Dewar laid upon the Table of the House the statement referred to.

VESSELS SCUTTLED FOR BREAKWATERS.—Mr. Newton, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) What was the number of dredges and harbour work craft scuttled by his Department in Moreton Bay and other bays in the State to form small boat anchorages and breakwaters, &c.?

(2) What were the names of these dredges and craft?

(3) Were such dredges and craft offered for sale or as scrap metal before being scuttled?

(4) In what other parts of the State have other vessels been scuttled by his Department apart from Moreton Bay?

Answers:—

The practice of scuttling obsolete and useless craft is probably as old as the port itself. Ample evidence of the practice is to be found on the Fisherman Islands at the mouth of the Brisbane River. Here, reclamation has built up around vessels scuttled earlier this century. I assume the Honourable Member does not desire me to go back to those early days in obtaining the information he desires. When I assumed the office of Treasurer, I inherited some legacies of doubtful merit. One such legacy was a number of broken down and useless craft lying at anchor in "Rotten Row" immediately downstream of Cairncross Dock. I had these vessels surveyed and, on the recommendation of my expert marine officers, I disposed of a number of them. These were useless craft, lying at anchor and costing some thousands of pounds a year to keep afloat. If they had sunk at their moorings because of old age, they would have been a menace to shipping in the port and would have been most costly to move. As an example, the old "Maryborough" was 78 years old at the date of scuttling. In scuttling, I decided to see the craft serve a useful purpose. They were thus towed to Tangalooma and sunk in a position where they constituted a necessary shelter for small craft. I assume the Honourable Member is referring to this matter and I answer his Question as follows:—

(1) "Seven (7)."

(2) "Suction Dredge 'Remora,' Bucket Dredge 'Maryborough,' Self-propelled Barges 'Dolphin' and 'Bream,' Anchor Launch 'Kookaburra' and two unnamed punts."

(3) "Yes, except in case of 'Kookaburra' and the two punts. Tenders had already been called for disposal of the larger vessels without satisfactory tenders being received. The three smaller vessels were also scuttled, as the calling of tenders was considered a waste of time."

(4) "No other parts of the State."

VENUE FOR HEARING LAND VALUATION APPEALS.—Mr. Newton, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

(1) Is he aware that the Valuer-General's Department is expecting ratepayers, including pensioners, to travel from Coolumb and other places of similar distance to have their appeals heard in Brisbane?

(2) Will he have the appeals heard in the nearest town to these localities or see that the appellants are reimbursed for fares incurred in coming to Brisbane for the hearings?

Answer:—

"The Valuer-General's Department has no control over the place of hearing appeals against the Department's valuations. The place of hearing is fixed by the Land Court which hears all such appeals."

INSPECTION OF ELECTRICAL INSTALLATIONS IN GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.—Mr. O'Donnell, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

As a fire protection measure, will he consider the appointment of full-time qualified electricians to inspect thoroughly and frequently the electrical wiring and fittings in State Government buildings with particular attention to be paid to wooden structures such as State Schools, official residences, &c.?

Answer:—

"There is no need to appoint full-time qualified electricians to inspect thoroughly and frequently the electrical wiring and fittings in State Government buildings as the practices and procedures in force meet all reasonable safety requirements and provide for adequate safeguard of life and property. The procedures provide for the inspection and testing monthly of all portable electrical tools owned and used by the Department of Works and for the earth continuity of all power outlets in Depots and Workshops and on all building construction jobs to be tested at six-monthly intervals. All electrical equipment in Vocational Training Sections of schools is required to be inspected and tested three times a year. Provision is also made in the procedures for all installations to be inspected and tested before connection to supply, for testing of earth continuity of all permanent outlets when construction of

additions to existing buildings is taking place and for the permanent wiring in all Government buildings which are required to be maintained by the Department of Works to be inspected and tested once every five years."

CLOSURE OF POLICE STATIONS IN ROCKHAMPTON AREA.—Mr. Thackeray, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

As there is discontent over rumours that police stations are to be closed in the Rockhampton area and surrounding district, are any police stations to be closed, what stations are they and when will closure take effect?

Answer:—

"This information has been given to the House in reply to a Question asked by the Honourable Member for Cook on October 7, 1964."

LIQUOR LICENSE FOR NORTH QUEENSLAND GOLF ASSOCIATION.—Mr. Coburn for Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) Upon application will the North Queensland Golfing Association be granted a liquor license for the club-house to be erected on the portion to be excised from the Town Common, Townsville?

(2) If so, what other North Queensland sporting bodies or associations will be granted a liquor license for their club-house, if an application is made?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The granting of liquor licenses is a function of the Licensing Commission in accordance with the provisions of *"The Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1961."* Any application for a liquor license which might be made by the North Queensland Golfing Association or any other North Queensland sporting body or association would therefore be a matter for consideration by the Commission."

MARKET FOR COAL IN INDIA.—Mr. Hanson, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a recent statement attributed to Mr. B. W. Hartnell that India was a potential large export market for Australian coal?

(2) If so, has his Department investigated the possibility with regard to specifications and quantities desired?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "Mr. Hartnell's statement was based on a report made by an Australian coal delegation which visited India in 1963. The

delegation's report, which details specifications and quantities, has been made available to me. Whilst it appears there are no immediate prospects of sales of coking coal from Australia to India, that country's expansion programme envisages importing substantial quantities of coking coal. If such programme eventuates, Queensland will be in a favourable position to make a strong bid for a substantial share of the trade."

IMPROVEMENT OF SOUTHERDEN, DEAGON AND BRISBANE STREETS INTERSECTION, SANDGATE.—Mr. Dean, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

Has the Main Roads Department any plans to improve the dangerous intersection of Southerden, Deagon and Brisbane Streets, Sandgate, which is part of the Clontarf main road? If so, when will the desired improvements be carried out?

Answer:—

"The intersection referred to by the Honourable Member is not on the declared Clontarf Main Road. However, a plan has been prepared to improve the intersection by channelising it. The cost of the work is to be borne by the Brisbane City Council and by the Traffic Commission, and as soon as the Council's confirmation of this arrangement is received, it will be requested to put in hand its part of the job."

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the State Electricity Commission of Queensland for the year 1963-64.

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Balance Sheet of the Coal Mine Workers' Pensions Fund for the year 1963-64.

ORDER IN CHAMBER DURING QUESTION TIME

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! When hon. members cease cross-firing I shall call for the next question.

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) having commenced to give notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much talking in the Chamber. I desire to hear the questions.

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) having commenced to give notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members on my left are continuing to talk. I ask them please to be quiet.

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) having commenced to give notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the hon. member.

Mr. THACKERAY having given notice of his question—

Was that good enough?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There was no need for the hon. member for Rockhampton North to pass any qualifying remark at the conclusion of his question. I asked the hon. member to speak up because I could not hear him, and I am quite sure that the "Hansard" reporters could not hear him, either. Unfortunately it appears to be the practice of many hon. members when reading their questions to speak with their heads down. By so doing, they make it very difficult both for the "Hansard" staff and myself to hear them.

COMMON LAW PRACTICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Dr. Delamothe, read a third time.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT— RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

(Mr. Hodges, Gympie, in the chair)

Debate resumed from 13 October (see p. 715) on Mr. Hiley's motion—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1964-65, a sum not exceeding £1,716 to defray the salary of Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor."

Mr. DIPLOCK (Aubigny) (11.30 a.m.): At the outset, I wish to refer to an article appearing in "Sunday Truth" dated 4 October. The article is headed "Foreign firm gets 30 homes.", and the heading was so obvious that I think the attention of every hon. member would have been attracted by it. In the article it is stated—

"The Commission is building the homes—20 almost immediately and 10 at a later date—at Tin Can Bay for the Titanium Alloy Manufacturing Company. The company will guarantee the rent of the premises to the Commission and simply take charge."

It is further reported that the Housing Minister, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, told "Sunday Truth" that the Housing Commission had received land from the Land Administration Commission at Tin Can Bay, and was clearing and preparing it for 20 homes. He further said, "We think this is a worthwhile industry and the company, unlike many, is building in an area outside the

metropolitan area." The Minister also said, "We believe in encouraging this type of industry as much as possible".

I have no criticism to offer against the Minister or the Commissioner, or against the Commission's action, if this help were given to Queensland firms, because—

(1) I believe that decentralisation of industry is necessary;

(2) That to attract workers from the city an employer must be in a position to guarantee accommodation for them; and

(3) That except for an unforeseen emergency the Commission runs no risk financially.

I point out to the Minister, however, that the Government has been much more helpful to this foreign company than it has been to a virtually all-Australian and, until a couple of months ago, a virtually all-Queensland company with which I am associated. To be fair to the Minister, I place on record the fact that the present Minister for Works and Housing has actually given some assistance—not much, but some—whereas no assistance was ever given by the former Minister for Works and Housing, to my knowledge, anyway. Last October arrangements were made for Napier Bros. to rent seven houses. To date—that is, 12 months afterwards—four of these have been completed, and are at present occupied by company employees. We were then promised another six houses, but I have been informed recently by the Minister that because of lack of finance these houses, for which tenders have already been called, will not be proceeded with for some time.

Mr. Mann: They are giving the finance to overseas companies and big monopolies.

Mr. DIPLOCK: The hon. member will hear about that later, too.

Napier Bros. Ltd. has a work force of 240, but we could easily place in full employment another 50 tradesmen if we could offer them accommodation. Our business has expanded to such an extent that I can confidently say that this number could be doubled within six months. Because of the scarcity of skilled tradesmen in this State we advertised farther afield—in Sydney and Melbourne—and hon. members will be amazed to learn that we had applications for positions from 350 skilled tradesmen. Our staff officers screened the applications, checked the qualifications of each, and after interviews decided on 50 top tradesmen. These men have been told of the accommodation problem with which we are confronted and are being brought to Queensland progressively as soon as we can secure suitable accommodation for them. We were not relying on the State to provide all that accommodation. I am pleased to announce that we have already living in Dalby 15 skilled tradesmen who, a few months ago, lived in Melbourne. The firm has found

houses for them by paying exorbitant rentals, but we feel we have to do this in the interests of the business.

Previous to seeing this article in "Sunday Truth" I had not offered a great deal of criticism against the Government because I understand that requests are coming from everywhere; but when I read it I thought it was time for me to do a little research and to disclose in this Chamber something of the results of that research. The State is crying out for this type of worker and we could secure them if the Government were as helpful to us as it evidently intends to be to this foreign firm.

In justifying the Government's action of building these houses, the Minister claims: "We think this is a worth-while industry"—probably it is—"and the company, unlike many, is building in an area outside the metropolitan area." This may be quite right, but let us compare the two companies' activities and decide which has the greater claim to being worth while and see if we can justify the marked difference in treatment being meted out to each of them.

Here is the comparison—

(a) They are both built in areas removed from the capital and thus they both assist in decentralisation.

(b) The Dalby company pays heavy freights both to and from the port. The foreign company probably will pay freight only to the port, but that is problematical because road transport could be used.

(c) The Dalby company probably pays a very much bigger work force a very much greater amount of wages than the foreign company will do and this money will be spent almost solely in Queensland.

Here is a very important point—

(d) The Dalby company is there to stay and its fixed assets in the State will increase. If the company that is being so greatly helped by the Government follows its usual form it will remain at Tin Can Bay only as long as the raw material is procurable there, and then, like the turtle, pick up its moveable assets and go elsewhere. When I quote figures later, hon. members will know that I am not guessing.

To compare the companies' finances—

(e) The Dalby company, with a paid-up capital of virtually £500,000 and note issues to the value of £124,000 at the time, faced a crisis approximately two years ago and was nearly strangled by another company that endeavoured to take it over. It has fought its way back to prosperity and is now definitely making sound progress. This progress is hampered by the lack of accommodation for extra workers, who are vitally necessary. Although we have made profits we have not as yet been able to pay the shareholder any dividend; however, we have been able to reorganise our work. We have been able to provide amenities for

the men, but we certainly are not yet in a position to undertake a house-building project of our own.

(f) The company to whom the Government intends to give much greater assistance is in a wonderful financial position. I do not know a company in a better position. It is well able to help itself and provide its own houses for workers. This it would probably do if it thought that it would operate permanently at Tin Can Bay.

I should like the hon. members to pay particular attention to these figures. According to its balance sheet for the period ended December 1962, which is the latest I have been able to examine, this company has an authorised capital of £100,000, but I assume, because of great profitability, it has not been found necessary to issue more than 9,502 £1 shares.

The Profit and Loss Appropriation Account showed that as at 31 December, 1962 there were undistributed profits—not profits paid to shareholders, not profits paid to other overseas interests, but undistributed profits—held by the company, which up to this time had been in existence for approximately 11 years, to the value of £691,741. In 1963 the recommended dividend payable to it by its subsidiary company—Mineral Deposits Pty. Ltd.—was £48,000. This represents a return for that year alone to Titanium Alloy Manufacturing Coy. of over 500 per cent. on its issued capital. This is the company which requires the Government assistance.

There is another story. Its fixed assets were then valued at £46,205, after it had written off buildings and plant amounting to £246,884. After 11 years' operation the company wrote off plant and buildings which it regarded as valueless. Their value was shown as nil because the company always follows the same plan. It gets what it can from the sand and then moves on. It had investments in other companies of £480,000. Fancy a company in this position wanting Government assistance! Listen to this: its current assets were then £205,134, including £64,846 in cash. The current liabilities at the time were £23,493, plus £6,603 provision for income tax. The ratio between current assets and current liabilities was 9 to 1. I think the Treasurer will agree that such a ratio would be the envy of 99 per cent. of the companies in Australia. Most companies are happy if they show a ratio of 2 to 1. When the new board took over Napier Bros. the ratio was 0·8 to 1, although it is much better than that now. Fancy a company with a ratio of current assets to liabilities of 9 to 1 wanting help from anybody. It could at once build 30 houses out of its own funds and would not miss the cost. If it follows past practices, when it has taken the minerals from the sand it will move on leaving the 30 houses there.

It is very interesting to note that, although I have quoted figures which I think will amaze most hon. members, this company probably has access to much larger funds. It is also interesting to note that the American director on the board of this company is also president of the National Lead Company, of the United States. I cannot say that this company is a subsidiary of the National Lead Company, because it is registered in New South Wales. However, I am having a search made and we will then be able to ascertain where a lot of the funds are going. I think I am reasonable when I assert that, if it wished, the company could call on far greater resources than I have disclosed. This preferential treatment afforded to an enormously wealthy outside company should make every supporter of the Government wonder what is going on. It seems that, somewhere along the line, with the alarming scarcity of houses in all parts of Queensland, someone has blundered.

I feel sure that the Treasurer would be disappointed if I were to resume my seat without making some reference to the reply that the hon. member for Condamine got from him when he asked a question in three parts about the T.A.B. This is the first opportunity I have had to refer to this question about the T.A.B. directed to the Treasurer by the hon. member on 10 September. Before I had time to study it I thought it was of the same pattern as those usually asked by Government members when they wish to give Ministers an opportunity to make a certain point, or to gain credit for themselves in respect of some particular project. Despite the Treasurer's fantastic flair for painting beautiful figure-pictures, the first and second parts of the question, which read—

"(1) Has he evidence to determine that since the introduction of legalised betting there has in fact been an increase in off-course betting?"

"(2) Can he make a comparison of off-course betting for the period from January 1, 1964, to June 30, 1964, as against the previous six months in the towns of Dalby, Oakey, Chinchilla and Jandowae?"—

obviously it could not be answered definitely by him, nor could they be answered by any reliable person, because there was no available data which would enable an answer to be given.

I felt very sorry for my old friend, the hon. member for Condamine, on the morning that the Treasurer answered these questions, because I believe, and believe very sincerely, that he did not expect the answer to question 3 which the Treasurer proudly gave to the House. I felt a little sorry for my old mate also because I thought he must have been disappointed on that morning. He reminded me of the little boy who made a kite which looked so big and important, but when he took it to school he found it would not fly.

In his reply to question (1) asked by the hon. member, which read—

"Has he evidence to determine that since the introduction of legalised betting there has in fact been an increase in off-course betting?"

the Treasurer paid no regard to the greatly increased turnover which in the year 1963-64, according to the Press reports that I have here, amounted to £9,709,364; nor will the Treasurer have any regard for the fact that according to a Press report the turnover for the first three months of this financial year was £3,185,645, compared with a turnover of £2,015,708 invested over the corresponding period last year. This was an increase of £1,169,937 in a three-monthly period, yet the Treasurer says there is no evidence to persuade the Government that the overall volume of betting has increased. There is an old and very true saying: "Figures can't lie, but liars can figure."

Mr. Mann: Are you suggesting that the Treasurer is a liar?

Mr. DIPLOCK: No. I do not for one moment think that the Treasurer believes that the figures quoted are released to create a wrong impression in the public eye, so the only logical conclusion is that the Government will never be convinced that the volume of betting has increased, and is increasing, irrespective of what volume the business of the T.A.B. reaches.

In his reply the Treasurer concedes the point that there was no information as to the volume of business previously conducted by illegal operators. It can be seen from the answer that the Treasurer cannot say he has an idea how much it is, and he knows he cannot say how much, but he is prepared to accept this tremendous increase, and further anticipated increases, as a natural sequence to the closing down of the off-course bookmakers. This would be just as logical, and just as factual, as it would be to suggest that the fantastic millions going through the poker machines in New South Wales were simply the result of channelling into that source the money that was being used previously in card games such as poker, in two-up, and in other gambling games.

The answer to question (3) asked by the hon. member for Condamine was the one which really caused me to be disappointed with the Treasurer. He fights, and generally fights hard and fair, but whilst he might have gained the approbation and smiles of some hon. members on the Government side by his answer, I can assure him that quite a number of decent men on that side of the Chamber did not appreciate his answer any more than I feel sure the hon. member for Condamine did.

Question (3) was—

“In view of the improved standard of racing in these centres,—”

(they being Dalby, Oakey, Chinchilla, and Jandowae)

“—due no doubt to increased prize money, what amount in the way of reimbursement from T.A.B. operations has been paid to these respective clubs?”

The Treasurer replied that Dalby had received £1,126, Oakey £275, Chinchilla £28, and Jandowae £52. Whether the standard of racing has improved considerably in the centres mentioned, I do not know. I want to make it perfectly clear that, if its improvement depends on the growth of the T.A.B., I do not care, either. To me, the sport of kings must have been weak if the amounts mentioned—or, for that matter, much greater amounts—spread over the number of meetings in a year, caused an improved standard in the racing. I would say that the racing must have been very weak in those centres.

Mr. Sullivan: If you check the T.A.B. report you will find that it is considerably more.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I assure the hon. member for Condamine that I am quite prepared to accept the Treasurer's answer as correct.

If the Treasurer and the hon. member for Condamine assess the improved standard of racing—that is, if there is an improved standard—as justification for the introduction of the T.A.B. in Queensland, they are entitled to their opinions. If those gentlemen consider that being able to make certain hand-outs to race clubs justifies the effect of the T.A.B. on the industrial, social, and moral welfare of the community, again they are entitled to their opinions.

Strange, but true, the Premier once had the same thoughts as I on the matter, because on 23 November, 1954, when he was, of course, on this side of the Chamber, he said, as recorded in “Hansard”, Volume 210, page 1564—

“I should say that it is an incontrovertible fact, notwithstanding the Treasurer's argument,—”

(the Treasurer was then Mr. Walsh)

“—that betting shops can serve no useful purpose whatsoever, but, on the other hand, must be detrimental to the industrial, social and moral welfare of the community.”

I am very proud to say that the Premier and I agree, although our agreement may be in different terms, different places, and at different times. I say how right he was then.

In his speech, the hon. member for Condamine made it perfectly clear that he was very much in favour of the establishment of the T.A.B., and was proud of its increasing activities.

Mr. Sullivan: I am.

Mr. DIPLOCK: He is as entitled to his opinion as I am to mine. He has certainly cleared up one point, namely, that the responsibility for its introduction and effect in the community does not lie solely with the horrible Liberals, as some people in my electorate have been led to believe.

In his speech the hon. member said—

“After having heard the criticism that has been levelled at the Government and after having seen the report of the T.A.B., it amazes me that people should be so foolish as to utter such statements.”

My only reply to that is—I say it quite sincerely—“God help Queensland, and Queenslanders, if the yardstick by which the worthiness of a project is to be measured is whether it is a financial success.” This would take us back to the days when it was said, “It must be good and right; we are getting great profits from it.”; when workers were sweated for long hours and enjoyed no amenities in order that the business might return high profits.

At this point, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am not suggesting for one moment that the hon. member for Condamine would think along those lines, because I know that he is a good employer. However, I also wish to make it clear to certain gentlemen in the Dalby district that my thoughts and actions on any matter will not be influenced by the criticism of certain would-be graziers who strut around the race-course, sporting binoculars, which they probably acquired on hire purchase, anyway. When attending the Oakey Cup meeting a week or two ago I was accosted by a couple of these gentlemen, one of whom claimed to have discussed the matter with the hon. member for Condamine, and my right to criticise the T.A.B. was challenged—to be fair, I should say that it was not challenged by the hon. member for Condamine—because certain race clubs were assisted by the T.A.B. I am not influenced by the amount of assistance these clubs receive.

Mr. Duggan: When was this occasion on which they accosted him? Since he became a member of the Government, or when he opposed the Government candidate?

Mr. Sullivan: He was not referring to me. He was referring to some would-be graziers walking around and carrying binoculars bought on hire purchase.

Mr. DIPLOCK: If everybody has finished, I will continue my speech. As I said, my right to criticise was not challenged by the hon. member for Condamine. We frequently go to our electorates and return to Brisbane on the plane together, and we discuss these matters in quite a friendly way.

Mr. Sullivan: It could not have been me. I haven't a pair of binoculars.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order! I ask the hon. member for Aubigny to address the Chair.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I forgot you were there, for a moment. I apologise, Mr. Hodges.

As I said, my right to criticise was challenged because certain race clubs were assisted by the T.A.B. I wish the clubs every success, but I was of the opinion, and I still am, that this miserable hand-out does not balance the ill-effects of the T.A.B. on the economy of the country and the hardship it brings to many wives and children, who are denied many of the good things of life because Dad repeatedly loses his money through the T.A.B.

Proceeding further with the Treasurer's reply to Question (3), he said—very piously, I understand—"Might I add that the spectacle of the hon. member for Aubigny deploring the moral problem of T.A.B. operation is one calculated to make the angels weep." On browsing through previous speeches made by the Treasurer, I noticed that quite often he introduces the names of the prophets and other biblical names and I wondered why he was unique in this respect. Could it be that he is endeavouring to shroud himself with a holy atmosphere, and that at the next election we can expect another gimmick? Hon. members know as well as I do that at the last election the Country Party sold, in wholesale fashion, "Honest Frank". At the next election, if the Liberal Party sells the graces of "Holy Tom", what a combination the Government will have. Taking his speech literally, if the angels could weep they would indeed have cause to cry—the carpet would be destroyed—because of their being linked with the next part of the Treasurer's reply which, but for your attentive supervision, Mr. Hodges, I would call a deliberate lie. But knowing that to be unparliamentary and how quickly you would call me to order, I am going to describe it as a deliberate evasion of the truth designed to divert the people's attention from my criticism of the T.A.B. However, the Government can rest assured that the numerous letters which I have received from all parts of Queensland prove to me, if not to other members of this Chamber, that my opinion of the T.A.B. is shared by many others.

The Treasurer said—

"He has never concealed from the House that he is himself a great punter. His only representations to me in relation to racing have been to protect the off-course bookmaker."

At no time, Mr. Hodges, have I ever claimed to be a great punter, nor have I ever had sufficient spare cash to be one. Before entering this Parliament I belonged to the teaching profession, and I can assure the Treasurer that that is not nearly as lucrative as the profession of public accountant. I have never endeavoured to hide the fact that I attend the races when I feel so inclined, and have a modest bet when I wish to. When criticising the T.A.B. on a previous occasion, I made known the fact that for a number of years I was president of the

Warwick Turf Club. I have the honour, too, of being an honorary life member of that club and I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not offering, and have never offered, criticism against racing, or those who attend race meetings. However, I have taken every opportunity to criticise the action of certain Ministers who gulled the people of this State and particularly those who belonged to various religious organisations into thinking that the T.A.B. was introduced to curb betting, and eventually reduce it to a minimum, whilst at the same time, they are allowing to develop at an alarming rate an instrumentality which makes it easy for, and almost encourages, young people and people who previously were not interested in racing to bet.

When the Treasurer says that the only time I approached him in relation to racing was to protect an off-course bookmaker, I must say to him, and say it very sincerely, that he is guilty of a cunningly concealed half-truth. On the one occasion I spoke to him about racing, we were walking from the dining-room. A week previously, a licensed off-course bookmaker—not an S.P. man—was advised that he would have to cease operating because his place of business was within a certain distance of the Dalby T.A.B. office. I refer to a licensed bookmaker in the electorate of the hon. member for Condamine, who would know to whom I am referring. I advised the Treasurer that a few prominent horse-owners living in the area had complained that the restriction would be most inconvenient to them. He suggested to me a certain course of action for them, which I did not relay to them, because I considered, after thinking it over, that it would be dangerous to do so. There was no necessity for me to do so, because neither they nor the registered bookmaker concerned had asked me to make representations on their behalf.

Mr. Coburn: Tell us what the advice was.

Mr. DIPLOCK: If a man gives me advice in confidence, I treat it with confidence.

For a moment, let us consider the Treasurer's statement as truthful. I do not know whether he took this into consideration. I definitely did not make any representations. I have related what actually took place.

Mr. Hiley: You merely asked me if I could protect him for his licence.

Mr. DIPLOCK: He was not just an off-course fellow; he was a registered bookmaker. That is a point the Treasurer has forgotten. We will consider that his statement was truthful. We then have this position: one of my constituents finds himself in trouble; he approaches me to make representations to the Treasurer on his behalf. I do so and then the Treasurer divulges to the House the business on which I interviewed him. This is supposing it were true. He certainly did not divulge the name of the party I

was supposed to represent, not because he would not have done so, if he could, but because I did not make representations on anyone's behalf.

Mr. Hiley: You told me where he was.

Mr. DIPLOCK: If the Treasurer spoke the truth can you, Mr. Hodges, or any other hon. member, imagine any action more unethical or unworthy of the Treasurer, whom I believe to be a gentleman? I spoke to the Treasurer in confidence and then he was prepared to divulge this information to the House because his pride had been ruffled. This must have a very great impact on every hon. member on this side of the Chamber, because all of them must be wondering whether it is safe to interview the Treasurer on any matter that is not strictly formal.

Mr. Hiley: You made a formal request to me, and I told you—

Mr. DIPLOCK: I did not make any formal request. We were talking about shares and I brought this matter up.

Mr. Hiley: You asked could I save him his licence and I said, "Not a hope."

Mr. DIPLOCK: Not a hope you are speaking the truth, either.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order!

Mr. DIPLOCK: Let us now assume that the Treasurer did not intend his reply that my "deploring the moral problem of T.A.B. operations was calculated to make the angels weep" to be interpreted literally, but that he meant to convey the impression that I was not consistent, or perhaps sincere, in this matter. I do not intend to weary hon. members by quoting from "Hansard" passages of his speech on 23 November, 1954, or speeches made by almost every other Minister presently occupying the Government benches, when he expressed violent opposition to any extension of off-course betting, or subsequent speeches made by him while he was sitting on this side of the Chamber.

I shall not weary hon. members by reading those passages from "Hansard" because they have already been read and re-read. However, I am going to invite the Treasurer to read those speeches made by him and then to read anything I have said on the matter. I then invite him to be the judge and jury and to decide who has been the more consistent in this matter.

The Treasurer concluded his reply by saying—

"His attitude in shielding the three illegal operators claimed to be known to him may delay their apprehension; but I remind him that the arm of the law is long and that, eventually, like the Canadian Mountie, the Queensland police officer finally gets his man."

To be fair to the Treasurer, I must admit that he was consistent, and again said something that was definitely not true. In my speech on 8 September, in reply to an interjection by the hon. member for Albert I said that I could take him to a suburb where three starting-price bookmakers were operating. But by no stretch of the imagination can this be interpreted—except by the Treasurer when he wishes—as a claim by me that the men in question are known to me. That would be just as logical as saying a few years ago, when all members of this Chamber knew that a house of ill-fame was being operated in Albert Street, that we knew all the girls. I did not know any of them. I know that these men operate, because I know a well-known race-goer who places his bets with them. If the Treasurer thinks that I am going to join the ranks of the police pimps in order to assist the T.A.B., I am afraid he has another think coming. If the Treasurer himself feels inclined to do this, that, of course, is his own business.

According to a Press report that I have here from "The Sunday Mail" of 20 September, 1964, the chief of the T.A.B. claimed that the S.P. bookmakers are still doing big business in Queensland. Surely a man holding this important position would not make such a claim unless he had some evidence on which to base it. I respectfully suggest to the Treasurer that he advise this gentleman to quit shielding these operators; to look out for these "Canadian Mounties" because they will get him, and to convey the information on which he bases his claim to the police authorities.

In the article in "The Sunday Mail" of 20 September, these statements appear—

"The S.P. situation isn't as good as the police say it is or as bad as the T.A.B. says it is," one Government official said.

"There are still some bad 'pockets' of S.P., but only a fraction of a year ago.

"Government members admit that in some areas there might still be an unofficial police 'tolerance' of illegal betting. In several cases police have been given a warning to 'cut it out'.

"In others, men have been transferred to new police districts."

If the Treasurer can get hold of those men, if they will act as pimps, we have a chance of stamping out S.P. betting. Unfortunately, in the same report, the fact is divulged that the only matter with which the T.A.B. is concerned is making the T.A.B. more attractive in order to swell further the volume of business it handles.

This is the heading of the report—

"Same-day pay-out is likely for T.A.B. Would help cut out S.P."

Undoubtedly the switch to same-day pay-outs would considerably increase the volume of business as it would channel back to the

investors more money with which to operate. The report says that the principal reason against it now is the Government's fear of protest at another encouragement of gambling. If the Government wishes to stamp out S.P. betting and is quite sincere in its belief that it is proceeding in the interests of the morals of this country, it has nothing to fear. When one is doing the right thing one has nothing to fear. If the Government is sincere in its claims that the T.A.B. was established to control gambling, surely this fear would not exist. There is one very bright spot in this Press report, and it appears in heavy black print. It says—

"One senior Government member said yesterday, 'The aim was never to make T.A.B. the biggest and most glorious gambling welter of all time'."

I ask hon. members to note that it says "senior Government member," not "official." That is really something. Those people who represent youth organisations and the various church organisations have really something to hope for, because the Government does not want to make the T.A.B. the "biggest and most glorious gambling welter of all time". When the volume of the T.A.B. increases to a certain level someone is going to be satisfied, and we will find that no further effort will be made to encourage the public to gamble.

Mr. DONALD (Ipswich East) (12.21 p.m.): I was very surprised at, and extremely disappointed with, the Premier's answer to a question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on Tuesday of this week. It was quite out of keeping with his previous character and disposition. I have known the Premier for many years, having first met him when he served with me on the Queensland Country Cricket Advisory Committee of the Queensland Cricket Association, and during those years I always found him to be a gentleman who treated people fairly, and to have a very friendly nature.

However, I feel that on this occasion he did not read privately the answer to Mr. Lloyd's question before he read it in the House, otherwise he would not have been guilty of delivering such a treacherous answer to what was quite a simple question. The question could have been answered simply in the affirmative or the negative had he chosen to do so. The question was asked in a sincere desire to achieve industrial peace, and to bring an end to what has become a running sore in the industrial life of this State, despite what the Government may claim to have accomplished. The answer did not heal the breach in any way. On the contrary, it considerably aggravated the position.

For the benefit of hon. members I think I should read the Deputy Leader's question, as well as the Premier's answer thereto, because, as the Premier said this morning during question time, unsatisfactory attention has been given to both the question and the answer.

For fear of being misunderstood and of being labelled as biased in the statement I have already made, I shall do that, because I regard it as absolutely necessary. As I have said, the question was asked sincerely in an effort to bring about industrial peace where it did not exist.

The question reads—

"In view of (a) the statement by the Minister for Industrial Development that he intended to seek the co-operation of the Trade Union movement in relation to the question of skilled labour available in Queensland and (b) the continuing industrial unrest within the Queensland Railways and industry generally will he reconsider his previous refusal to meet representatives of the Trade Unions to discuss these problems?"

The Premier's answer cannot be interpreted in any way other than as a vicious, unwarranted attack on the trade-union movement and the working class of Queensland. Part of the Premier's answer reads—

"The alleged unrest to which the Honourable Member refers has been stimulated by officials of certain Unions, kept in well-paid positions by Union fees paid by the working man under a system of compulsory unionism."

Let us analyse that statement. Trade-union officials are paid out of union dues collected from workers. Does the Premier, or any other Government member, think that union officials should not be well paid? I know that it is their belief, when the ordinary working man's wages are considered, that the working man should not be well paid.

I could be excused for thinking that the Premier is only being consistent, as a trade-union official is a servant of the working class. However, it should not be forgotten that a trade-union official has to face an election, sometimes every year, sometimes every two years, and sometimes every three years, depending on the policy of the particular organisation. He has to give good service, the same as do hon. members of this Assembly, and in many cases he is elected under the same conditions—by secret ballot. The Governments in Australia—including this one—introduced secret controlled ballots into union elections. I say without fear of contradiction that ballots in the union to which I belong are conducted as efficiently and fairly as are those in State and Commonwealth elections. That statement by the Premier casts reflections on the honesty of working-class people.

The Premier refers to "a system of compulsory unionism." I have strong views on compulsory unionism, and they may not coincide with those of other hon. members on this side of the Chamber and those opposite. I feel that compulsory unionism must inevitably weaken union leadership. When people join a union because they feel it is necessary to do so for their own protection, and because they believe that an injustice

to one is an injustice to all, strong unions result. Under these conditions, a man becomes a member because he wants to pull his weight in the fight for better conditions and freedom of expression.

What do we find when there is compulsory unionism? Unions are very democratic bodies—indeed, much more democratic than many people are prepared to acknowledge—and as soon as a man becomes a member he gains full rights with all others, including those who have been members for 50 years or more. The new member has equal rights to submit propositions, to speak, and to vote at elections of union officials. Furthermore, if the union is affiliated with the Australian Labour Party he has the right to vote at pre-selection ballots to decide the A.L.P. candidate for the electorate in which he resides.

There may be a lot to be said in favour of compulsory unionism. However, I do not favour it. I still feel that it weakens unionism and union leadership. Even representation on this side of the Chamber can be weakened by the exercising of voting rights in pre-selection ballots by people who do not believe in the movement.

The Premier's answer went on to say—

“These officials, following the dictates of foreign ideologies, have fabricated the present industrial situation by the coercion of workers to take part in stop-work meetings and strikes with loss of pay, using them as dupes in a designedly attempted disruption of the State's social and industrial progress and prosperity, with attendant suffering amongst fellow workers, their wives and families.”

That is a direct accusation that members of trade unions are guilty of electing as leaders men who are opposed to our democratic way of life. The insinuation is that they have elected members of the Communist Party. Nothing is further from the truth. If members of this party have been elected to offices in the trade-union movement, they have been elected because of their worth to the unions. I think it is logical to make that clear.

Mr. Rae: You want to get rid of them, I say.

Mr. DONALD: We can think about replacing Communist leaders in the trade-union movement when there are other leaders just as sincere and capable of looking after union interests.

Why is it that Communists are elected to leading positions in the trade-union movement? The hon. member for Gregory may know something about some organisations, but he does not know anything about trade unions or he would not make such a silly interjection. To become a leader in the trade-union movement, a man has to win the confidence of members of his union. It matters little what he is. If he is capable, earnest, honest, and competent, he will gain the support of the members. If he is not, he

will not. Unlike those who believe in democracy only when it suits them, I am a true democrat. I sat for many years with a fellow officer of my union who was a Communist and who was elected by the same people who elected me. That is the position in my union today, as it has been for some years; the same people at the same ballot elect a member of the Communist Party as well as a member of the Australian Labour Party. It is the job of those who are elected to work together in the interests of the people whom they represent, and, if the Communist works in their interests, why should I refuse to work with him if he has been elected to a certain position by the members who have elected me to another position? I cannot say, “I am not going to sit with you because you are a Communist.” That would be capitulation on my part. Perhaps that is what the hon. member for Gregory and the Government would like. The union movement would then be controlled by Communists. There is no excuse for the Premier's going out of his way, or the Government's going out of its way, to say that leaders and officials of the trade-union movement are following the dictates of foreign ideologies.

The Premier went on to weep crocodile tears for the wives and families of the workers. It is to the credit of the working-class wives and families that they do not cry when their man is on strike. They do whatever they can to assist him, and the long history of the industrial movement shows that sometimes when the men are wavering or weakening because of the conditions at home, it is the womenfolk who come to the fore by organising soup kitchens, and so. Women's help has played an important part in the birth of this wonderful party and of the wonderful trade-union movement of Australia. Without it, we should never have made the progress we have made. If a woman whose husband is on strike complains, it is the wife of a compulsory unionist, not the wife of a genuine unionist.

I intended speaking on a different subject, but I thought I should be failing in my duty to the unionists of Queensland, and to the people of Queensland generally, if I allowed the Premier's statement to go unchallenged. What does the Premier say? On Tuesday of this week the Premier was guilty of referring to the working-class people of Queensland as “dupes” who paid a lot of money to keep people in soft jobs. He went on to say—

“The persistence of this questioning by him and any continued ill-considered and ill-founded statements of his Leader could give rise to suspicions of an alignment with the disruptive tactics of a party—the hirelings of interests foreign to our nation—which, under the guise of industrial unionism, deliberately and by dictation is seeking to destroy Australia's economy and the freedoms which citizens enjoy under democratic Governments.”

He linked that statement with the name of the Leader of the Opposition. I now repeat what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said on Tuesday last: that the Leader of the Opposition has a proud military record, and that his brother gave his life for his country in battle. The Deputy Leader himself, though his modesty prevented him from saying so, not only served his country with distinction but also was awarded a D.F.C. These are the men who the Government and the Premier would have us believe are agents of the Communist Party. What rot!

Why do the Premier and Government supporters continually harp on this subject? History has shown quite clearly that when the nation is in danger and democracy is in danger, again and again the working class has saved it. The Leader of the Opposition has mentioned on numerous occasions those members of the Australian Labour Party in this Parliament who have served their country with distinction. In spite of that, we have this nasty insinuation. If the Premier, the Government, and certain other people in Queensland, had listened to the unions, the trouble that we are experiencing at present may not have arisen.

I asked the Premier a question on this subject as far back as 16 September this year, and its purpose was similar to that of the question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—to bring about industrial peace where none existed. This is the question I asked—

“As the Public Service Commissioner has refused to meet representatives of Government employees, working in the Departments of Main Roads, Harbours and Marine, Irrigation and Water Supply, and Works, and the South Brisbane and North Brisbane Hospitals, to discuss wage increases to tradesmen and their assistants employed in the Departments and hospitals mentioned, will he in the interests of industrial peace request the Public Service Commissioner to meet representatives of the employees?”

By no stretch of the imagination could anyone say that that is an unreasonable question, nor was the question of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition unreasonable. The only interpretation to be put on them is that they indicated a desire on the part of members of the Opposition to end an unsatisfactory position and to see these people get wage justice as well as social justice.

Here is the Premier's reply—

“In any approaches of this nature by Unions, they have been advised by the Public Service Commissioner that, if increases are desired in the rates of pay prescribed by Award, they should make application to the State Industrial Commission asking that appropriate variations be made in the Awards concerned. This suggestion as to procedure is consistent

with the attitude of the present Government and of previous Governments upon industrial matters of this nature affecting Government employees.”

That is not true. The Premier can express his opinion, if he likes, as to the present Government's attitude, but it is wrong to say that was the policy of past Governments. I myself, on behalf of the miners in Queensland, have interviewed and had conferences, before a strike, during a strike and after a strike, with members of an Australian Labour Party Government, and that has been the experience of everyone. We had a big strike in the railways, if my memory serves me rightly, when Mr. Hanlon was Premier. Mr. Hanlon never on any occasion, either as a Minister or as Premier, refused to meet the representatives of the working class and the trade-union movement when there was trouble, and to say that it was not the practice of Governments is not entirely correct. However, it is good enough to use against the trade-union movement.

What are we wanting to do? What is the purpose of a meeting of the Public Service Commissioner with representatives of the union? It may not be arbitration, but our policy is arbitration and conciliation. The Government claims that to be its policy, too. It frequently claims as its own a policy that the Australian Labour Party has fought for and achieved after perhaps a period of 10 or 20 years. But why does not the Government resort to conciliation?

What did the question of the Leader of the Opposition seek other than for the Government to get together with employees and conciliate—discuss their grievances? What did my question mean? It was nothing but an honest attempt to bring about conciliation. I am in a position to speak in this Chamber of the value of conciliation, quite apart from arbitration. The Miners' Union has a reputation, which it perhaps deserves—it is nothing to be ashamed of—of being one of the most militant unions in Australia. We have our own set-up and we use conciliation more extensively than probably any other section of industry.

Hon. members should witness a conciliation meeting in the mining industry in Queensland. I was a member of the Reference Board, where the merits of disputes are ventilated. What happens is that there is a dispute at a colliery—any colliery in Queensland. It looks as if it will be serious. Representatives of the workers meet representatives of the company. They have a talk; they sift things out, and on almost all occasions what would have resulted in a stoppage is quickly and satisfactorily settled. Is that not a common-sense way of doing things? If it can be done by the employers, in this case, in the metal trades industry throughout the State, why cannot the Government do it? All we are asking is that the Government allow its officials to meet representatives of the metal trades workers and discuss their wages.

I have with me correspondence that has passed between the Public Service Commissioner and Mr. Devereux of the Metal Trades Federation. Anyone who thinks for a moment that Mr. Devereux is in any way sympathetic to the Communist Party, or that he is a Communist, is very sadly mistaken. Mr. Devereux, whom I have known for many years, is a very devout churchman. He belongs to a church that has fought the Communist Party tooth and nail over the years. Jack Devereux is no more a Communist than I am, or than is any other member of the Australian Labour Party. He has been accused, very unjustly, by the Premier of being a Communist and putting over the Communist philosophy to try to weaken the economy of the State.

I will read a letter dated 21 July. I emphasise "21 July"—this is 15 October and still the Government has not decided to be sensible and meet representatives of the unions. The letter says—

"Arising from a meeting of Shop Stewards and job delegates of Metal Trades Unions employed by Government instrumentalities, i.e., Main Roads, Harbours and Marine, Irrigation and Water, South Brisbane and North Brisbane Hospitals and Department of Works, it was decided that a request be made to you to receive a deputation to discuss the question of a wage increase to tradesmen and their assistants employed in the above-named establishments.

"In making this request we are aware that it has been the policy of your Department to have the matter of wages determined by the Industrial Commission. So much has occurred in recent weeks—the Metal Trades Employers granting wage increases of 42/6d. to tradesmen, 27/6d. to crane drivers, 21/3d. to trades assistants, and the attitude of the State Industrial Commission that the wage rates will not be increased without agreement having been reached between the parties—it is felt a discussion with you could be helpful in overcoming the problems confronting Government Departments and employees therein in relation to the question of wages.

"Trusting you can accede to this request and meet the Unions at an early date."

Is not that letter couched in moderate terms? Is it not a letter that is almost pleading with the Government to meet union representatives, pointing out that outside employers have done so and have agreed to give substantial pay rises to their employees? Any suggestion would be helpful, but what did we get in reply?

The Public Service Commissioner replied, on 29 July—

"With reference to your letter of 21st July regarding the rates of pay for members of the Metal Trades Unions employed by Government Departments and Instrumentalities, I wish to advise that, if

increases are desired in the rates of pay prescribed by Awards, your Federation should make application to the State Industrial Commission asking that appropriate variations be made in the Awards concerned."

I have nothing but praise for the Public Service Commissioner. I have always found Mr. Fraser very helpful and willing to assist members of this Assembly, always very courteous and efficient, and a gentleman in every sense of the word. That is not his reply; it is the reply of the Government. The Government has to accept full responsibility for the prolonged negotiations and for the present trouble in industry, both in and out of the Government.

It has been said by the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission that the wage rates will not be increased without agreement having been reached between the parties. The Government has said, "Go to the Industrial Commission" but the Commission has told the metal trades workers that unless they can reach agreement with their employer—in this case the Government—they have not a chance of getting increases from the Industrial Commission.

On 30 July Mr. Devereux wrote to the Public Service Commissioner in these words—

"I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 29th instant in reply to my letter of the 21st instant in which you were requested to meet representatives of the Metal Trades Unions to discuss the question of wages in Government Departments.

"Your decision not to meet the Unions will be conveyed to the members of the Unions employed in the various Government Departments and no doubt will cause concern to those employees, particularly that portion of your letter which states:—

'... if increases are desired in the rates of pay prescribed by Awards, your Federation should make application to the State Industrial Commission asking that appropriate variations be made in the Awards concerned.'

"The members are aware that the Industrial Commission has informed the unions that without agreement between the parties an application to the Commission for marginal increases would fail."

Can we blame the unions for pleading with the Government to meet their representatives so that they can go to the Commission to get the increases that have been justified because they have been awarded by the Commission to outside employees? Is there any difference between men who work for the Government and men who work for private enterprise? They have the same obligations to their families for clothing, food, housing and education. The increased wages have been paid by outside employers, and it is beyond my comprehension that the

Government should adopt consistently this attitude of refusing to meet union representatives. At the same time in refusing to conciliate it is destroying the men's admiration for the system of arbitration and conciliation. The unions are asking the Government to conciliate but they are not getting any sympathy.

The letter continues—

"It was because of the difficulty arising from the policy of the Commission that the Shop Delegates and Union Officials felt it would be desirable to meet you in an endeavour to explore the avenues available to the parties to ensure that the wage rates paid to engineering workers in Government Departments were comparable with those now being paid to similar classifications in private industry and I believe I made this clear in my letter of the 21st instant. The unions are not opposed to taking the necessary action by way of application for variation of the respective awards, but no good purpose would be served in making such an application unless—

(a) there was some indication that the Commission had reviewed its policy in regard to wage rates, or

(b) some agreement was reached to conform with the policy of the Commission as conveyed to the Unions and the Metal Trades Employees' Association in conference on the 11th and 12th June, 1964, and confirmed at a hearing before the Full Bench of the Commission on the 17th July, 1964.

"The unions submit that having regard to the problems confronting the Parties in relation to award variation, it would be in the interests of industrial peace if you would agree to discuss these matters with the Unions and Job Representatives.

"In the circumstances I again respectfully request that you meet the Unions at your earliest convenience."

Is that not a pleading letter to the Government, although it is addressed to the Public Service Commissioner? The Public Service Commissioner would not, and should not, decide the policy of the Government, and he would not decide—nor should he—whether or not these people should meet him. That is the Government's prerogative—the union knows it and so does the Government—but it is adopting this very unwise policy—I cannot say why—a policy that will cause a lot of friction. Can we blame people in Government employment, doing exactly the same work as those in outside employment, for wanting the same conditions, wanting to use the same procedure, wanting an increase in wages, and wanting a conference with their employer so that they may then go to the Industrial Commission? Yet the Government steadily and consistently refuses to meet them. Can that letter be interpreted as a letter of intimidation, a letter expressing any foreign ideology?

It is evident that the reply from the Public Service Commissioner was the result of instructions from the Government. The reply of the Public Service Commissioner to the letter of 30 July from Mr. Devereux is dated 7 August, so the Government had plenty of time to discuss the matter. It is not Mr. Fraser's fault, and certainly not the union's fault. It says—

"With reference to your letter of 30th July regarding increased rates of pay for members of the Metal Trades Unions employed by Government Departments and Instrumentalities, I wish to advise you that, after reading this letter and making inquiry with respect to certain of its contents, I can find no reason or circumstances which would necessitate any variation of the terms of my letter of 29th July upon this subject."

The attitude of the Government in consistently refusing to meet the unions in conciliation is characteristic of its disregard for, and ill feeling towards, the working-class movement. No-one can deny that. The men used every method at their disposal. They have been very patient and very courteous in the matter, and they have pleaded, not only by word of mouth, but also in several letters, asking the Government to allow its representatives to meet the representatives of the unions. The Government not only refused, but rebuffed all members of the unions, particularly the officers of the unions for their audacity in asking the Government to meet the employees in conciliation.

The metal trades unions, feeling frustrated in their honest and consistent attempt to meet the Public Service Commissioner, said "We will write to the Premier himself. Surely the Premier will meet a deputation. Surely the Premier, with the image he enjoys throughout the country, is a just and fair man. He will at least meet us, even if the Government or Cabinet will not let Mr. Fraser, the Public Service Commissioner, meet us." This letter, written by Mr. Devereux in the capacity of secretary of the Metal Trades Federation, Queensland Branch, is dated 9 September 1964, and reads—

"On behalf of engineering, electrical and allied trades employees of Government and Semi-Government Departments, I have been endeavouring to arrange a conference with the Public Service Commissioner on the question of the wage rates paid to these employees and I attach hereto copies of my letters of the 21/7/64 and the 30/7/64 and the Public Service Commissioner's replies of the 29/7/64 and the 7/8/64.

"The Unions are aware that it has been the policy of the Public Service Commissioner to have the matter of wages determined by the Industrial Commission, although we believe the salaries of Public

Servants have been the subject of conferences with the Public Service Commissioner, and the Unions suggest that having regard to existing circumstances, the Public Service Commissioner could confer with the Unions, as it does appear, from our experiences during negotiations with the Metal Trades Employers, that the Industrial Commission has laid down principles in relation to wage fixation which, without consultation between the parties, are such as to indicate that an application for wage increases by award variation would not be successful.

"Today I have again requested the Public Service Commissioner to meet the representatives of the Metal Trades and Allied Unions and I respectfully request your assistance in arranging such an interview with the Public Service Commissioner."

That letter is couched in very temperate language and very good terms. It again makes the plea that Government employees be allowed to meet their employer, or a representative of their employer, so that they can conciliate. This has been going on since June, and with what result? What a glorious opportunity was handed to the Premier to prove that he was not only a fair man and a strong man, but a man who was very desirous of bringing about industrial peace, if not in the State generally, at least among Government employees. But, unjustly, the Premier refused the request. This letter points out to him the experience that the unions have had in the Industrial Commission, and their experience when negotiating with outside employers of Metal Trades Federation members.

What did the Premier say to Mr. Devereux in reply to that letter? On 24 September 1964. Mr. K. Spann, Acting Under Secretary, writes—

"I am directed by the Honourable the Premier to refer again to your letter of 9th September, 1964, regarding the desire of representatives of the Metal Trades and Allied Unions to meet the Public Service Commissioner to discuss the question of wage rates.

"I am to inform you that on 16 September last in response to a question asked in the Legislative Assembly by Mr. J. Donald, M.L.A., the Premier replied as follows:—

"In any approaches of this nature by Unions, they have been advised by the Public Service Commissioner that if increases are desired in the rates of pay prescribed by Award, they should make application to the State Industrial Commission asking that appropriate variations be made in the Awards concerned.

"This suggestion as to procedure is consistent with the attitude of the present Government and of previous

Governments upon industrial matters of this nature affecting Government employees."

Again I draw attention to the fact that that reply is not strictly correct, because on numerous occasions over many years Premiers and Ministers of Labour Governments met members and officials of trade unions on this and other matters. The present Minister for Mines has on many occasions met representatives of the Queensland Colliery Employees' Union on matters such as policy, wages, and pensions. He has always received them courteously.

The Metal Trades Federation wrote to the Premier on 9 September asking that the Public Service Commissioner meet representatives of the unions. The reply to Mr. Devereux, who wrote the letter, referred him to the Premier's answer to a question asked by me on 16 September. Does that indicate the Government's sincerity when it claims to desire industrial peace in Queensland? I could be excused for saying that what the Government wants is industrial unrest, and those who refuse to meet the unions and conciliate must bear the odium of having that suggestion applied to them. If I have a dispute with someone who will not talk to me, how can our quarrel be resolved? Here there is no quarrel; there is merely an approach by the unions to the Government.

The Government consistently and steadfastly says, "We will not meet representatives of the trade-union movement. We will not have men coming here and putting a case to us. We will not allow our nominee, the Public Service Commissioner, to meet them, either. If you want increases, go to the Industrial Commission and ask for them." That is what the unions are told, despite the fact that the Commission has made it clear to them that they will not be heard unless there has been a conference between the Government and its employees. That has been made plain in every letter written to Jack Devereux by either the Premier or the Public Service Commissioner.

I do not want to say that the Government is steadfastly refusing to meet the unions to save face. I do not want to say that the present attitude has been adopted for reasons of prestige because the employees concerned are not white-collar workers but are labourers, if one likes to call them that, and electricians, fitters, turners, wood-workers, boilermakers, boilermakers' assistants, and other essential members of the community who, with few exceptions, perform more useful services than do those who work in a collar and a white shirt.

I think it behoves the Government at this late hour to swallow its pride, if there is any thought that meeting representatives of the working class shows a lack of pride. Meeting them would show statesmanship, courage, and understanding, and a desire by the Government that these men should receive wage justice. If it is possible for outside firms to give increases to their employees,

why should the Government refuse to negotiate with its employees or their representatives?

[*Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.*]

Mr. DONALD: I want all hon. members and the Government to realise that decisions in trade-union affairs are made by the rank-and-file members of the unions, not by the union officials. It is the duty of the officials to see that the wishes of the rank and file of the union are carried out. If they do so, that is no reason why the Premier on anyone else should castigate them or refer to them as the agents of foreign powers and ideologies that will destroy the economic and democratic system of this State.

I should also like to warn the Government that if it refuses to give economic justice and wage justice to employees of the Railway Department, it will have trouble on its hands. I was recently in the company of a half a dozen railwaymen. It is true that some of them were members of the Australian Labour Party and some were not, but it is equally true to say that none could be described as a militant unionist. Those men were unanimously of the opinion that if the Government continued treating them in the way in which it is now treating them, the only solution would be a general strike throughout the railways. If the Government chooses to treat railwaymen in the same cavalier fashion as it has treated men employed in the metal trades, it can expect trouble.

Recently there has been a great deal of talk about crime, the need to prevent it, and the penalties that should be imposed upon offenders. This has tempted me to say a few words on the subject.

It is a self-evident truth that democracy means the acceptance of responsibilities as well as the claiming of rights. Everyone living in a democratic country has some responsibility to his workmates, his neighbours, indeed, to all of his fellow citizens. All of us share rights which, in a perfect society, would be equal.

No-one, irrespective of the political party to which he belongs in whatever political philosophy he may advocate, would claim that our society in Australia is perfect, or that equality before the law, which is, in theory, one of our basic rights, is always clearly revealed in practice. This presents us with one of the most difficult problems in the general process of balancing responsibilities and rights.

As democrats we must be concerned with justice, both for the community and for those who offend against it. But we must also be concerned with two refinements of this simple antithesis—with the forestalling and prevention of crime; with the peace and order of the community—so that the forces of justice need be invoked and used as economically as possible, and a dimension beyond justice with care for the offender

as a human being. The obligations of each citizen to society are matched by the obligations of society to each citizen. A society which fails in its obligations to many of its citizens must not be surprised if some of them do not keep its rules.

Despite our pride in what has become known as the welfare State, there are serious gaps in its supposedly universal service. Unemployment, with its attendant worry, misery, poverty, and social inadequacy, still exists on a considerable scale, through no fault of those who suffer from it.

Of these evils, the external ones—poverty and squalor—are not as severe as they were during the great depression that affected Queensland between 1929 and 1932, but unfortunately they are still with us. However, the difference in the living standards between the poorest and the best off, or even the average, is hardly more tolerable. The social inadequacy, the failure to fit in, may be, if anything, more widespread as the technical apparatus of life becomes ever more complex.

This is relevant to my theme, because the poor are more vulnerable to some obvious temptations than are the better off. The strain of their living conditions must tend to weaken their resistance to such temptations. They are also, when they yield, more likely to be caught. On the whole, however, criminals do not come from stable and closely knit working-class families, however poor their circumstances may be.

There is another important element in the background of any study of crime. The value that prevails among those who dominate society may be expected to spread to all its levels. If men and women who have been brought up from childhood to regard personal advancement and ruthless self-interest as the main considerations, material success will certainly not train them in social responsibility. Worldly failure may well lead to social inadequacy and a resentful sense of inferiority. What is commonly called the inferiority complex is found in a remarkably high proportion of adult criminals and young delinquents.

It is the get-rich-quick characteristic spirit of the affluent society that leads to a weakening of moral fibre. Those who blame such a weakening, apparent or real, on the social security of the welfare State (they say they have everything done for them nowadays) have usually enjoyed substantial social security of a different kind, and come from homes in which, likewise, everything was done for them, at least until fairly recently, by domestic servants.

For acquisitiveness as the overriding motive in life, Socialists substitute the ideal of mutual service and work towards a society in which everyone has a chance to play a full and responsible part. It is sometimes observed, as if it were an argument against Socialism, that they—the young and high-spirited and ill-educated—have no more respect for public property, which in theory belongs to them, than they have for private property. But the

overwhelming tendency of political propaganda in the daily Press, and now in expensive advertising campaigns, is to blacken common ownership, especially in the form of nationalisation.

The imbalance in our mixed economy between the private sectors, constantly reinforced and encouraged by non-Labour Governments, and the far smaller public sector, combined with the exaltation of acquisitiveness already noted and the constant sneers at the nationalised industries, may well excite an immature mind to regard all property, public or private, as legitimate loot.

There is also an element of class discrimination here. Youths of the working class who break windows or engage in any other form of vandalism are taken to court and thereafter have to carry the stigma of a police record. University undergraduates who break windows or engage in vandalism, or in a beer-drinking competition, may be dealt with by their college authorities and suffer no legal or social stigma at all.

Very few of the adults who pass through the courts can be labelled as criminal types. It has been claimed, and in fact written, by ex-prisoners that there is no such thing as a criminal type, but that among those who have served long sentences there is an easily recognisable prison type.

Some of these people to whom I refer are callous and violent, some are sick, while many are mentally adult but emotionally immature. These are among the social inadequacies of many prisoners noted by those who have studied and written on the subject. Therefore, the object of our penal system cannot be merely to punish, to teach the offender against society a lesson and make him pay the penalty for his offence, and then to set him free again to prey on society.

Although society may be justified in demanding a measure of retribution to deter the criminal, this is a negative approach. Something more is needed for the true protection of the citizen, the prevention of crime by the care of the inadequate and immature, the healing of the sick, the rehabilitation of the offender, the restoration of his self respect, and his training in respect for the rights of others. These are the positive aspects of penal practice and penal reform. It is to these that we should direct our attention.

It would be very wrong indeed to underestimate the incidence of crime in our society, as it is one of the greatest social problems of our time. However, it is a problem that we share with many other countries and localities. It is also a problem that should be viewed in proportion. Most people, including the vast majority of young people, never come before the courts, and never do anything that could bring them into serious conflict with the law.

It is, therefore, important to assess accurately the size of the problem, but this is not as easy as it may appear. News reports often give a misleading impression of the

kind of crimes most frequently committed, simply because only the more unusual cases make national news. This is not criticism of the Press, but an opinion that the Press is not a source of scientific information on the extent and nature of crime.

The popular idea of crime prevention is mainly negative. It is based primarily on the principle of deterrence: the strengthening of the police so that the potential criminal fears that he will not get away with it, and exemplary punishment by long prison sentences and rigorous prison conditions.

I feel we can all share the view that a strong, efficient Police Force is a prime necessity both for preventing and detecting crime. Equally necessary, however, and in the long run likely to be more effective, is a positive, constructive policy for tackling the problem at its roots—by social measures designed to remove or reduce the factors which predispose people to crime, and by methods of treatment that will help the offender to overcome his handicap or disabilities and strengthen his will to reform.

The ability to obtain employment in a satisfactory calling is the basic right of the worker. Unfortunately, this is a right that is still far from being universally enjoyed, particularly in those parts of the country where unemployment is consistently above the national average and living and working conditions far too often leave much to be desired. In these areas school-leavers, both boys and girls, have to wait far too long in restless idleness before they find a suitable job—if they ever do.

There is an urgent need for a review and radical improvement in the payment and allowances to our pensioners—age, widow, service, invalid and miners—to relieve human suffering, and to ensure that the resources of these services are better used.

The child who has only one effective parent—it matters little whether this is due to death, divorce, desertion, or the fact that the parents are unmarried—is, with very few exceptions, if any, at a considerable disadvantage compared with others. Society has a duty to care for such children. However strongly some may censure unmarried, divorced or separated parents, their sin must not be visited upon a defenceless child. Provision should be made for the single-parent family, and the fatherless or motherless child provided for more liberally than at present.

Labour's policy insists on full social provision, as a right, for every individual. That is what the welfare State means. However individuals differ in their needs and abilities, however comprehensive the social provision, there will always be some who, through no fault of their own, need special help and support.

It is a truism that a happy and secure family life is the foundation of a healthy society and the best safeguard against delinquency and anti-social behaviour. Many

pay lip service to this belief, but all too little has been done seriously to attempt its realisation.

Is it too much to expect that children suffering from any kind of handicap, physical or mental disability, emotional disturbance or maladjustments, should receive the care they need? These are the factors which, as well as causing great personal unhappiness, lead to anti-social behaviour or delinquency. Such children need treatment as early as possible. Treatment should be given under conditions where family links can be preserved and strengthened to the maximum possible extent. Isolation from their families and institutionalisation almost without exception handicaps them still further.

Chronic or serious delinquency in a child is, in the main, I feel, due to the lack of care and guidance, and the opportunities to which every child is entitled. We can all agree that there are very few children who do not behave badly at times. I am sure that all hon. members will agree with that statement, particularly the hon. member who interjected a little while ago. None of us in this Chamber can claim he is without sin; none can claim that he has not acted badly, not only in his younger life, but also in his adult life.

Anti-social behaviour in a child may arise from difficulties at home, from unhappiness at school, from physical or mental handicaps or maladjustments, or from a variety of other causes, for which the child has no personal responsibility. However, such problems do not always lead to delinquency, although they are a very real handicap that the child has to overcome.

Experts on this question, and indeed officers of the State Children Department, have frequently expressed the opinion that the childhood experiences of many who have turned to crime have not been to any great extent out of the ordinary, while many who have had unhappy childhoods never become criminals. Nevertheless, there appears to be some relationship between a disturbed childhood and a subsequent career of unsuccessful crime, and I emphasise the word "unsuccessful". It is not only the victim of the broken home, but the child placed with badly selected adopters, the child who suffers periods of lack of parental care, and the child suffering from mental disorders, who later appears in the criminal court more frequently than his incidence in the general population would justify. It is, of course, only the unsuccessful criminal who is caught and therefore becomes a unit in criminal statistics.

I should now like to quote from an article in "The Courier-Mail" of 9 October, 1964 under the heading, "Low I.Q. and Crime". The article reads—

"New York, October 8 (Special)—A preliminary report issued by a committee appointed by the late President Kennedy

is expected to 'revolutionise the administration of criminal justice in the United States.'

"It establishes a definite connection between low intelligence and crime, and explodes some psychologists' theories that criminals are at least as intelligent as the rest of the population.

"The report concludes, after a comprehensive examination of the inmates of Maryland State Prison, that the mentally retarded are three times more likely to commit serious crimes than people of average intelligence.

"It says that persons of low intelligence make up 40 per cent. of America's 200,000 convicts.

"Eighty-two per cent. of them are chronic alcoholics. Less than 1 per cent. are narcotics addicts."

I sound a note of warning: many people in the community become alcoholics. It is true that every person who drinks does not become an alcoholic, but it is equally true that at one time every alcoholic has been a social drinker.

I now return to my remarks about crime. In justice to our children, and for the health and well-being of society, no youth should have to face criminal proceedings. These youths should receive the kind of treatment they need, without any stigma or any association with the penal system. It is not only the welfare of the individual child that is at stake, but also the interest of the whole community. An appearance on a criminal charge may well aggravate the youth's difficulties and be the first step towards a criminal career.

Opportunities for young people to develop and use to the full all their latent and frustrated energies, mental as well as physical, are not only their rights, but also the community's greatest safeguard against hooliganism, vandalism, and anti-social behaviour generally. Penal measures alone can never succeed. They must be supplemented by the provision of a wide variety of things to do which will catch the imagination and engage the energies of boys and girls.

Many believe that probation, rather than prison, should be regarded as the normal penalty for many types of offenders. Probation properly used can be the most economical method of treatment of offenders, firstly, because in itself, with perhaps few exceptions, probation does not involve the use of residential accommodation, and secondly, because probation leaves the offender at large in the community, where he can meet his social obligations and, in many cases, remain in productive employment. It is very important that he should remain in productive employment. If a

man has the satisfaction of producing something useful, his mind and his physical condition are in a much better state than if he is producing nothing, or is putting in his time in some unproductive work or occupation.

Probation is also the most constructive and least damaging form of treatment, for it must be based on the effect to understand the individual offender and to help him understand himself and adjust himself to the demands of social living. Severe punishments, however apparently justified, are liable to be repressive and to breed within the offender a resistance to the society which punished him.

(Time expired.)

Mr. PILBEAM (Rockhampton South) (2.36 p.m.): Before making my contribution to the Budget Debate, I take this opportunity to congratulate the Treasurer on the excellent Financial Statement he has brought before the Committee. It discloses that, with his capable hand at the financial controls, Queensland has been successful in the past year in achieving records in primary industry—in sugar and wheat production, and in the quantity of wool sold. The Treasurer has also been able to report an increase in the value of production in the meat industry as well as in mineral production. He has realistically reported a rapid acceleration in the activities of the tourist industry, and outstanding gains in regard to the search for oil, in particular, in the acquisition of two oil refineries at Brisbane. His sound and progressive Budget allows for the continuation of this development, and for the commencement of even more exciting developments in the coming year.

In the Central Queensland scene, this development includes the extension of the brigalow lands project, which has already commenced to establish itself as very successful, the completion of the construction of the Calcap power station and dam, the further development of the coal deposits at Moura and Blackwater, with the resultant increase in coal exports over Gladstone, the thrilling alumina development at that port, and the building up of exports, from our Central Queensland ports, of grain from the Dawson and Callide Valleys, and the Central Highlands.

In this regard I was gratified to read in this morning's "Courier-Mail" that—

"The State Council of the Queensland Grain Growers' Association has supported the principle of establishment of one port facility in Central Queensland to handle the export of all grain shipments."

This was decided at that association's recent meeting, and the move was strongly supported by the president, Mr. J. G. Tod.

It continues—

"Members generally agreed that Port Alma near Rockhampton would possibly emerge as the most suitable location."

It is very gratifying to all citizens in Central Queensland to see the great potentiality there of the wheat industry.

I should like to make particular reference to the increased profits earned by Mt. Morgan Ltd. during last year, and particularly to the extra gold that was won. This famous mine has probably produced more gold than any other single mine in the world. At a time when it was thought that gold output was diminishing, and that it would have to depend almost entirely on copper, it has enjoyed this Indian summer in regard to gold production. I am sure that everyone wishes the mine well in this output. We would all like to see it become the famous goldmine it once was.

Mr. Davies: Mt. Morgan is in the good hands of the hon. member for Port Curtis.

Mr. PILBEAM: Yes. I am not denying that.

In the mineral field, another interesting development has been the discovery at Marlborough, near Rockhampton, of large deposits of a gemstone called chrysoprase. Leases have been taken out, and quite a lot of this gemstone is being won at the present time. It is a very pretty green stone. Some call it jade but it is not really that. It is not extremely valuable, although it does attract a fairly high price. It is the wish of the people of Rockhampton that a shop be set up in which this stone can be cut and polished and presented as a tourist attraction, with other gems won from the gemfields at the back of Rockhampton. One of the lessees asked me to offer a specimen of this stone to the House. I have been in touch with Mr. W. Wilson, who has agreed to cut and polish the stone, and I offer it to the House. I suggest that it would make a better paperweight than the one on Mr. Speaker's table at present. I hope Parliament takes advantage of my offer.

Mr. Murray: Is this lease held by Capricornia Mineral Development Company?

Mr. PILBEAM: There are two lessees there. It is the local company that would do the cutting and polishing. The other company is exporting most of the stone.

Mr. Murray: You are fully aware, I am sure, of the great dangers in its not being properly controlled in marketing?

Mr. PILBEAM: Yes, we realise all those things.

There has been in Central Queensland in the past few months very substantial industrial development. The second stage of the cement works has been reached, and the second major meatworks, that of T. A. Field Pty. Ltd. at Nerimbera, is nearing completion. Two steel-prefabricating

engineering works have been set up. Queensland Can Co. Ltd. and Commonwealth Industrial Gases Ltd. have established branches in Rockhampton, and there is also a ready-mixed cement works, together with the ancillary industries that go with them. There will be a very great advancement in industrial development in Rockhampton next year, thanks to the progressive policy of the Government.

There is now a much different situation in regard to employment. Two or three years ago the employment position in Rockhampton was not good, and up to 1,100 were unemployed during the off-season at the meatworks. This year a complete metamorphosis has taken place. There will be a shortage of labour next year as a result of our industrial development. The position has been entirely reversed. There is now a shortage of skilled labour, and next year we are quite sure that there will be a shortage of unskilled labour, too.

The Treasurer was certainly correct when he said in the Financial Statement that the building industry is working at an extremely high level of activity. Rockhampton provides no exception to this statement. The architectural skyline of the city is starting to look very fine indeed. Thanks to the efforts of the Minister for Education, there has been remarkable development in our high schools. The Minister for Works and Housing has met all our requirements under this heading. The Minister for Education has granted to the South Rockhampton High School, out of Commonwealth grants allotted to the State, provision for a new science block, for which I thank him.

A very fine air-conditioned police station has been completed recently, and the Commonwealth Government has spent a substantial sum of money in renovating the post office, which, I might say, was already the best post office in the State architecturally. When one adds to this a beautiful Customs House, the best provincial Town Hall in the Commonwealth, a very fine C.R.E.B. building, an outstanding square of Government buildings, and a very fine air terminal, one begins to get a picture of a truly modern city, architecturally at least.

To complete the picture, I can tell hon. members now that we will have a new railway station, and I thank the Minister for Transport for his generosity in this respect. Although he is struggling to establish the Railway Department on a profitable basis, he still has spared enough capital to enable the obsolete Rockhampton station to be replaced, and I understand that the first allocation has been made. The people of Rockhampton are very grateful to the Minister for making the new station possible, and I am sure that it will acquire great significance. The old station has stood for over half a century, a monument to the perfidy of Governments and the falseness of politicians' promises. Every election year for half a century we have been promised a new station. On one occasion tenders were called and accepted

and foundations laid, but the work did not proceed. I can testify to the excellence of the galvanised iron used in the construction of the old railway station. It was made almost a century ago, and apart from a few spear-marks made by the early inhabitants of this country, it is virtually as good now as it was when it was first used.

I have dealt with the assistance, architecturally and industrially, given to Rockhampton and to Central Queensland. Now I should like to deal with two requirements for the decentralised development of this part of the State. I refer to water conservation and the building of bituminised highways throughout the area.

Let me deal first with water conservation. I think it must be agreed that there is a water shortage throughout the world, and scientists tell us that the world will be seriously short of water before many years go by. In fact, experiments are being carried out now to extract salt from sea water because of this contemplated shortage. Having this in mind, we must deplore seeing so much water going to waste every day down that famous old river, the Fitzroy.

Mr. Coburn: The Burdekin.

Mr. PILBEAM: The hon. member can speak about his river; I will speak about mine.

The catchment area of the Fitzroy basin is about 52,000 square miles. It is the largest coastal river basin in Queensland, and in Australia is second only to the Murray-Darling system. Unfortunately, the flow of the Fitzroy River is highly variable, the minimum recorded annual flow being 144,000 acre-feet and the maximum 20,100,000 acre-feet. Because of this variation in the flow, effective utilisation of the large and valuable water resources of the Fitzroy River can be achieved only by the provision of large storages of sufficient capacity to store a high proportion of the water that flows off in wet years and carry this over the long dry cycles, which can last as long as 20 years. Fortunately, even the rather limited investigations of the basin to date have revealed several large and attractive storage sites, and apart from these the city of Rockhampton is shortly to embark on a scheme to build a barrage across the Fitzroy River at Rockhampton, thereby turning the river at that point from a salt-water to a fresh-water stream.

We have been battling to prove the possibility of this barrage for over five years but owing to reports in the past, which indicated that such a barrage might cause flooding in the river, we had to prove that it could be put in without danger to the city. To do that we had to pay some £12,000 to the university to prove the safety of the project by means of a large-scale model. In fact, we had to go to the expense of providing another smaller model to show

the effects of the barrage on the river below Rockhampton, but the findings so far have been favourable to the project.

The proposal is no longer a nebulous one; we know we will get the barrage. The only thing in dispute at present is the design. The design, in detail, is being drawn up by engineers of the Department of Local Government and we are keeping a close watch on their workings. The projected date for completion of the plan is June next and, with the sympathetic support of the Treasurer, we propose to build the barrage in a period of just over two years so that we can do it with three annual allocations of loan moneys.

This barrage will make Rockhampton one of the best venues for industry in the country. It will give us a water supply not of 7,000,000 gallons a day as we have at present, but of up to 40,000,000 gallons daily. It will give us the opportunity to provide unfiltered water for industry for the cost of pumping only, which should be a mere few pence per 1,000 gallons. There is tremendous interest in this barrage project and I am quite sure that the industrialisation of the city, which has already commenced, will rapidly accelerate with its advent into the city scene.

In the overall picture, the point I am making is that we must have storage in the Fitzroy River. We cannot allow this colossal wastage of water to go on day after day and year after year. I told hon. members that several attractive sites for storage had been found and were being investigated. There was one in the Nogoia River, approximately 12 miles upstream from Emerald, which has been considered in detail. Investigations show that storage could be built at this site with a capacity of 1,117,000 acre-feet which would provide an assured annual supply of 120,000 acre-feet.

There has also been detailed investigation in the upper part of the Nathan Gorge, and it has shown that very large storage could be provided in that area. One possibility—and I quote the words of the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission—is for a reservoir with a total capacity of 5,500,000 acre-feet, which is approximately 1,000,000 acre-feet more than the total storage capacity of the Snowy Mountains scheme. That is a tremendous possibility and it makes one realise just how much water is being wasted in this river. Flow run-off from the catchment will only permit an actual storage for conservation of 2,500,000 acre-feet and the balance of 3,000,000 acre-feet could be used to provide a very high degree of flood mitigation for the Dawson River between Nathan Gorge and below Moura. As hon. members will know, that area is subject to considerable flooding at the present time.

This storage could provide an assured annual supply of 320,000 acre-feet, about twice that available from the Tinaroo Falls Dam in North Queensland. Here again

we get some idea of the tremendous storage that can be effected. On the Comet River, a site that is known to exist near Yarrinila would provide a total storage capacity of 350,000 acre-feet. That is about equivalent to the area trapped in the Tinaroo Falls Dam on the Barron River.

At a point close to the city of Rockhampton a particularly large storage would appear to be possible approximately 100 miles above the mouth of the Fitzroy River as a site known as The Gap. This would provide tremendous protection from floods to the city of Rockhampton. The site has not been fully investigated, but it is known that a wall 150 feet, high would back water up the Fitzroy River for a distance of 120 miles. Hon. members can gauge from that the tremendous storage capacity. It would seem likely that a storage at this site, if found practicable, would provide from 7,000,000 to 10,000,000 acre-feet—again a tremendous possibility.

We can see what potential there is for water storage in the Fitzroy River. Up to the present time no Government has had the courage to tackle these large projects. They are large ones, not small ones. Several possible sites are known to exist on the Dawson River catchment upstream of Nathan Gorge—both on the Dawson River itself and on a major tributary, Palm Tree Creek. Several storages have been examined in the Callide Valley, and one is under construction on Callide Creek—the one I referred to—to supply water to Calcap power station. Unfortunately a combination of poor dam sites and poor run-off makes these sites very expensive. For example, the capital cost of the first stage of the Callide Dam is equivalent to some £500 per acre-foot of annual assured supply. By comparison the Nogoia Gap Dam site, the one the Government is currently concentrating on, would provide water at a capital cost equivalent to about £80 per acre-foot of annual assured supply.

The Emerald irrigation project was investigated in the middle 1950's by the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission, when it selected a site at the Nogoia Gap, to which I have referred. At the request of the Queensland Government the Commonwealth Bureau of Agricultural Economics is carrying out an economic study of this proposed project. There is no doubt in the world that it will provide ample irrigation for such crops as cotton—the one we in Rockhampton are particularly interested in at the present time—summer and winter grains, lucerne and irrigated pastures. The investigation has disclosed that sufficient water would be provided for some 130 irrigated farms. The cost of the scheme, including the dam, would exceed £12,000,000. Two pilot farms are to be established in the area to demonstrate the commercial production of some of these crops, utilising water available from the Selma weir.

I refer again to the Nathan Gorge Dam from the viewpoint of irrigation. It has been proved that water available from this storage would be sufficient to irrigate an area of some 130,000 acres in the valley. Soils in the area appear to be suitable for the production of crops similar to those in the Emerald project, namely, cotton, grains, lucerne and irrigated pastures. The cost of that scheme will exceed £20,000,000.

This is the scheme that will interest particularly the hon. member for Roma. Before deciding firmly on any scheme for the Dawson Valley, investigations are about to commence into alternative possibilities for storage and irrigation developments upstream of the Nathan Gorge. These are the developments that the hon. member for Roma, discussed when he sought to take the threat away from the grazing areas that would have been inundated by the Nathan Gorge scheme. On the information given to me by the department I believe that these investigations will be well worth while. To assist in these investigations experts from the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority have been obtained. Of all the tributaries of the Fitzroy River, one of the largest is the Isaacs River. No real investigation of this tributary has taken place and there is a very strong possibility that water investigations in the upper Isaacs River, particularly in the Connors River, may provide very satisfactory storage. That statement could be justified by examining the heavy rainfall in the area, which is 40 to 50 inches annually. That indicates that a very large volume of water could be trapped by a suitable storage dam.

To assist in the overall planning of water conservation and irrigation development in the Fitzroy River basin, arrangements were made several years ago for the Land Research and Regional Survey Division of the C.S.I.R.O. to carry out land system surveys over the bulk of that basin. Those surveys will provide broad-scale information on the available soils in the basin from which initial selection can be made of various areas suitable for a more intensive investigation of irrigation development. This work is now well advanced. The point with regard to water conservation is that time is the essence of the contract.

The particular industry to be developed by these large storage projects is the cotton industry, and the indications are very clear, that if we do not do something in a hurry we will lose a wonderful industry because other States are planning to grow the whole of Australia's cotton requirements under irrigation. It will be a very serious blow to Australia if we do not grow all our cotton requirements, and it will be an extremely serious blow to Queensland to lose the industry to another State. Australia has a high status as an agricultural country, yet cotton imports are third on the list of imports after petroleum and vehicles. At present Australia imports about £10,000,000

worth of raw cotton for spinning and weaving into yarns, and nearly £50,000,000 worth of woven cotton textiles and manufactured piecegoods. About one-half of Australia's requirements are imported from the United States and the balance comes from Mexico and India. A very large cotton industry is already established in this country, as can be seen from the fact that we have some 88 spinning and weaving mills, employing nearly 9,000 workers and paying about £8,500,000 a year in wages. For many years Queensland was the only cotton-producing State in Australia, but in recent years we have had opposition, particularly from New South Wales, which discovered, as we are discovering now, that irrigated cotton is the only answer to supplying the full requirements of the industry. In New South Wales there is irrigation from the Keepit Dam on the Namoi River and from the Murrumbidgee and Murray River waters and, of course, in Western Australia there is the Ord River project.

If it is fair enough to say that those people are growing good cotton there, it is fair enough to say that on last year's results cotton growing under irrigation in Queensland was better than that grown in the other States, and it gave a higher yield per acre. I would say that the situation is not hopeless, but it is pretty bad when we consider the figures supplied to me by the Cotton Marketing Board setting out the irrigated acres of cotton in Queensland, New South Wales, and Western Australia for the years 1963 and 1964, and the anticipated areas in 1965 and 1966.

In 1963 Queensland had 2,200 acres of cotton under irrigation, New South Wales had 2,360 acres, and Western Australia had 200 acres. In 1964 Queensland had 2,400 acres under irrigation, New South Wales had 9,000 acres, and Western Australia had 1,640 acres.

Mr. Davies: There is a Labour Government in New South Wales.

Mr. PILBEAM: That was done there because of American capital. It was the same sort of project as the King Ranch project in North Queensland to which the hon. member objected. A particular firm was given certain advantages to grow cotton under irrigation in northern New South Wales.

The estimated area that will be under irrigation in Queensland in 1965 is 6,500 acres, in New South Wales 21,000 acres, and in Western Australia 5,000 acres. By 1966, as a result of the added acreage following the completion of the Leslie Dam, it is estimated that there will be 10,000 acres in Queensland, while there will be 50,000 acres in New South Wales and 8,000 acres in Western Australia under irrigation.

The Australian Cotton Growers' Association, like myself and other interested people in Queensland, is very concerned with the situation. The chairman of the Queensland branch of that association has submitted

these points to me for the consideration of the Committee. Australian cotton-spinners require about 100,000 bales of raw cotton a year. In 1964 Australia will produce about 12,000 bales. However, it would require only an area of 60,000 acres of irrigated cotton to fully supply the Australian demand. I have shown in the statistics that I have just read that that acreage will be available in Australia in 1966, mostly in the northern area of New South Wales. The chairman of the association says that cotton is now being grown successfully in the Namoi River area and the Griffith area in New South Wales. These areas have sufficient land and water to produce the 100,000 bales a year required by our spinners.

Central Queensland has the best conditions in Australia for cotton-growing. I do not think anybody would deny that. That is pointed out in the report on the Australian cotton-growing industry, compiled by the Commonwealth Bureau of Agricultural Economics. It seems very unfair, therefore, that this area, which would be eminently suitable for cotton-growing, and has proved to be the most successful, should miss out entirely because we have no major irrigation schemes there.

The chairman of the association, referring to the Nathan Gorge scheme, says that the land which the dammed water would inundate is grazing land which at present would have an average gross earning of approximately £1 per acre per annum, whereas, if irrigated, it would have a gross earning of from £85 to £150 per acre.

I am sure that hon. members will appreciate the necessity to introduce at least one of these large water conservation schemes so that irrigation can be provided to allow us to attempt to recapture our position as the premier cotton-producing State in the Commonwealth.

I have mentioned on many occasions the subject of bitumen highways in this State. I say now, as I have always said, that no decentralised development of Queensland is possible unless a proper system of bitumen highways is implemented at the earliest possible date. I refer specifically to the roads running west from Rockhampton and Townsville. The coastal highway is almost completed.

The road from Rockhampton to Longreach has a rather unfortunate history. For many years under previous Governments it was left untouched and was not even a main road. In places it wound round trees, and was not gazetted as a main road. No-one was responsible for it. Shires were told that this highway would not be gazetted in their areas unless they "de-mained" equivalent lengths of main roads. In one unfortunate situation the Jericho Shire Council, with hardly any main roads within its area, had to spend all its Commonwealth aid road grant in maintaining this road. It is

a highway, and should have been so recognised by Governments half a century ago. It is to the credit of this Government that the road has now been recognised and gazetted as a highway, and will shortly be bituminised as far west as Emerald. As a matter of fact, there is to be a ceremony to mark that occasion, at which I expect the hon. member for Barcoo will be present.

Within the next year the road from Longreach to Barcaldine will be bituminised. In fact, work under two contracts is proceeding at present on the road. The position is, however, that there are still 178 miles of this roadway—I shall be charitable and give it that name—not bitumen-surfaced between Emerald and Barcaldine. Until that road is properly constructed and surfaced, we will not receive the full value of the bitumen construction this side of Emerald and the other side of Barcaldine.

Whilst that road remains in its present condition, people in the West will not use it, nor will those going to the West from coastal areas. It damages cars even now. It is imperative for decentralised development to have that road surfaced with bitumen along its full length. No-one can appreciate what is being lost to coastal ports unless he goes to Barcaldine and sees the heavy flow of traffic moving direct to Brisbane on a highway that is almost 700 miles long but, except for a few short stretches, is completely bituminised.

The position is fairly acute, and, in the interests of development of the area, I make a strong appeal to the Minister to consider making a grant or loan sufficient to surface that strip of road with bitumen, and also to completely bituminise the road to Cloncurry from Townsville. It is the east-west roads that aid decentralised development; north-south roads aid only the development of Brisbane.

The Division of Northern Development has recently been brought into being with Mr. Rex Paterson, a very capable officer, as director, and I think the attention of this department should be brought to the need for constructing major highways in bitumen. Up to the present, we find that the Commonwealth—in fact, the States have probably contributed to it by putting their case to the Commonwealth on this basis—will provide assistance for roads that will develop one industry. I refer particularly to the roads in the brigalow area and to the beef roads, which benefit one industry, and one industry only. I can tell the Committee that £9,300,000 has been allotted for the construction of beef roads, of which £5,000,000 has been a free grant from the Commonwealth Government. Surely, if beef roads are considered important, roads that develop the whole of the area should be considered even more important. I think a case could be made out—I hope Mr. Paterson sees eye to eye with me on this—for a grant to complete

these two very important highways—the ones west from Rockhampton and Townsville—and allow the development of the country to proceed as was contemplated when the railway system was laid down. This would give the Department of Main Roads an opportunity to consider in their correct perspective all the other important roads in the area.

When we press for the speedy construction of these major highways, we are told that we should not ask for prompt attention to any other important roads in the area. I think that is wrong. I think these major highways should be constructed now and got out of the way; they are long overdue. If £20,000,000 can be spent on strengthening the railway line in North Queensland, surely about £8,000,000 could be obtained to complete, as a matter of urgency, these two major highways to which I refer. I have discussed the matter with the assistant Commissioner for Main Roads at Rockhampton, who considers that about £4,000,000 would be required for the completion of the road from Rockhampton to Longreach. There is approximately 178 miles of roadway, the cost of which would average about £20,000 a mile, and in addition something like £500,000 would be needed to regrade the Drummond Range section. The road over the Drummond Range would not be complete unless heavy loads could be taken over it.

As I say, the construction of these major highways is being used as an excuse to deter us from asking that other important roads be completed. I refer specifically to highways that are the concern of my colleague, the hon. member for Mackenzie, and particularly to the roads to Rockhampton from Biloela and Theodore. Some attempt should be made to have these roads completed as speedily as possible. I do not think the highway from Theodore has been touched for years, and it is very important that there should be access to Rockhampton from these rich agricultural valleys. People coming to Rockhampton are entitled to travel on well-constructed, bituminised highways.

The Rockhampton Harbour Board has asked me to urge that consideration be given to the construction of roads other than those in the brigalow area that come within the Act. I have been asked to request that the Minister consider improving the road from Comet to Rolleston, and that the existing shire road running south from Blackwater be lifted to developmental-road status, and also that the road from Bauhinia Downs to Duaringa be constructed. These roads act as feeders for fat cattle to be brought to the rail loading points at Blackwater, Comet, and Duaringa, and they link up with the main highway to Rockhampton. By providing this link, fat cattle will be made available for sale, at the Gracemere yards, to the C.Q.M.E. Company Limited and Fitzroy River Abattoirs Limited, thereby providing competition with southern works.

In this regard it is necessary to construct highways that will allow cattle to come to Rockhampton, because we are about to experience a tremendous increase in killing capacity at Rockhampton meatworks. Lakes Creek works is at present undergoing major reconstruction costing a considerable sum of money, and T. A. Fields Pty. Ltd. are about three parts on the way to completion of their works at Nerimbera. It is a very modern establishment and the abattoir is well on the way to completion.

Furthermore, both the C.Q.M.E. Company and T. A. Fields Pty. Ltd. are building major cold rooms at Port Alma, costing in the vicinity of £500,000. At present we are about to reach agreement on the utilisation of 20 per cent. of those works by other operators, so next year we will see a tremendous increase in the number of cattle killed in Rockhampton. However, unless more cattle are brought to the town, our works will not be economic.

Mr. O'Donnell: How many operators will take advantage of it?

Mr. PILBEAM: The indications are that it will be availed of. Already there are more than enough applications to take up the full 20 per cent.

There is no doubt that we will see a tremendous use of these works in Rockhampton, but in order to move cattle into them we must have modern highways constructed as quickly as possible.

These two things, water conservation and bitumen highways, are of vital importance in any picture of decentralised development in Queensland. In the tremendous river system of the Fitzroy River millions of gallons of water go to waste daily, and where we have long stretches of our main highways not properly constructed and surfaced, we are divorcing our ports from the wealth of the country. If an effort is made to provide finance for these facilities at an early date it will materially assist the development of Queensland. Instead of placing the emphasis on development in the capital city we will be placing it on development in the central and northern parts of the State, which is what we are all trying to achieve.

I certainly hope that the Treasurer and the Ministers for Main Roads and Conservation will see this matter my way and that these very essential projects will be brought into being at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (3.24 p.m.): Before I congratulate the Treasurer on his Budget, I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to a move that is being made at the moment to bring about a shorter highway between Brisbane and the Northern Rivers district of New South Wales. On Wednesday last, 8 October, I attended a conference at Kyogle convened by the Beaudesert and Kyogle Chambers of Commerce together with the local authorities of

Beaudesert, Boonah, Kyogle and the whole of the shires and towns right down to Grafton.

The proposal is to build a short deviation to by-pass the bad section of highway around Mt. Lindesay. We must give credit to the Department of Main Roads in New South Wales for what it has done in the way of road construction over the years. We, too, have every reason to be proud of what our department has done over the past 30 years. But we have to remember that when these early roads were constructed engineers were not so fussy about hairpin bends and grades as they are today. When the Mt. Lindesay road was built it was intended to serve not only the Northern Rivers area but mainly the country inland from the rivers around Woodenbong and further inland.

This conference was perhaps the most enthusiastic I have ever attended. The Brisbane Chamber of Commerce was not represented but tendered an apology. However, I have reason to believe that Brisbane is wholeheartedly behind the proposal. The conference was attended not only by local authorities and chambers of commerce but every public body in the Northern Rivers—farmers' organisations, timber interests, meatworks, even representatives of the ambulance and police. It was also attended by the member for district, Mr. Richmond Merryweathers, and myself. The Australian Labour Party and the Country Party were represented, each speaking with one thought.

There is really nothing parochial about this proposal; it is a matter of national importance. We have to realise that although this territory is officially included in New South Wales, geographically it is closer to Brisbane than to Sydney. We were informed the other day that between 60,000,000 and 80,000,000 super feet of hardwood timber is being carried over the road between Kyogle and Brisbane. It costs between 14s. and 16s. per 100 super feet to cart that timber to Brisbane; it costs 40s. to take it to Sydney. The meat people at Casino informed the meeting that the proposal would be of tremendous benefit to the meat industry in that area. It takes a considerable time to carry the treated and frozen meat to Sydney, and it suffers deterioration on the journey. Apart from that, there are the additional freight charges.

Never have I seen a meeting so filled with enthusiasm. Sooner or later this road must come. It is not a costly matter. It is something that should be examined very closely. I am informed that by putting in a deviation of five or six miles one could travel on that road now. The school transport bus travels right to the top of the range from Kyogle now, so it will be realised that the grades provide no difficulty. It looks quite a possibility through Richmond Gap and Grady's Gap. You could depart from the main highway somewhere about Laravale to Christmas Creek Valley, or deviate at Rathdowney and go up Running Creek Valley.

Representatives of the police and ambulance at the conference reported that the present road is definitely dangerous. Hon. members who have travelled over it would know that that statement is all too true. A proposal of this kind should interest both our Main Roads Department and the Department of Transport. Interests in New South Wales, of course, have made approaches to their Government. They feel that that section of roadway should be treated as a national project. At the moment I am not in a position to say what it would cost. By reducing the distance to Brisbane by 25 to 30 miles, with the number of vehicles travelling that road daily hon. members will realise the saving that could be effected in running and maintenance costs. Anyone who saw the number of people from the Northern Rivers of New South Wales travelling—if I may use the expression—"hell bent" for Brisbane would really be impressed.

The Northern Rivers district has much to sell. Norco, the great dairy complex with a depot in Brisbane, produces dairy products in New South Wales and brings them over the border. New South Wales has meat and timber to sell, while we in Queensland have a tremendous market for grain and hay. In fact, there is a reciprocity in trade between the two States with tremendous possibilities. Never in my life have I seen people so keen on doing something, not for parochial gain or with the idea of serving their own ends, but to help every section of the community.

I hope that within the next few weeks I will have an opportunity, on behalf of a deputation from the Beaudesert and Boonah Shires, of placing a proposal before the Minister for Main Roads. I am sure that Cabinet will be interested in the proposal, and something similar will have to be done in New South Wales. This move was instituted largely by changing conditions and the use of road transport. Recently the Boonah railway line, which served the interests of the district for many years, was closed.

Mr. Davies: Did you agree?

Mr. MULLER: The question asked by the hon. member for Maryborough was put to me at the time. I was asked, "What are you going to do?" I said, "On the position as I see it, I find it very difficult to advocate the continuance of a service that is not being used." I was not using it, nor were the people who asked the question. I will cite the instance of a big timber firm whose business with the Railway Department was worth about £2,000 a month for several years, but just prior to the decision to close the line it had dwindled to £2 10s. a month. That was general. There was a loss of £70,000 a year on the line. It can be argued that it provided a service, and I will be fair; I believe that nothing did more to develop the Fassifern district than the railway line. However, with changing conditions the railway has to go. We now have the best and cheapest service we have ever had

and I have not heard one complaint. I suppose if I had spoken like this 10, 15 or 20 years ago I would have been out on my head in quick time, but these things happen and that is all there is to it.

Until recently, in New South Wales the only means of marketing available to people just over the border was to put all their produce onto the rail and send it to Sydney. We are within a comparative few miles of them. I will again give the distances so that they may sink in. It is 120 miles from Brisbane to Kyogle and, by cutting off 20 miles, the distance will be reduced to 100 miles. It is 140 miles from Brisbane to Casino, compared with 500 miles from Casino to Sydney. That gives hon. members the picture. Something has to be done. If we are too sound asleep at present to take action, it appears to me that the time will soon come when something has to be done. I do not believe it is a difficult proposal. I suppose it may be impudence on my part to make such a statement because I am not an engineer. However, at a glance the grades do not look difficult—not as difficult as they are going around the edge of the mountain now. Even if they are difficult, I draw attention to the fact that, with present-day plant, we can do things that could not be done 40 years ago when that road was built. Today, with the volume of traffic on the roads, we cannot take the risk of continuing to use the present dangerous road.

I believe that the proposed road would be of tremendous benefit to Brisbane. I am sure that when the proposal is thoroughly understood by the people of Queensland, we will have not only the members of the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce, but also every member of this Parliament, behind it. That is the belief on the other side of the border at the moment. The people there are doing their best to induce their Government to do something to assist in this regard.

The Department of Main Roads has done a mighty job, which has meant so much to all connected with primary industry. I should like to give an illustration of what I mean. When we drive out of the gate at Boonah, we are on bitumen until we turn into the property at Proston, 200 miles away. We can go to the West and to the North and find similar conditions. I do not give credit to any particular Government for that, because it has been a general march of progress.

There are cases where railway freight costs over longer distances would be very much lower than road freight costs, but as time goes on more and more freight is being diverted to road transport. Whether we like it or not, it is the wish of the people. It is cheaper in many ways, and is so much more convenient. It is a question of my judgment and the judgment of the people themselves.

That is the reason our country branch lines have been closed. It was the wish and decision of the country people themselves.

When you see a service being carried on and nobody is using it, you cannot help but ask yourself: would the poor unfortunates at Goodna carry on a business when nobody wants it? That is the position as I see it.

I should like to deal for a few moments with matters contained in the Budget itself. There are a few observations I should like to make. Land revenue is £3,000,000, which is a colossal sum. Perhaps a few years ago we would have considered it an almost impossible amount, but does this indicate a high standard of prosperity or does it reveal a high standard of inflation? If it is inflation. I do not blame anyone for it. It is not Queensland-wide; it is Australia-wide. As a matter of fact, it is largely world-wide. It is the duty of this Committee to have a very close look at it. Perhaps a remarkable feature of this high standard of prosperity and full employment is that we seem to have increasing industrial trouble. That is something that has to be examined closely.

I listened carefully to the speech of the hon. member for Ipswich East this morning. I suppose there is no more sincere member of Parliament than Mr. Donald. He put his point of view very well, but the question I ask myself in a matter of this kind is this: can you run two systems? Can you run and maintain a system of arbitration and at the same time maintain a system of conciliation or negotiation? It is like two electric thunderstorms. As any bushman would know, if there are two thunderstorms in one locality at the one time, they either have to amalgamate, or if one goes out the two go out. In my opinion that would happen if we had a system of conciliation and a system of arbitration at the one time. I am of the opinion that no-one would be greater sufferers under a system of conciliation than the industrial workers themselves. I have watched this position for a very long time, and although I cannot go back to the early shearers' strikes, I have read of them and I know the history of industrial disputes over the years.

I have felt for a long time that there is only one real solution to industrial disputes, and that is to have some independent authority to deal with them. There is at present a dispute at General Motors-Holden's Pty. Ltd. I suppose it would be very easy to say that the profits of this company are tremendous when it can return approximately £17,000,000 or £18,000,000 and pay stockholders bonuses of 106 per cent., and that it should therefore share them with the workers. I believe that it should, and I might myself subscribe to that line of thought. One could well say, "This industry can afford to pay increased wages." Look, however, at the embarrassing position in which a Premier or a Government would be placed if the findings of an industrial tribunal were set aside merely because this particular industry is in such a position. Perhaps the same thing might be said of the workers at Mt. Isa. Where would it end?

Perhaps some of the fault must be attributed to Governments for increasing the salaries of public servants. Those not so privileged may well say, "If public servants are entitled to these concessions, so am I." The more we diverge from decisions of industrial tribunals, the further we go into the woods.

With great prosperity in some industries, moderate prosperity in others, and stagnation in the remainder, how can any common factor be arrived at? The situation to me appears to be hopeless, and in a very short time it could end in complete chaos. Who then will be the greatest sufferers? I believe that before anything of this nature is allowed to be carried too far, it should be carefully examined. It is easy to burn one's house down, but where is one then? Privileges now enjoyed can be destroyed, and a good deal more lost than is gained.

Nevertheless, under conditions of high inflation many people are hit very hard. There is no question about that, and it will continue. Those hardest hit are those who are taking it in silence. I refer to pensioners and those not in receipt of wages of a decent standard. I do not think for a moment, however, that any industrial mischief will help these people in any way. Whilst this system continues and some people are constantly crying from the housetops, "We want more and more," the primary producer is taking all the knocks. He is receiving nothing extra and has to meet higher costs. Many would be surprised to see the number of people who have given up farming. They are not failures but practical men who have given the job away. They say, "What's the use of carrying on? Costs are going higher and higher. Turnover looks all right, but in the end we have nothing."

What are they doing? They are not going into high Government positions. They are taking jobs as ordinary workers on the basic wage, preferring that to carrying on under present conditions on the land. It is true that farms today are worked with machinery. It has to be remembered, however, that whilst these aids are available it is not cheap to run a farm or grazing property with machinery. Although the work can be done quickly, the costs are higher. We must do something if we are to retain these industries.

Figures are produced in Parliament from time to time showing the cost of maintaining the Public Service and other services of the State, and the Government relies on the prosperity of the primary industries to meet this cost. If primary industries are sagging, it is only a matter of time before everything else sags. I know it is generally thought by people who live in the city that primary producers have never been more prosperous than they are now. I want to remove that idea from their minds. Industries such as the sugar industry and the wheat industry, which are highly protected and, I might add, subsidised, are sound, but the beef and dairying industries and the general produce industry are not very

profitable. We saw reports in the Press last week of potatoes selling at £100 and up to £105 a ton. The price reached that level because 99 per cent. of potato-growers had no potatoes to sell. People should not be carried away with the idea that these prices are high. There was a fall this week of about £40 a ton, and the genuine grower has to take whatever price the market offers him. The same is very largely true of the meat industry, although I know there are some hon. members in the Chamber who will not agree with what I am saying. I am in the industry and I know how much profit there is in it. I can assure them that there is very little profit in it when one has paid interest on capital, as well as rates, taxes, and other charges. In fact, it is very doubtful whether one gets the basic wage. I have been in the industry all my life, so I know something about it and I know how difficult it is.

The question of how the inflationary trend is going to affect primary producers is one of which we must take note. It is not a matter of working five days a week; it is a matter of working seven days a week. I assure hon. members that primary producers are getting pretty fed up, and if anybody is entitled to kick over the traces and try to get better treatment, it is the primary producers. Without organisations, of course, they are not in a position to go to the court and say, "I want so-and-so. If I don't get it, I won't produce." They have to produce to enable them to pay their way and so that they will not starve. There are exceptions, and perhaps some people are in a more fortunate position.

The speech made by the hon. member for Warrego in the Address-in-Reply debate comes to my mind. He said then that many of the people in his electorate were living on depreciation. That is a rather tall story, but there is no doubt that some people have become well established and can live on their assets for some time. The country's real asset, as I have said before, is the young man with his life and energy before him who is prepared to work. If we are not prepared to look after him, we shall do the country a great disservice. There are many things to be done, but I ask the Committee to bear in mind what I have said.

The hon. member for Warwick referred to the deterioration in the soils in Queensland. Our soils are one of our greatest assets, and I recall the words of Louis Bromfield in the foreword to one of his books—"Everything we have comes from the soil. If our soil goes, our civilisation goes with it." That is very largely true. Although the soils in Queensland have deteriorated considerably, we are doing very little to arrest the deterioration. As a matter of fact, in many cases it is too costly to do it, and many primary producers cannot afford to do the fertilising that they are told to do. A short while ago I mentioned the exploitation of primary producers. In order to fertilise, primary producers first have to get fertiliser. Let us take what has been done in the New England district of New South Wales

in the last year or two. Most hon. members have seen the article in the newspaper under the heading "Miracle Performed at Glen Innes," in which it is stated that 10 head of stock are now being carried where previously only two were carried. I believe there is something in it. They have done a really wonderful job. But here again, what assistance do primary producers get?

I should like to draw attention to an article that appeared in the Brisbane daily Press on 2 October. It refers to "Fertilizers' issue and big profit increase" and reads—

"Australian Fertilizers Ltd. will raise £1,660,898 by an issue of 1,207,926 £1 shares, at a premium of 7/6 a share, on the basis of three for five held at September 25.

"This follows a lift in parent company profit of 27 per cent. from £201,321 to £225,789 in the year to June 30."

The point I make is that recently the Commonwealth Government made available a subsidy for the purpose of reducing the price of fertiliser. You know what happened, Mr. Hodges. Instead of the primary producer getting the benefit of that subsidy, these people increased the price of fertiliser and the producer had to pay the same price as before. If that sort of thing is to go on, what is the good of anyone trying to help? If people of this kind can cash in on any assistance that is forthcoming, what is the good of giving it?

The idea of improving soils and building up legumes is a wonderful idea. It is really astounding what can be done. I mention legumes because, in my own district, much has been done but the cost of doing it is beyond the average man; he just cannot afford to do it and most of the reason is that right along the line this exploitation goes on. I want to be fair in my examination and analysis of the adjustment of wages and I believe, as much as I hate price control—and I have used these words in the Chamber before—that the time is coming when the Government might have to consider some form of price control.

Mr. Graham: Would you not say it is long overdue?

Mr. MULLER: Wait until I am finished. If people of this kind can come in and cash in on opportunities that become available to them because there is no price control, the Government, whether it likes it or not, may be obliged to step in.

I hate price control. When we had it, it was carried to the other extreme and if it gets into the hands of some unscrupulous person, again it makes things impossible for the primary producer. I remember only too well what happened, for the reasons I mentioned a few moments ago. So many people do not understand what cost of production is and the primary producer cannot organise and say, "If you do not give us so-and-so we won't give you any food."

Already the primary producer is being exploited very badly and this is something with which I am confronted as, I am afraid, is every other member: as wages increase costs go up with them and everything it taken. I have a soft spot in my heart for the wage-earner; in fact, for everyone who works. I do not care whether he is in a sound financial position or not. If he gives an honest day's work to the community he is entitled to a fair day's pay.

I could cite any number of instances, but if hon. members like to look carefully around this is what they will see: in trade and commerce today there are two suckers, one at each end—the producer and the consumer. Those in between, the wholesaler and the retailer, appear to be looked after right along the line.

When I mention producer, I go so far as to include contractors as well. Only a few weeks ago I listened to the hon. member for Yeronga make his maiden speech in which he told us something of the problems of contracting today. When one sees people like M. R. Hornibrook Pty. Ltd. and K. D. Morris & Sons Pty. Ltd. going broke because of impossible conditions, one cannot help but wonder whether something is wrong. One section produces an article and then somebody rushes in to make the job impossible.

If there is one duty of this Parliament, or any other, it is to see that no-one is allowed to monkey about with the whole thing. Even if we have to depart from the old-time form and principle, when measures of this kind are introduced we must do something. It took the dairy farmers 12 months to satisfy the authorities that they were entitled to an increase in the price of butter and milk. They got that increase, but a quarter of it went to the wholesaler and another quarter to the retailer. The other half went to the primary producer.

The matter of bacon prices should be looked at very carefully. I hesitate to discuss this subject in case I am misunderstood. I know something about growing pigs. When I was a boy I fed hundreds of them, and I have seen a lot of them being fed. With today's prices I know that pigs cannot be raised cheaply. With the price of grain and other feed it costs a lot to rear pigs. Bacon pigs reached a price of approximately 3s. a lb. In some cases the price went slightly over that but today it is under 3s. a lb. I see no justification for the prices charged for bacon in shops throughout the State today.

I am trying to put up a case for the primary producer. I have always adopted the attitude that if you manufacture an article for sale you must have some regard for the consumer. If business houses in Brisbane forgot the interests of their customers they would not be in business for very long. I spent the best years of my life in the marketing of dairy products and I am convinced of one thing: it is the duty of those engaged in marketing to attend not only to the production end but

also to the selling end. If you force the price of your commodity to such a high level that the consumer cannot afford to buy it, you are looking for a lot of trouble.

With bacon pigs at 3s. a lb.—to take the top price—I am far from convinced that there is any justification to charge 15s. a lb for bacon. Of course, that is the top price, but even if we take an average price of 10s. a lb. there is no reason for the margin between 3s. and 10s. How in the name of heavens is the primary producer going to survive under these conditions? I openly admit that I cannot afford to buy bacon, and there are hundreds like me. Bacon has become a luxury. No-one can tell me that this sort of thing is going to help the primary producer. It is crucifying him. As you go around the farms and see the men producing potatoes, onions, dairy produce and everything else you like to mention, you come to the conclusion that they are doing no good.

It seems remarkable that here we have a Budget of about £300,000,000 with extravagance in every direction, with so many appearing to be prosperous, yet at the same time genuine citizens are being crushed to death because of it. We must grant some relief. If we do not, more problems lie ahead of us. Farmers come to me and say, "There is no money in it. I am not going to pull my guts out seven days a week and get less than the fellow on the basic wage." That is happening everywhere. The most serious part of it is that these men are experts—men who know the job. If we are going to replace them with a lot of novices, again we are looking for a lot of trouble.

I have one suggestion to make to the Treasurer this afternoon. I was impressed very forcibly by one item in his report. I refer to the transport tax, which was dealt with very fully by the hon. member for Gregory. Road transport tax is paid mainly by the primary producers and this year it amounted to £2,389,926, which is £590,309 more than the amount for last year. The time has come for some relief to be given to the primary producers who have to pay this tax. Government Members talk about decentralisation, but the farther people are from Brisbane the higher is the rate of tax.

This is an extremely serious impost on primary producers. It is all very well to say that they can use the railways. We must all plead guilty; as I pointed out earlier in my remarks, the day has come when road transport is so much more convenient. Surely people who pay heavy taxation should be allowed the use of our roads for a reasonable fee. I believe that the present tax on the transport of cattle is unfair when rates and other charges are taken into account. I should like to see this matter closely investigated.

I note with a good deal of satisfaction that a move is being made to reduce land tax. That may, to a point, be a set-off. However, we must remember that this little

bit of juicy fruit we get by way of relief is, in the next breath, taken away by an increase in value. I was very delighted to see in this morning's Press that there is a possibility of a further investigation of the methods of land valuation. If the Government does not do something about the Valuer-General's Department, the Valuer-General's Department will do something with the Government. That is the way I sum it up.

Mr. Hewitt: At least you have always been consistent.

Mr. MULLER: There is no question about it. I could never understand why we should have a continuous crack at land values. If a land value is struck in 1940 and it has to be lifted in 1945, that is bad enough. If it has to be lifted again seven years later, and again seven years later, where does the unimproved value come in? I have watched this happening. I am not posing as an authority on everything, but having moved around the State and with my experience of primary production, I claim that I know something about land values, and I know that the values struck in the last year or two are not struck on the unimproved value. They have been struck on the improvements. Tremendous sums of money put into improvements are not always visible to valuers who may come along, as they have over the years. Farmers who have put money into improvements from time to time have found that their farms have increased in value.

Mr. Graham: That is not the basis on which the Valuer-General makes his valuation.

Mr. MULLER: I can recall my words when I sat in Opposition years ago and, although it was 20 years ago, I suppose, to me they ring true again this afternoon. I said, "This is not a Bill to adjust land values; it is a Bill to increase land values."

Mr. Graham: Land values must increase with the prosperity of the State.

Mr. MULLER: In some cases that should take place. I agree that upon converting a grazing block or a farm block to building blocks, values should increase. However, for primary production the valuation should not increase because the value of the land is represented by what is put into it. It has to be cleared; fertilisers have to be added; it has to be top-dressed, and many other things have to be done. However, at the moment, if we try to extract from a man what he has put into the land, he will not do anything. Only one who has been on the land can fully absorb the theories of it. Even though I am prepared to concede the point of the hon. member who just interjected, I say in reply: how can he account for a value such as that which was applied in Lockyer a few years ago—£110 an acre?

Mr. Graham: How many farmers would sell their land for less than that?

Mr. MULLER: It was sold for £100 an acre, and in most cases there would be £80 worth of improvements on it. Some are small farms of 80 to 100 acres, and if you deduct the value of the house, the buildings, and the watering facilities, there would be very little left. I bought a property and by the time I accounted for the improvements on the place there was nothing for the land. I can assure the hon. member that that happens in 90 per cent. of cases.

Mr. Fletcher interjected.

Mr. MULLER: If the Minister for Lands wants to come in, I can get him many places like it. Those values are struck largely on an improved basis. I am not only sour, I am bitter towards anyone who exploits a man on the property that he has built up. Hon. members say that land has improved because of conditions. The land I referred to was potato land. If the hon. member for Mackay thinks there is a lot of money in it, he should buy a potato farm and have a go.

Mr. Graham: You could not get a farm today for under £10,000.

Mr. MULLER: I will get the hon. member one if he will work it.

It is not because of the high value of land, but because of the work put into it. There are hundreds of places where people are not doing too well because they have not the money, but why swamp the man who has made a success of it? When you get onto grazing land, it never ends. There are suckers, weeds, and other types of pests to contend with.

Mr. Graham: All primary producers—cane farmers and others—want something for nothing all the time.

Mr. MULLER: I suggest that if the hon. member feels that way, he should go out and join them. I have been his best supporter in this debate. I am the only one who has given him any support at all. As an Independent, I am trying to be fair. Whenever there is a brawl there are two types of people, and they go to both extremes. That is why we are in trouble now.

The type of statement the hon. member made a little while ago embitters people. I am not bitter towards either the employer or the employee. I have worked as hard as anyone else, and I am trying to put up a case in defence of the man who is entitled to a fair and reasonable wage. I am also putting up a case to stop this exploitation which I mentioned a moment ago. I am as sour as the hon. member with certain people, very often trades people. Complaints have been made to me recently about the cost of clothing, footwear, and food. By the time these men support a family and pay the rent, they do not live; they simply exist.

Mr. Graham: You cannot blame the worker for trying to get an increase.

Mr. MULLER: No, and I do not want anyone to blame the farmer, who has worked just as hard. He works five days a week, plus two more days a week. If the hon. member was in a district such as mine, he would realise that.

One of the greatest problems we have in the cattle industry is the cattle tick, and so far not a great deal has been done to solve the problem. Officers of the C.S.I.R.O. and of the Department of Primary Industries have made an effort and look like getting somewhere, but those of us who are engaged in this industry have to use whatever facilities are available to us to control the cattle tick. For years stock were dipped, using arsenical preparations. Finally the cattle tick developed an immunity to arsenic. There are now available remedies that are much better, but again primary producers are exploited in their use. I refer to Bercatox and Asontol, which are, in my opinion, outstanding examples. The only thing wrong with them is their extremely high price. Nothing can be done about it. In all my years in the cattle industry I have never used a dip as effective in the control of ticks as Asontol. It is supplied in powder form in small packages. Each package contains 5 lb., there are four packages in a drum, and the cost is £52. That is the price of four packets of the preparation, making it approximately £13 a packet.

A short time ago a small corporate organisation was set up in my district which was able to get supplies from the importers at a price reduced by approximately £6 15s. a drum. This organisation did not last very long; after approximately six or eight months supplies were cut off. These are things that the Government can investigate, as this is a burning question with stock-owners today. There is no justification for the extremely high price of these preparations.

Mr. Houston: How many cattle would you do with one packet of 5 lb.?

Mr. MULLER: We estimate that it costs about 1s. a head each dipping. The cost depends on the number of times a beast is dipped. I understand that the landed cost of this preparation is less than half the amount that those using it have to pay for it. There must be some means of stopping this exploitation. It seems to be an open go for people wholesaling or retailing anything one cares to mention.

I am pleased that the Minister for Lands is present, as another subject with which I wish to deal this afternoon is the conversion of leasehold land to freehold, which has been a controversial question during the last few weeks. As everyone knows, I, with the support of the Government, was responsible for the introduction of this legislation. I know that hon. members on the other side do not like it. It is very convenient for the Minister that they are so hostile towards it, as otherwise he would

have had to face a number of questions concerning the delay with applications for freeholding.

My view on land tenures is that a lot can be said for both leasehold and freehold tenure. For the best use of the land, the things that I was discussing a few moments ago have to be done, and nobody is going to spend a fortune on improving land if he feels that there is a danger that it will be taken away when his lease expires. Freeholding has therefore much to commend it.

I have made an application for the freeholding of certain land. I do not want to "cash in" on any of my legislation; I do not care if the application is rejected. I do, however, wish to point out what has happened. I made the application on 2 January, 1962, three years ago next January, and I have not yet received even a reply. What I have received is an acknowledgment that my application has been received. So far I have not been able to ascertain what the valuation will be, or whether it is ever likely to be converted.

I do not know why there should be this delay. I know that side issues are brought in. The timber valuers have ridden over the place time and time again. I am sure of one thing: the time spent by the Forestry officers valuing the timber on the place would be worth more than the timber itself. That is not an exaggerated statement; it is true. The Treasurer is smiling. Let me tell him that one day, 12 months after the matter was supposed to have been settled, I saw eight men with two trucks on the property. I said to the boss cocky, "What are you doing now?" He said, "We are stripping." They took a chain every 10 chains. Much of the land was bare of timber, but they were scratching their way through speargrass and they had seeds from their bellies to their toes. I would not have done it, but they went over the whole property. This is only a small property; it is less than a living area. I do not know why there has been this delay.

Mr. Hiley: How many acres is it?

Mr. MULLER: Less than 5,000 acres. There are two leases and they aggregate about 4,500 acres. I have a freehold block alongside them, but that is beside the point.

Mr. Hiley: Mountain slopes?

Mr. MULLER: Yes. There is everything in it. Some of it is on the river and some of it is on the mountainside. It is used only for grazing, and no-one has claimed that it is useful for anything other than grazing.

I am mentioning my own case not to embarrass the Minister but to let his officers know that there is something in the point made by Mr. Peter Bell a few weeks ago. We heard the President of the Land Court, Mr. Wright, say, "We are dealing with the cases as they come to us." All I have to say is that what Mr. Wright said is true.

These things are hanging fire and are doing the Government a lot of harm, and they certainly are not doing the property-owner any good.

Mr. Fletcher: How long is it since the Forestry officers were there?

Mr. MULLER: They have been there several times. The last time that I saw them was in July 1963. I saw a land valuer there four or five weeks ago, an officer of the Minister's department. I said, "What are you doing?" He said, "Having another look at the property." He went over and over it. The Valuer-General and the local authority both come into the valuation. People come to me and tell me again and again, "The Government is murdering your freehold legislation." I have not given any encouragement to that statement, but I do not know what benefit there can be in delaying the application. However, in my own case the property requires a great deal of costly improvement because of suckering, and so on, and it is important to know the tenure before one starts. I know that many other people are in a similar position, and it is time that something was done.

I have another complaint, and for the first time this afternoon I shall get down to the parish-pump level. I have discussed it with the Minister for Transport, and I am glad to see that the Treasurer is in the Chamber because it concerns him to some extent. My complaint relates to the Boonah-Dugandan railway. I have said before that I agree with everything that the Government has done. However, there is a cattle-trucking yard in the city of Ipswich, and I asked the Minister for Transport to give us a few miles of railway out of town to enable us to load cattle onto railway wagons or to receive the trainloads of cattle that come to the district. The existing yards are at Churchill, and people have built all round them. In fact, there is a school only about 80 yards from them. The people who own the yards have been reluctant to move them, but the Minister told me that he would move the railway yards and provide yards out on a small extension when the other yards were moved. So far nothing has been done. The Minister wrote to the Moreton Shire Council saying, "If you want to run this extra two miles you will have to run it yourself." Just imagine a local authority running two miles of railway! How could one enter into a piebald arrangement like that with the Government owning and controlling the rolling-stock?

The Fassifern people have no railway connection at all and they want this centre so that they can load cattle and get them onto the main line. I have one concern about roads, and it is my only concern. You cannot bring much produce in to the city by road. The roads will not carry it. There is no room. You cannot load in Ipswich as there is no room there. I should like hon. members of the Cabinet, when they meet in Ipswich, to

examine this question for themselves. If they prove me wrong they can tell me so, but if I am right they should do something about it.

I appreciate the hearing that I have had today. These are very important questions. I have not been at all critical of the Government. In whatever I have done I have tried to be fair to both sides, but I repeat one point: if we want peace in industry we must be reasonable and there must be understanding on both sides—and some degree of fairness. It is no good saying, "If you are not prepared to take what we give you, you can do the other thing."

For the life of me, I cannot see how anyone can operate a system of conciliation and negotiation with one of arbitration. I believe that over the years the court has done a wonderful job but I think we must have a look at its constitution. I think the position has become so serious that a close examination should be made of ways and means of perhaps amending the system of arbitration—if there is anything wrong with it—before it is too late.

A similar investigation is now being made into the adjustment of land values. After all, it is better to be sensible than bull-headed when dealing with such a problem.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Aspley) (4.23 p.m.): Being of a charitable nature, I have some sympathy for the Leader of the Opposition and other members opposite in their difficulty in finding issues in the Budget upon which to attack the Government.

Mr. Houston: You have been asleep.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I have not been asleep. I have listened to hon. members opposite endeavouring to find some constructive point on which to attack the Treasurer's Financial Statement. They have had extreme difficulty in making their points. That is not hard to understand, because on every page of this document can be found evidence of sound administration, positive policies, proper accounting practices, and a genuine desire to promote the social and economic welfare of the entire community in this State.

We can also see that the State is reaping the rewards accruing as a result of the continuance in office of the Country-Liberal Government, which is pursuing a policy that rejects the socialistic outlook of Labour and is bringing increasing confidence to all sections of the community and encouraging a positive, progressive outlook among all those who are responsible for planning for the future.

It is one of the high spots in the achievements of this Government that since the dead hand of Socialism has been removed from the Government of this State, the attitude of increasing faith in the future has been created and fostered. It is this factor above all others that has resulted in the massive developmental projects that are now beginning to take shape and that are only a sample of what will accrue in the future.

I take this opportunity on behalf of the Liberal Party to acknowledge the tremendous contribution that has been made to the progress of this State by the Treasurer during the seven years he has occupied this important position. Mr. Hiley possesses many talents and qualities, but I believe his greatest faculty lies in his rare ability to comprehend the subject in hand. So our party, the Government and the State have derived immense benefit as a result of the diligent and skilful manner in which he has employed his talents as Treasurer.

Considerable concern is being expressed at the increasing tendency of the Brisbane City Council to impose more and more stringent conditions on those seeking to establish or expand industry in this city. This has been a gradual process. In saying this I am not casting aspersions at any particular administration. This process has been going on for many years. It has now reached the stage where many small industries are being lost to the city and the State. I suggest that, in the interest of evolving a greater industrial complex in this city, the operations of the City Council should be examined in order to alter these practices, which have crept in under successive administrations and which are hampering the development of this city.

When we examine some of the problems that are being encountered we find that conditions imposed by the City Council are unique in Australia. To indicate the situation about which I have been speaking, I want to cite two or three different examples of the very many which have been brought under my notice and, I feel sure, have been brought to the notice of other hon. members.

First of all, I cite the experience of a small business in my area which over the years, through the application of industry and ingenuity, has developed into a very flourishing wood-working business. Because of the unique qualities of Queensland hoop pine, which incidentally is the best timber in the world for wood-working, and as a result of ingenuity the owner of this business has been able to develop many projects. He has been able to obtain contracts for the supply of such trivial articles as school rulers. Following a recent visit overseas he finds that he can meet world competition, both in price and quality, and has built up quite a good export trade. One particular project he has developed is the manufacture of simple slivers of wood known to the medical profession as tongue depressors. Because of the quality of Queensland hoop pine his product is superior to any made of any other timber. It is a typical example of the ingenuity of this factory and the progressiveness of the proprietor.

Because of the increase in this man's business over the last few years he sought to expand his premises. He has already secured land at Geebung on which to build a new factory, but his present capital does not allow him to build his new establishment.

Consequently he plans to remain on his present site for the next five years. In order to meet the increasing orders he found it necessary to extend his plant, and some months ago he started negotiations with the Brisbane City Council with a view to building an addition to his factory. He was agreeable that this should be a short-term expansion as he was in a rapidly developing residential area. After months of negotiation with the Brisbane City Council agreement was finally reached and he was given permission to make the necessary extensions to his factory subject to the condition that, in five years' time, he would remove the buildings to a new site which he had at Geebung, some two miles away. However, he was shocked and alarmed at the conditions that the council imposed on him concurrent with the granting of permission to extend his premises. I have his permission to quote the letter he received from the Town Clerk dated 22 June, 1964. I will read the relevant parts, which are as follows—

"Dear Sir,

I take pleasure in advising that, as an outcome of your application dated 25 May, 1964, the Council Registration Board has granted the necessary permission to erect part of a building, of the size and in the position depicted on the site plan submitted, by way of an addition to the existing factory building on land situated at the corner of Hamilton Road and Charlotte Street, Chermside, and described as Subdivisions 2A, and 17 of Portion 573, Parish of Kedron, to be used for such purpose, subject to the following conditions:—

The first of the conditions set out stated that the proposed addition must be of suitable design and harmonious with the rest of the building and to be the requisite distance from the street alignment. The second condition deals with the facilities for parking. The third condition prohibits the storage of substances of a noxious, hazardous, or offensive nature, which is understandable.

The fourth clause, Clause (d), reads as follows—

"The company entering into an agreement and also giving to the Council by way of a bond the sum of £5,000 that the land will be cleared of all industrial buildings within a period of five years from the date of approval of this application, the agreement and bond both to be satisfactory in all respects to the requirements of the City Solicitor."

If this man had £5,000 surplus capital to invest in a bond which the City Council required to ensure the honouring of the agreement he was prepared to enter into, possibly he would have been able to use it to establish his new factory at Geebung, and may not have had to engage in the extensions on his present site. However, he has an expanding business. All his personal capital is fully committed, as is any advance that he can obtain from his bank.

Because of the harsh requirement of the City Council that he lodge a cash bond of £5,000, he is unable to proceed with the extensions to his factory. In effect, he is unable to expand his business to cope with the orders he is receiving. I do not see why the City Council should not have accepted a fidelity bond from an insurance company, which would have been readily forthcoming and could have been submitted to the City Council to satisfy it that he would carry out the conditions imposed on him. However, that was not good enough. The council required him to submit £5,000 in cash. In consequence, he is unable to expand his business.

The next case I mention concerns a Sydney poultry-equipment manufacturer who, because of volume of business, wished to establish a factory in Brisbane. On 21 February this year he successfully applied to the Minister for Industrial Development for a lease of land at Tarragindi Road, Rocklea, covering Lot 14, which is almost opposite Davies Street. The land was rough and completely undeveloped, but he was quite prepared to develop it.

Being a stranger to this city, he did not realise the problems that he would encounter when he applied to the Brisbane City Council for connection of the necessary services. At this point Tarragindi Road is unmade. He asked the council to give him a road frontage. The council assented, conditional upon his paying about £2,500. He then asked for the connection of a water service. He was again told that after the payment of the necessary connection charges to extend the main to his property, that service would be provided. The same applied to electricity and sewerage. The council required the payment of several thousands of pounds before he would be supplied with the essential services so that he could commence the erection of his factory.

Not having had experience of the operations of the Brisbane City Council, he naturally was shocked. He said to me, "Fred, I am satisfied that you people in Brisbane don't want industry to come to this State. I contrast my experience here with the experience I had in Adelaide when, to proceed with a similar venture, I approached the local authority there. I was furnished with the services of a liaison officer, and everything possible was done to make easy my task of getting into business. It was not long before I was able to establish my factory. I had exactly the same experience in Perth. They rolled out the red carpet in order to encourage me to set up a factory in that State." As a consequence, he did not proceed with the project and has made no further attempt to establish a factory here. Many southern business men have had similar experiences.

I now quote the experience of a property-owner at Aspley. For the last 30 years he has conducted a poultry farm on a couple of

acres, but owing to the extension of residential development in the area he now finds himself almost surrounded by homes and desires to realise on his property.

An offer was made for the land as a motel site and a condition of sale, of course, was that it be subject to site approval by the Brisbane City Council. The council was quite happy to give the necessary site approval for a motel because the land was ideally situated on the main North Coast road; there is only one motel within several miles, and there is a pressing need for another of this type of industry in the area.

Site approval was conditional upon the owner's providing drainage for a small stream which runs along the boundary of the property for several hundred yards. The cost of providing this necessary service amounted to within the vicinity of £10,000. This made it impossible for the owner to proceed with the proposal, and this unfortunate poultry-farmer, who desires to retire, has to continue working. As the land is in a non-urban zone, permission to subdivide it for residential purposes cannot be obtained.

There are three instances of things that are happening as a result of the increased powers granted over the years to the Brisbane City Council. The City Council has taken these powers and is imposing these conditions in the mistaken idea that the burden on ratepayers is being eased. This is a short-sighted policy. It results in industry going elsewhere, whilst Brisbane misses out on this very desirable development.

I suggest that it is time that consideration was given to the setting up of a select committee of Parliament to investigate the powers that the Brisbane City Council has aggregated over the years, in order that they might be modified and brought more into line with those applying in other capital cities of Australia so that we can obtain a greater share of the industries that will be established in this country in the future.

To sum up, two or three weeks ago I received through the post an invitation to attend the Australian Congress for International Co-operation and Disarmament, 1964. I suppose all hon. members received a similar invitation. Included in the list of Queensland sponsors are many prominent people, among them ministers of religion, professional men, business men, members of local authorities, and members of Parliament. Included in the list is the name "Mr. F. Campbell". Because I have fairly prominent associations with Rotary, the Y.M.C.A., my church, and other organisations, I do not want there to be any misunderstanding that the Mr. F. Campbell included on the list of Queensland sponsors for the Australian Congress for International Co-operation and Disarmament 1964 is the Mr. F. Campbell who is the member for Aspley. I say that because already quite a number of people have questioned the wisdom of my lending my name to such a Communist-front organisation.

I notice that in the list of sponsors the name "Mr. A. Macdonald" appears as an executive, and I presume that he is a member of the executive of the sponsoring committee. I presume that this Mr. Macdonald is the Mr. Macdonald who is secretary of the Trades and Labour Council in Brisbane and who is a Communist.

Mr. Duggan: He was at a garden party that the Governor gave. Was it a Communist party because he was there?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition should try to draw such an analogy. A Communist holding the high position in the Communist movement held by Mr. Macdonald would not participate in any activity unless it was designed to promote the Communist cause. Indeed, in the articles of faith to which he subscribes, he, as a highly classified Communist, is charged with the task of directing all his energies and talents towards the achievement of Communist aims. Even though he might be otherwise occupied, that is his main purpose.

I have a great deal of grudging respect for a highly classified Communist, because I recognise that he is dedicated to his chosen vocation, I recognise that he has a high degree of skill, and I recognise that he is sincere in serving the cause that he follows. Make no mistake, the path of a highly classified Communist is not an easy one. His task is more difficult than that of a dedicated Christian, for whilst the latter is responsible only to his Christian conscience, a highly classified Communist is answerable directly to his higher command and has continually to perform acts to prove his worthiness and is obliged to furnish regular reports of his subversive activities to his superiors as evidence of his loyalty and dedication. So in organising these various congresses in the name of peace—it is to be noted, of course, that the title in this case has been changed from the familiar Peace Congress to another rather peculiar title—the Communist Party has taken hold of one of the most sacred words in the Christian language and so subverted its meaning that "peace" now has a rather tarnished implication.

It is not without significance that this latest Communist-front conference is not to be called a peace congress but bears the peculiar title to which I have referred. In his next report to his superiors in the Communist Party, Mr. Macdonald will be able to state that as an executive officer of this Queensland-sponsored committee of the Australian Congress for International Co-operation and Disarmament of 1964, in the list of sponsors from Queensland, apart from other prominent citizens, there appears one member of the Federal Parliament, three members of the State Parliament, and three aldermen of the Brisbane City Council.

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) (4.51 p.m.): Before I deal specifically with the Budget, I take the opportunity of referring to the passing of a late colleague, Mr. "Watty" Wallace. I knew Mr. Wallace for many years before he became a member of this Legislature. He was known to various members of my family. He was a kindly man, one who, if he was friendly with you, was a very firm friend indeed. He observed strictly the codes of decency and good behaviour, and was a very fine and exemplary Labour man. I should like to place on record my personal sense of loss at his passing and my very deep sympathy for his family.

The Treasurer, in concluding his Budget speech, referred to the fact that the year ahead will be an outstanding one for this State, that development will be very widespread, that employment will be at a maximum, and that there will be considerable difficulty in keeping costs and prices at a reasonable level. He told us in his dramatic conclusion that the planning and waiting stages are finished and that the stage is set, that we are poised, and that only one thing has now to happen—the tap has only to be turned on and the milk and honey and liquid gold will flow freely.

If his predictions are correct, good luck to us, to him, and to the State. But I should say this much in regard to his Budget and the administration: as a forecaster, if he wanted to forecast the weather, he could look at the skies and, judging by the wonderful forecast he has made in the Budget, to use the racing vernacular, be a "bird" in the next meteorological stakes.

It is particularly noted that in his Budget speech he refers firstly to the unlimited funds that will be available in the private sector, and secondly to the restraint which will be evident in the public or Government-spending sector occasioned, as he says, by the modest restraint put on the Commonwealth works and housing programme.

With regard to his first point, the unlimited funds that would be available in the private sector, despite the fact that economists generally say that the economy is very sound and that everything in the State of Israel is very happy, I point out to him a certain number of events that have occurred. In particular, I refer to the recent Budget brought down by the Federal Treasurer in which he increased income tax, sales tax, and excise duty on selected items. This is a short, sharp and smart way of what I would call "applying the brakes."

If the Liberal-Country Party administration runs true to form we will find that, through Treasury and Reserve Bank control, a tight rein will be placed on bank liquidity, with restraint being imposed particularly on trading bank operations. That method has been part and parcel of the policy of the present administration for many years. Unfortunately the result has been to hunt many private citizens away from the realms of orthodox banking operations into fields far

removed from Central Bank control and any sort of Government surveillance. The ineptitude of the administration has saddled this country with a "stop-go" policy. Such a policy is not conducive to assisting the progress of Australia, and certainly is not conducive to assisting the progress of Queensland. This ineptitude has restricted growth because over the years that the present administration has been in control in Canberra we have seen over-restraint in one year or for a couple of years, followed by a flush of Government spending. If anyone can tell me that that is economic planning, the type of planning that Australia and Queensland should have, I will walk from here to Bourke.

To talk about unlimited funds being available in the private sector such a short time after the presentation of the Federal budget is just so much bosh, particularly in view of a recent report from the Reserve Bank that fiscal measures will probably be necessary at the end of the year if the public turns from holding money to holding other assets. That is the warning given by the Reserve Bank. There have been a number of reported statements that possibly this financial year a supplementary budget will be brought down in the Federal sphere. Whether it will put a further restraint on Government funds or whether it will put a further restraint on funds in the private sector is anyone's guess. As I said before, there has been so much "stop and go". Sometimes there is a great flush; sometimes certain income-tax concessions are given and everybody plans accordingly his business operations, his trading and the marketing of his products. But suddenly, at the flick of a finger, he finds this is all cut off. Anybody who tries to tell me that that is progress in this young country, or that it is desirable, has a very poor idea of what is needed for its future economic growth.

I do not want to assume the role of a nark or knocker, but I believe in being a realist. Merely to use words for the sake of using them is a very dangerous practice when the evidence suggests that the true position is other than what those words convey. Certainly, if the harsh measures of the credit squeeze come again I am sure that anyone knowing the Treasurer's forecast would say that it is a very poor forecast indeed. Last year, 1963, was the year of the Federal election and hon. members will remember the credit squeezes of 1960 and 1961. If hon. members opposite were in any way observant of what is required in the economic field of Treasury spending in this country for a burst of expansion, they would know that political reasons have been very prevalent.

In 1962, after the Government was so much "on the nose" after its fall from the elevated heights of eminence at the 1961 election, the political climate was such that rabbits were virtually pulled out of the hat. A sting was put into the economy and it

was administered with the adeptness of a racecourse urger. I could cite example after example of the measures taken. For instance, there was a 5 per cent. cut in income tax. That was as late as February-March 1962, and even after the 1963 election there was a reduction of from 33½ per cent. to 22½ per cent. in the sales tax on various types of motor-cars, such as station wagons and utility trucks. There was an additional 20 per cent. concession for certain types of new plant and machinery. This was after a period of very harsh economic measures. This year a certain increase has taken place in income tax.

In the whole structure of Federal finance that governs the private sector, and very much governs the Government sector, there is a yo-yo economy—up and down and up and down. It is reflected in this State and in every other State in the Commonwealth. The Treasurer is not very smart or adept if he thinks that the hobbles have been thrown off. After all, they can be easily applied if Mr. Holt and his advisers decide they should be applied. I think the Treasurer should impress upon his Canberra brothers that a planned economy is needed whereby the people may know where they are going. We do not desire an economy in which the Treasurer has to resort to the conjurers' act every now and again.

The Treasurer has spoken about Government borrowing and the restraint placed on him by the Australian Loan Council. There was a modest increase from £34,400,000 to £36,676,000 in the borrowing programme, representing an increase of £2,276,000—a very moderate increase because it can be very easily absorbed with spiralling rising costs. A look at the borrowing programme reveals that, per head of population in Queensland, it is £22 17s. 5d., or £3 3s. 9d. lower than the national average. A further look into the semi-governmental programme reveals another modest increase of £712,000, but if we look still further at the special allocations we find that there is a decrease of £1,722,000 against a total allocation last year of £2,677,000. I repeat that no doubt the latter figure was due to the fact that the political economy during 1961 was indeed more buoyant. That was when the electors of this country unfortunately lost the opportunity to return a party that would have placed this nation on the road to real progress and political sanity.

It is particularly amusing, therefore, to analyse the Treasurer's forecast. He told of the brakes being applied in the field of Government spending, yet at the same time forecast that in the private sector the horse would be able to gallop without restraint. I charge the Government with hopelessly mishandling the planning of this State's future economy.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. HANSON: If hon. members opposite will listen they will be enlightened, because I will tell them in a very few words how the planning of the future of this State is being mishandled. In the first place, let us look at the deal we are getting compared with that being handed out by the Commonwealth to other States.

The Treasurer spoke of two very important projects in this State. The first was the Mt. Isa railway line project, which is reaching completion. If hon. members do not know already, the Commonwealth provided for that scheme £20,000,000, on the basis of £2 for every £1 supplied by this State. Repayment was on half-yearly terms, with interest on outstanding balances, spread over 20 years. In regard to the brigalow scheme, there was to be a maximum of £7,250,000 spent, and repayment was to be made over 20 years with interest.

A glaring example of what the Commonwealth is doing in other States can be seen in South Australia where, under the Railway Equipment Agreement Act of 1961, an advance of £1,325,000 was made. The terms were that the Commonwealth in the first place supplied all capital, and the term was for 50 years, and one-third of the loan had to be repaid.

To take another example, I refer to the Chowilla Reservoir Agreement Act of 1963. The Commonwealth participated together with New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia, in this venture. The Commonwealth was up for 25 per cent., but it also agreed under the Chowilla Reservoir Agreement Act to advance to the State of New South Wales its full capital participation. It would lend New South Wales the money to enable it to participate in the scheme. The terms were that repayment of each advance would commence 10 years after it was made, and would continue for another 10 years afterwards. They are not bad terms.

I now come a little closer to home and deal with something I know a little more about. I refer to the assistance given by the Commonwealth Government to the coal industry, principally for coal loading. We in our area are grateful that we were recognised, and did get some form of assistance by way of both grant and loan. I am not sour about that. I am happy it occurred. But I want to make the point that we are not faring as well as they did in other States.

In the first place, southern political interests—and a former Liberal Minister for National Development was concerned in this—hotfooted it to Japan and tried to strangle Moura. They tried to perform the duty of the Lord High Executioner.

I have never discussed this matter with the Minister for Mines, but I think he would agree that he was very unhappy about it. He went to Japan to try to rectify the situation. Under the Commonwealth scheme we

were given a £100,000 grant and a £100,000 loan, compared with £2,650,000 given to Balmain, Newcastle, and Port Kembla. It will be realised that there are considerable differences in the amounts advanced. I maintain as a Queenslander that those grants and loans were made solely because we had the advantage of a shorter sailing time to Japan from our ports, as well as efficient coal-loading plant. To minimise the competition that Queensland provided, more revenue was made available to the other States so that coal-loading machines there could reach a state of efficiency much higher than we in Queensland can expect in the foreseeable future. When transport arrangements between field and port are completed, we will be able to enjoy the benefits of a scheme far superior to the one we have, and probably to those in the southern States.

Those are three examples of the point that I am endeavouring to make. We in Queensland are missing out because we are not adept enough at getting a better deal for ourselves. There is the Railway Equipment Act of South Australia, the Chowilla Reservoir Agreement Act, and the Coal Act, which was part and parcel of Commonwealth legislation. I think I have now answered the interjections of hon. members opposite.

As a need arises, we find that, after a fair amount of argument and headlocking, somebody comes along and is quite willing to go along with the idea. There was considerable waiting time before an application was made to the Commonwealth Government by the Treasurer for special assistance. Perhaps he had his reasons. It is possible that the obtaining of money had been very difficult in the past and approaches were made to the Prime Minister in fear and trepidation for grants of money which would be of material assistance to Queensland. At the time of the 1961 election there was a sudden flow of money to Queensland. Since the election of last year I can assure hon. members that there will be a sudden deterioration in the supply of funds. This idea of a stop-and-go economy emanating from Canberra is not conducive to good planning in Queensland, and indeed is most undesirable.

The Budget reveals an excess of expenditure totalling £4,795,685. If we look a little closer, it will be found that £521,764 is attributed to rehabilitation of the Moura-Gladstone railway line. Here is backing for my argument that there is a considerable lack of planning. I maintain that this item of expenditure should have been foreseen. We see the Government, in the first place, guaranteeing, under the Industries Assistance Act, an advance to the Thiess-Peabody-Mitsui company of £700,000 to assist in the installation of a washing plant and the provision of various other equipment connected with mining. The Gladstone Harbour Board participated in deepening at the berth and wharf extensions. What was lacking was

the transport system. Orders were actually in hand and coal was flowing over the wharf. We witnessed the Minister for Mines going to Japan, followed by, hot on his trial, the Minister for Transport, before any Government announcement was made that the £500,000 would be made available for this rehabilitation. It came at a very desirable time, I will admit, because it offered some poor devils an alternative to their former employment at the Gladstone meatworks.

Nevertheless, it was something that just arrived and the Government said "We will have to do something about this." It did everything in a mad rush and there was actually no planning. If we look a little further, we find that no definite decision has been made in regard to the direct railway line mentioned in the original legislation, and I should like to ensure that the needs of unionists and workers are not lost sight of when a decision is finally arrived at. Their needs should be one of the Government's first considerations. It does not really matter whether the coal is transported expeditiously or what happens to it. The people are the inheritors of the earth and should be able to enjoy the things around them, and they should be provided, in the first instance, with satisfactory and continuous employment. As I said, we do not know whether the line will go direct or whether there will be a duplication of the present line. Although it was stated that a certain franchise had been granted under the Act and the Premier, in a reply to a question, said that the original agreement would be adhered to, there has been so much argument on this subject that I think the position should be clarified.

Instead of a Budget full of jargon such as "the stage for development is cast", "the economy is bursting at the seams", and "the State is growing from strength to strength", let us have a little more planning. What about the Government's getting a spike on the end of the boot and starting to kick some sense into its Federal counterpart? We hear a great deal about defence. Since the Menzies administration took office in 1949, each year there has been expended on defence—this is borne out by Federal budgets—£200,000,000 to £250,000,000, and this year the figure is about £295,000,000. Statements emanating from the Federal authorities say, "You have a general revenue grant of £50,534,000. You have a special purpose payment of £25,908,000. You have a special Government loan programme for works and housing of £36,760,000." But what about the unseen allocations that go indirectly to States under the heading of defence? Look at the clothing and building materials that are required for defence purposes. Look at the earthworks and other schemes and operations carried on by contractors that provide employment. I should like to see some figures that really show how much is spent on defence in Australia. This State, which is the most vulnerable in

the Commonwealth and which bore the brunt of wartime activities in the early 1940's, lags behind.

From where do the southern moguls think the attack will come? From the penguins of Antarctica? From the denizens of Heard Island or some other barren waste in the South? That is too ridiculous to consider. If £295,000,000 is provided in the Budget for expenditure on defence, surely some of that money should be allocated to Queensland. If it was, people engaged in the building industry and in supplying clothing, materials and implements of various kinds could provide employment for many workers in this State. As I said, it is an unseen allocation and for many years it has been going to southern States, and to southern States alone. If one went south during the war years, one did not know there was a war on. Certain southern interests gloried in the fact that they were far removed from the theatre of operations. On the other hand, Queensland's transport systems, particularly its railways, were almost wrecked as a result of carrying men and material needed for the war effort. In my opinion, Queensland should stand up for its rights and make sure that it gets something from this hidden source of defence expenditure.

Mr. Duggan: When Mr. Hulme was Minister for Supply the amount spent in Queensland was infinitesimal.

Mr. HANSON: That is so. The Leader of the Opposition has mentioned what I should say is a very sound reason why he suffered political demise in 1961. Of course, certain happenings have occurred since, but if something does not occur in the future many others will suffer the same fate as he did in 1961.

The comment by the Treasurer about the availability of capital funds is worthy of comment. Certainly, it is agreed that a planned economy could be launched very well without a drastic overhaul of this State's allocation, but already the knives are being bared and sharpened. I asked the Treasurer a question some time ago relative to the proposal of the Victorian Premier to introduce State income tax. I asked him the question to acquaint him of the situation and my object in asking it was to put him on guard if he was not already aware of the implications of this proposal. I firmly believe that it is a ramp, that there is a form of collusion between Mr. Bolte and the Prime Minister in this regard because, after the original announcement, he came forth with a statement in which he said he would forget about his entry into the income-tax field if the Federal Government would vacate the fields of estate duty and gift duty. In view of the fact that there are many large estates in Victoria Mr. Bolte would benefit considerably.

Last Sunday morning, when I am sure he had quite a headache, Mr. Bolte accepted the offer to talk about the tax plan, according to this newspaper article, which states—

"The Victorian Premier, Mr. Bolte, has accepted an offer that a State Treasury official should put further information and argument about the proposed State income tax before Federal Treasury officials.

"Mr. Bolte disclosed his plans for a separate Victorian income tax—to run parallel with the existing uniform tax system—in his Budget."

The article also says—and I think this is apparent to the Treasurer and to anyone with a knowledge of accounts—

"There is no constitutional barrier to such a tax, but Mr. Bolte has said that, to be effective, it would be necessary for the Commonwealth to collect the proposed tax."

That is a point that should not be overlooked, that is, that it will be necessary for the Commonwealth to collect the proposed tax. But I should say that there would be a certain amount of premeditation and discussion. The whole point is that these people in the south are trying to put the axe into somebody. Their loan allocation at the moment definitely has them worried and they do not care whether it is to the detriment of this young State, which is the most vulnerable in the Commonwealth from a defence point of view, but which has the greatest potential for the production of primary materials and minerals. They are trying to stave off the evil day when the financial moguls will suffer some form of severe headache when this State reaches a stage of real progress.

In his Budget, the Treasurer mentions Section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution, which states clearly—

"During a period of 10 years after the establishment of the Commonwealth and thereafter until the Parliament otherwise provides, the Parliament may grant financial assistance to any State on such terms and conditions as the Parliament thinks fit."

As the Treasurer mentioned, it is purely a palliative; it is hardly a remedy. It is purely preventive. It is something that could go according to political whim or the political climate of the time. The Treasurer also said that in the past the Commonwealth has been very realistic in helping to meet the State's needs and he said that he would expect a regular appreciation of the needs of this State. All I can say is that I hope that when he sits at the Loan Council table he keeps his wits about him. He probably knows these people better than any other member of this Chamber, and he knows the name I could probably call them because I know what types they can be. I am speaking politically, of course. Nevertheless, let him be on his guard. The outburst of Mr. Bolte is purely

a sham to get more assistance for his State to the disadvantage of other States and, I fear, to the considerable disadvantage of Queensland. At one meeting of the Loan Council he asked why Queensland should get special treatment in view of the fact that we had mismanaged our affairs.

While dealing with the subject of a planned economy, I think it appropriate that I refer to a statement made this afternoon by the hon. member for Fassifern when he spoke about fertilizers. I could not agree more with what he said. Let us look at what has happened in the Mt. Morgan mining area. The hon. member spoke about the mine's profit and the bounty it is receiving by the good grace of the Tariff Board. We know about that, but it goes deeper than that. An earlier speaker mentioned that there had been considerable increase in gold production at the Mt. Morgan mine. The copper production of about 7,000 tons a year is not without significance. The big thing up there is the potential pyrites production of nearly 300,000 tons a year, yet only 30,000 or 40,000 tons are produced. That goes through the port of Gladstone to Cockle Creek.

Not long after the present Federal administration took office, at the time of the dollar shortage, a sulphuric acid committee was set up for the purpose of trying to encourage plants to take pyrites from various mineral fields. Unfortunately, the chance discovery in the United States of America of a large body of brimstone, which contains a fair amount of sulphur, knocked that idea on the head. No plan was proceeded with here to make use of the pyrites on a large scale. However, a certain bounty was given to producers but it assisted them only on a short-term basis. In the past 12 to 18 months the production of sulphuric acid in Australia has increased from 104,000 tons a month to 132,000 tons a month.

With the potential production of pyrites at Mt. Morgan of 300,000 tons a year we can see a great chance to set up an industry in this State that can be part of the State. After all, we have a considerable amount of overseas investment in Queensland. We know that there are people doing hand-springs to try to assist these industries and ventures. At Mt. Morgan we have the potential to do something constructive about assisting an industry that could become part and parcel of the State. The mine has been operating for 70 years. At times it has enjoyed considerable prosperity. In the dark days of the late 1920's it shut down for four or five years. Imagine the misery and sacrifices of people who were directly dependent upon the mine's operations. At the present time the fear in that town and district is that this could occur again. Everybody must realise that with the considerable mining operations that have been carried out there over many years the gold and the copper cannot last for ever. There

is a significant quantity of pyrites which could be used to keep the mines for many years.

Some years ago interested parties investigated the possibility of treating pyrites. Despite the fact that in various places throughout the world there is a change to tetrachloride processes and chloride processes, nevertheless there are always some operations that can use the sulphates. They are not without significance. They have been used in many areas, particularly for the manufacture of sulphuric acid and fertilisers, such as sulphate of ammonia. This is one industry for which we should get a plan. Give us something that belongs to the State. If the minerals are there let us work the industry locally so that the people may be assisted and enjoy prosperity, thus lessening many of their worries.

I shall now refer to a problem that is peculiar to my electorate. It concerns the Nauruan resettlement. I will not debate the rights or wrongs of the resettlement because, after all, that is decided in the corridors of the United Nations and Canberra. It is not the direct responsibility of the Queensland Government. It was notable that, in the discussions conducted by Government leaders, these people originally sought sovereign rights. It was emphasised by the Premier and the Prime Minister that they would not be granted sovereign rights. I agree with that decision because certain difficulties could arise, many of them not in the best interests of the State or the nation.

The present residents of Curtis Island have been subjected to considerable anxiety and embarrassment. At the present time the future of many of them is in the balance. Many are old people who decided to settle there and enjoy their retirement. The southern portion of Curtis Island is a delightful area. Many people decided to buy shacks and houses and stay there but now they do not know whether they are to be dispossessed. Certain statements have appeared in the Press that the resumptions are to be proceeded with; other statements have been made that the Nauruans are not proceeding with the venture and even further statements have been made by people in Canberra. There is much anxiety among the residents, particularly concerning compensation and other relevant factors. In addition, many of the reports are not official. Now and again officers arrive and express differing opinions, but in many cases they have no power to negotiate.

It is within the power of the State Government to resume land. In the Land Resumption Acts, 1906 to 1955, provision is made for any of the following purposes: land to be set apart, to be subdivided, to be resubdivided, to be reclaimed, to be alienated, to be taken up and occupied, leased, used as town lands or suburban lands, or to be dealt with in any manner in which Crown land may be dealt with under the Lands Acts, 1910 to 1955.

If the State Government resumed this land it is extremely doubtful whether it could proceed with the scheme under the present machinery. It appears that the only appropriate method to adopt would be to create a reserve under Section 334 of the Land Act of 1962. However, such reserves may be created only for special purposes. Whether the settlement of the Nauruans is a special purpose in this regard and whether the Act is applicable is extremely doubtful. Any other tenure or lease under the Land Act would be open to competition from the public at large. However, if the scheme was to be proceeded with, legislation could be introduced to approve the scheme or otherwise, or there could be an amendment to existing legislation.

Under Section 51 of the Commonwealth Constitution there is power for the acquisition of lands in certain circumstances. The Land Acquisition Act, 1955 to 1957, Sections 6 and 10A, gives the Federal Government power to acquire land for public purposes, by agreement or compulsory process. This probably means that the Government can acquire land for the Army, or for other defence purposes. But whether the settlement of the Nauruans on Curtis Island is one of those purposes is certainly another matter. It seems clear that the Commonwealth can acquire land on which to house these people until such time as they can be absorbed into the community, but to dispossess the residents on Curtis Island in favour of the Nauruans is something that does not seem right, because after all, why couldn't the Commonwealth dispossess those people in favour of Papuans, New Guineans, or Victorians. It may involve a question of degree. For the Commonwealth to take the land of one Australian citizen and hand it over to a new citizen of this country is an inherently dangerous practice and could be beyond the Commonwealth's legitimate power.

As I said when raising this question, the existing residents have been embarrassed. One Federal Government official went there and promised them everything. Another said they would only get the market value for their property. Still another arrived and said, "We will set you up on Facing Island", which is just across the road. Not too many of them are happy about that.

I consulted the Premier on this matter, and in the course of his reply, dated 27 May, he said—

"Now, we could not expect to leave the position of existing residents on South End in an unsettled state. You will appreciate that owners would desire to improve properties and yet be faced with a future of uncertainty and the likelihood of being disturbed at any time. Again, because of likely disturbance, property values would quickly deteriorate. Against this background it was agreed that action should be taken to acquire residential interests on

South End as quickly as possible, and that, for the purpose of assisting the resettling of persons displaced from South End, action should be taken to open up a suitably developed area on Facing Island and providing a jetty there. It may be that some living at South End will not desire to go to Facing Island. In that case, proper provision will be made for compensation and every endeavour will be made to assist residents to find alternative accommodation elsewhere."

Following on that the Premier advised me that he wrote to the Prime Minister stating that—

"... in view of the continuing uncertainty about the final outcome of the proposal and following on the statement made by the Commonwealth Minister for Territories on 18th August, the State Government feels it should not proceed further with any plans for acquisition of properties or re-settlement unless and until the Nauruans make a definite decision to settle on Curtis Island. As a result, the Prime Minister has been informed that the Queensland Government is ceasing acquisition action forthwith and the State Departments concerned have been informed accordingly."

That is all very fine, but I say that the residents on Curtis Island are still left up in the air. They still do not know whether they can plan for the future. They still do not know whether they can carry out improvements to their homes, paint their homes, improve their yards, or do the other things that are done around a house. They are still in a state of embarrassment and anxiety. Many of these people are elderly. I know of one particular man who has been in hospital and is very ill at the present time because of the management of this affair. I say that the Commonwealth Government, despite the fact that it has power under the Land Acquisition Act, 1955 to 1957, has a responsibility to these people. If the land is to be resumed, it can be resumed only on just terms. The market value is not enough. A considerable amount should be paid for the disturbance that they will be caused.

All I ask is that the question be resolved one way or the other so that these people will be allowed to live in peace. They have been kept on a string for about two or three years, and are very unhappy. If the land is to be acquired, I also ask that the Government see that these people are not duped but are given adequate compensation. I can assure hon. members that many of them have not the necessary money to take these matters to the various courts. There are many precedents involved, and much argument can be put forward with regard to the Act. Despite the fact that the Government can resume land, it is open to argument whether it has the necessary power under existing legislation in

this State. I thought I made it quite plain that under the Land Acquisition Act, despite the fact that land can be acquired compulsorily or by agreement for the defence forces, it is extremely doubtful whether it can be resumed for Nauruans. Much legal argument is involved, and it is not merely a case of saying that there is power under the Act.

There have been considerable differences in what has been said by Government officials. Three have visited the area, and each has told a different story. As a matter of fact, some seem to adopt the role of Ananias, who was kicked out of hell for telling lies. One thing that stands out in this matter is that the Gladstone Town Council has received scant information from the Government. This Parliament, which is the State's most important body, has also received little information on the scheme.

This brings me back to my original argument that what is needed is more planning. Let us make it clear where we are going. The Treasurer said in the Financial Statement last year that the railway line to Mount Isa would soon be completed and the Government would have to look round for other projects to take its place. I think they should be on the drawing-board now.

I conclude my remarks by again repeating the need for adequate planning. I firmly believe that if this is not done, the administration will be selling the State down the river. It is all very well for the Treasurer to quote in his Budget speech the various records that have been attained in mineral production. A glance at the amounts returned from oil shows, to my mind, that it is not sufficient. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, there are sheiks in the Middle East who are receiving from oil more money than this Government will get from it. Oil is a mineral, and the State should be receiving from it greater financial satisfaction than is expected at the present time.

Other speakers have referred to the high prices that have to be paid by primary producers. This is very wrong. As one hon. member said, the producer and the consumer are certainly getting it in the neck.

A lot of significance is attached in my area to bauxite, and the plant being erected to process it. Why not endeavour to see whether an aluminium refinery can also be established? Now is the time to strike and put forward this proposal. If we wait till the alumina plant is completed, it is possible that the product will go to Lake Manapouri in New Zealand which would be a very severe blow for this State.

Look at the Railway Equipment Act of South Australia and consider the poor deal that Queensland is getting compared with other States. Look at the Chowilla Reservoir Agreement Act and the various coal loading Acts. Look at the action of the Railway Department in running round pulling up lines. Look at the dissatisfaction that is rife in the

Railway Department. Look at the dissatisfaction that is rife in the ranks of industrial workers throughout the State. None of these people want to go on strike. All that the workers want is the right to earn a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. The Government is here. Surely it should be approachable. The workers certainly are not getting anything from the Industrial Commission.

The Treasurer said recently, "Why don't the advocates prepare a good case for the Commission?" I can show him cases in which reams and reams of argument have been put before the Commission and its decision has been "No," without giving any reason for its refusal. The position is very unhealthy when so many workers in Queensland are dissatisfied.

Let us look also at the closure of police stations. That is certainly not desirable. I made representations very recently for an increase in police strength at Gladstone in anticipation of the big growth in population that will take place soon, but I received no satisfaction. The only satisfaction I got was to pick up the newspaper and find that suburban police stations in Brisbane were being closed.

Recent events have shown the Government's gutless attitude on the question of intrastate airline operations. Why does it not follow the lead of the great Premier of New South Wales and show a little bit of fight. If it did, Queensland would have some chance of taking its place as the greatest State in the Commonwealth.

There are many things to which I could point. The fall in dairy production was mentioned very forcibly by the hon. member for Fassifern. The Government is not interested in that. It cannot claim that Queensland is poised for development and ready to expand when the people have before them its unsatisfactory approach to royalties on oil, a reduction in primary production, widespread dissatisfaction among the workers, the closure of railway lines, the closure of police stations, and its weak approach to the question of intrastate airline operations. The Government should be ashamed of its attitude on these matters, and I trust that next year the Treasurer will bring down a much better Budget than he has brought down this year.

Mr. McKECHNIE (Carnarvon) (5.48 p.m.): The Budget is a progressive one, promoting industrial and port development, and at the same time it can rightly be called an education Budget. It makes abundant provision, also, for hospitals and roads, and I compliment the Treasurer on producing, in his usual sound business style, an even better Budget than he has produced in past years.

I believe that the time has come for us to look more closely at the long-term plans for production in primary industries, which produce 90 per cent. of our gross income

and 80 per cent. of our total export income. I have no objection to the wonderful job that the Government is doing for the hon. member for Port Curtis. He is fortunate that such great industrial development is taking place in his area. I do not begrudge him the money that has been spent on improving railway lines and rolling stock in Central Queensland, and I wish him every success in the industrial sphere. The Government's efforts in this direction are something of which we can be proud. Progress is taking place everywhere in Queensland at present, and the hon. member for Port Curtis is fortunate that his electorate is seeing some of the tremendous strides that are being made in the field of development. But unless we make some special provision in primary industries in regard to food and timber, by the year 2,000, which is only 36 years away, we will not have nearly enough of either for our ordinary daily needs. It is estimated that by that time we will have a population of about 22,000,000 and this industrial development of which we are so proud will have much to do with that increased population.

Extra provision is made in the Budget for reforestation. It is quite an advance on the figures for previous years but I do not doubt that much more is urgently needed. At the same time, we should also take steps to encourage private enterprise to come more into the field or reforestation. At the present time we are not producing enough timber for our needs as of now, with a population of 11,000,000 people, and if, by the year 2,000—and this is quite a feasible possibility—we have 22,000,000 people, we will have to double our timber production, or do even a little bit better. We require at present 321,000,000 super feet of log timber, but from Australian sources we are producing only 274,000,000 super feet. Consequently, we must be importing 47,000,000 super feet of timber.

In these figures I am only referring to log timber. I am not touching on pulp or plywood timbers. Officials of the Department of Forestry have estimated that by the year 2,000, we will require 670,000,000 super feet of log timber alone, so we have at least to double our production.

Mr. Davies: In other words, the Government is falling down on its job very badly.

Mr. McKECHNIE: As a matter of fact, Governments must have been doing that for many years. It takes about 40 years for a tree to grow to maturity and it would have been back about that length of time that some move should have been made. I will not go any further with that subject because the hon. member realises the implication of what I am saying.

At present we are using 92,000,000 super feet of pulp timber but many more products will use the pulp and formed product rather than sawn timber. Despite that

fact, and the fact that cardboard has taken the place of timber for cartons for many products, particularly fruit, how can we overcome this problem? There are two ways, namely, we have to grow more and save more. By "saving more", I mean making better use of waste products.

In the south-eastern highland area of Queensland there is an area of 4,000 acres in the Amiens-Passchendaele region suitable for the growing of two types of pine—*pinus radiata* and *pinus elliottii*. Admittedly there are a few other types, but *pinus radiata* is the promising type. So far as we can estimate, over a period of 50 years forestry such as this will give a return of £1,600 to £1,800 an acre. That is a gross return of £30 an acre per annum and at present it costs £32,000 per annum to run 4,000 acres of forestry.

I have endeavoured to estimate the capital outlay for such an area balanced over the period and I have arrived at a figure of £18,000 per annum, giving a gross cost, for expenses and capital, of £50,000 per annum. Spread that over 4,000 acres of forestry and over 50 years and you have a gross cost of £12 10s. an acre to set off against a gross income of £30 an acre. It is quite reasonable, therefore, to assume that forestry is a profitable business in that area, where it will return £17 10s. an acre or approximately a 60 per cent. net return. So it is clearly proven that forestry can be a profitable business.

I think our own forestry should expand further. Federal assistance should be sought for it because it is a national project which provides employment and brings about decentralisation. Federal assistance can help forestry provide for what is going to be a desperate need in the years ahead. It is desirable that forestry should bear its fair share of rates in an area. If forestry can be a profitable business—there is no doubt from these figures that it is running as a profitable business—it should not be a drag on its own local authority. That does not apply so much in the case of a plantation covering a relatively small area. In the Passchendaele-Amiens area the plantation covers 4,000 acres, which is not a lot of land in a big district, but in the case of, say, the Inglewood area, where forestry occupies possibly a third of the district and contributes only a token amount to the shire in rates, it means that the local authority is working under a big handicap in maintaining roads in the area. In large forestry areas spreading out 50 miles, and in extreme cases 60 miles, from their centre, large truck jinkers are constantly traversing soil-formed second-grade roads built by the local authorities.

It is only fair that forestry should be contributing a fair share of rates. Admittedly quite a lot of the land is leased as cattle country. This land is valued and assessed for rates but the amount is relatively small compared with the rates that would be levied

if the land were rated as secured land. Admittedly in the plantation area the forestry maintains quite good roads at its own expense. They are mainly forestry roads but they do cater for the public by giving access to scenic attractions and picnic areas. On the other hand, in the large areas relatively sparsely covered with millable timber the local authority has to incur heavy expenditure, so that in effect it subsidises forestry production.

These forestry areas surround or adjoin private land held under lease or freehold title. It is incumbent on the owners of that land to destroy noxious vermin, both fauna and flora. I think that forestry should pay its share of the cost of destroying these pests, particularly dingoes. I know that the Minister is giving this matter consideration. To some extent the Co-ordinating Board is going into these areas and destroying the noxious vermin. I am very appreciative of the fact that the Minister in charge of forestry is looking into this matter. If forestry would take a greater interest in destroying noxious vermin it would be a big help to the surrounding areas.

The Government allotted quite a deal more money to forestry in this year's Budget, but if we are to run forestry as a business and relate it to land matters generally we will have to find ways and means of providing extra money to have these noxious vermin destroyed.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.]

Mr. McKECHNIE: I have been dealing with forestry on rateable land and the desirability of encouraging private enterprise to enter the forestry domain. Private landholders should be encouraged to plant country that is too rocky for fruit growing and, in grazing areas, if the hilltops are planted with *pinus radiata* they can produce timber which would serve as a good means of combating wind erosion because it is planted on the high country. It would also make the country warmer, which is even more important. In a few instances, and I stress the word "few," the country has been too denuded of the natural forest.

Mr. Duggan: How long does it take *pinus radiata* to grow to commercial size?

Mr. McKECHNIE: It takes 50 years to reach its absolute maximum as a beautiful tree. However, the thinnings come in after about 15 years. About 600 trees are planted to the acre. They are thinned progressively until there are only 80 adult trees to the acre, which can produce a greater volume of timber than all the thinnings from hundreds of trees. Over a 50-year period it is a good financial proposition, either for the Government or for private enterprise.

Mr. Duggan: What is the approximate diameter on maturity?

Mr. McKECHNIE: In that area the diameter would be about 24 inches. I do not know the exact measurement.

I suggest that, for windbreaks and wind-erosion prevention, the areas should be approximately 10 chains wide. They would have to be fenced and cared for when the trees were young, but as they grew beyond the reach of sheep, they could be opened up to provide shelter for the sheep in the cold weather and, in the warm weather—which does not present a big problem in this area—they would provide shade. The landholders would pay normal shire rates on this land, thus helping in the development of the local authority area. This does not apply to any great extent with Government forestry plots.

I believe that landholders should be assisted in some way. Most men, who plant timber cannot wait 50 years for their final return so it is really a matter of a father making provision for his son, or his grandson. To encourage this desirable production some provision should be made in probate and succession duties. The normal rates would have to be paid, but I think a special place would have to be made in the probate and succession duty laws for this type of return as the Forestry Department is specially favoured and does not attract probate and succession duties. I pointed out earlier that the return could be £1,600 to £1,800 an acre in 50 years' time, and assuming that money values change as they have in the past few years much more money could be involved.

Mr. Davies: That is on present-day values.

Mr. McKECHNIE: Yes. They would be producing it at present-day values, and in 45 years the value of money may be only half as much as it is today. This could provide an incentive because they are producing the timber with money at a relatively stable level and the value could be doubled through the appreciation in money values.

The Forestry Department is anxious to help private enterprise in this regard. *Pinus radiata* can be bought at the seedling plots for 25s. a hundred in unwrapped bundles, and anybody, such as a school or private landholder, is welcome to buy the trees and establish private plantations.

Now I come to a field where we can save rather than have extra production. I refer to cypress pine. After a tree has been cut and the log is carted to the mill, 45 to 50 per cent. of it is wasted in the milling process and burnt. I dealt with this matter last year and would like to enlarge on it. We should set up an experimental pilot plant within the Forestry Department to find a means of handling this waste cypress. I consider that we could save the equivalent of 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 superficial feet of cypress a year, which means that there would be almost over-production of cypress, if we could

convert this waste into some type of chip board. It is being done effectively with hoop pine and other softwoods. We should conduct experiments to try to save this waste and produce that much extra without cutting one more tree.

Mr. Windsor: And they are splicing small pieces of timber together.

Mr. McKECHNIE: That is being done at the moment. Flooring is being spliced, and that saves a considerable quantity of timber. But I am thinking of the offcuts. Anyone visiting a town in a cypress-pine area will have observed the white ash heap near the town which causes a nuisance. It is the result of burning at least 45 per cent. of the cypress that is sent to the mill.

Such a set-up as this could use all the forest thinnings, which at present are burnt or allowed to rot, with the sawdust to produce a chip board, which in many cases would be worth more than lumber board.

Mr. Bromley: Can't they do something with the waste sawdust, too

Mr. McKECHNIE: I have already said that the sawdust could be worked in with the chips.

Mr. Windsor: It would be expensive to produce such a chip board.

Mr. McKECHNIE: It would cost about £100,000, and the mill would require at least 3,000,000 superficial feet before it would be economic. That would be possible if it could use the waste products of three or four mills in a cypress area.

I shall deal now with plots of ground within cypress forests. It would be to the advantage of all concerned if those small areas, which contain good parcels of land for cultivation and grazing but are a total loss in the production of timber, could be used. Some of the areas are small, and some are big. I think we are reaching the stage where we will have to use this land instead of having it tied up. We could excise and amalgamate some of the small areas and get a living area out of them, and, in conjunction with a forestry lease, they could be made quite an attractive proposition. I know there are certain legislative difficulties involved, but as the need for land increases these problems will have to be met and solved.

I am pleased that the Minister for Conservation is present because I wish to compliment him on his approach to valuing rather thinly screened cypress pine and other timber where freeholding is involved. The procedure was to go through and, at considerable expense, arrive at an exact valuation. I am glad that the Minister is now working on a plan under which a much simpler method will be used. It is no doubt a little more open to criticism, but

this disadvantage will be more than offset by the very considerable saving made. I know that in some cases the cost of the valuation equalled the value of the timber. Naturally people seeing this sort of thing going on do not form a very good image of a department that is spending as much on valuing something as the object is worth. I commend the Minister for his attempts to overcome this problem.

I mentioned earlier my feeling that it should be incumbent upon the Forestry Department to take action to control vermin, both flora and fauna, in all forestry areas.

I wish to deal now with primary production and the use of the land, combining these things to some extent with forestry. As I have already said, the lands of this State are responsible for 90 per cent. of our production and 80 per cent. of our export income. Rural activities have to be encouraged and developed, even now for export. To take the figure that I have already quoted, in 36 years' time, when the population of Queensland has doubled, it has been estimated that at the present rate of production 60 per cent. of the State's requirements of dairy products will have to be imported. The State will also have to import 100 per cent. more pig meats, 40 per cent. more beef, and, strange as it may seem, 80 per cent. more sheep meats, or mutton and lamb. Naturally it will not work out that way, but something has to be done to provide for increased production in this period.

We have to start at the base of things by considering education for increased primary production. At present the Department of Education is undertaking considerable extensions at Gatton. Extensions of university work are forecast in the veterinary field in Brisbane, and I have been fortunate in having them extended to Goondiwindi in my area. All these things will help. Within the last week the Minister for Education informed the hon. member for Gregory that a pastoral school is to be set up at Longreach. Each of those three things will lead, through education, to increased primary production.

When these young people leave school, I feel that there is a greater need in the Junior Farmer organisation for minds more inquisitive on where the country is going. These people will provide the basis of our land development in the years to come. They should be encouraged to experiment and seek ways of increasing primary production. Young people will see many things that we do not see. I admit that they will make a lot more mistakes but they have inquiring minds and look at things in a different light. Every support and assistance should be given to junior farmers to become a more practical body and to search for ways and means of increasing production.

In New South Wales, combined with that, there are what are called production study groups, and one or two of them have crossed the border into Southern Queensland. They may sound a bit theoretical; left to themselves they probably would be; but if they work in conjunction with a practical man, they can assist in determining the best use of the land. I think a survey would show that we are not using our land to the best advantage.

I have here the results of a survey carried out on a particular property. A map of the property has lines on it similar to those on a contour map. They show the various types of soil and these areas are analysed so that they can be exploited to the full. When I use the word "exploited" I do not mean wasted; I mean used in the best possible way. It shows, for example, that some of it would be best used purely for grass. In the brigalow belt, particularly in forest and sandalwood country associated with it, one often sees land used for farming that would be much better left under grass. On the other hand, of course, one often sees land under grass that would be much better used for farming. Surveys of this type give a clear indication of the various soil types and whether the land would be better used for oats, lucerne, or improved pastures. The blocks vary so greatly that one often finds five types of soil on one block. The soil types are marked with irregular lines, and they show the most economic use to which the land can be put. One has to look deeply into the economic use, of course, because frequently it is not what it appears to be on the surface. I again emphasise that a practical man should work in conjunction with a theoretical man, because the practical man would be capable of discarding parts of the information, collating the rest, and putting it to good use.

I have dealt particularly with the granite section for forestry, and I suggest that private individuals should be given an opportunity to put a large area in the highlands, the rocky area, under pine forest, probably using *pinus radiata*. The slopes are ideal for fruit-growing or grazing, whichever is better in the area, and the low-lying, frost-hit flats could be converted to improved pasture for cattle-fattening or fat-lamb production. This would give much better results than are now being obtained, because a great deal of the stone fruit is badly frosted on low patches that could be used for crop-fattening.

In the trap-rock country the biggest problem is eucalypt regrowth. Recently a new weedicide, Tordon, has been formulated in the United States of America, and men in my electorate are very keen to get some of it and carry out experiments. I was told last week that they cannot get it in its pure form, that what they are getting is diluted with 2,4-D and is not of much use. I do not know just where the fault

lies. The persons to whom I spoke seem to think the proprietary companies have a rather large supply of 2,4-D that they wish to dispose of, but I am not sure of my facts. In the United States, Tordon in its pure form has given wonderful results on the small timbers that cause us so much concern. Prior to this the trap-rock country had been making quite good use of 2,4,5-T. It has been used fairly extensively in that area, but it is Tordon that I should really like to see used if it is as good as it is supposed to be in the United States.

Reverting to the brigalow lands, at the moment second-class country is quite often farmed there as a means of eliminating regrowth. Country that is farmed today and has some sort of crop taken from it will revert to true pasture, and it is essential that it be farmed to destroy regrowth. I am quite convinced that it is the most economic way of getting rid of brigalow regrowth.

Our other approach to producing more food must come from irrigation and I hope that in the future we will have available more finance for irrigation. At the moment in Australia there are 2,100,000 acres under irrigation and all the construction or plans for construction at the moment will only increase it to 3,000,000 acres. We have, therefore, to make a much bigger increase.

In my own area we are fighting to have the Border Rivers scheme implemented. So far, we have not received the co-operation of the Commonwealth, and we are not sure that we have New South Wales co-operation either. But the similar set-up on the Victorian border, namely, the Snowy River scheme, was first mooted in 1900 and it took 48 years, till 1948, to get it moving.

The Border Rivers scheme was first mooted in 1931 but the Border Rivers Act was not brought in until 1945. Still, 19 years have elapsed and we have much work to do there. I hope that we will be able to co-operate with the Commonwealth, or that the Commonwealth will co-operate with us and New South Wales, in order to go ahead with this very worth-while project.

The only other matter with which I wish to deal is land tenure as it affects primary production generally. To my mind, there is only one way to get maximum production in country areas, and that is to freehold. If a man owns the land he is prepared to develop it. He will put substantial amounts into it, and substantial improvements are the cheapest in the long run because the results are there for a greater number of years.

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. McKECHNIE: The hon. member need not worry about my attitude. I believe in freehold, but I believe land should not be aggregated into large holdings.

Mr. Sherrington: What is your attitude towards selling to foreign and overseas investors?

Mr. McKECHNIE: My idea is that it should be held in family groups. I am quite happy with that angle and I believe that freeholding is a means by which we will make greater progress. I agree with the interjectors that land must not be aggregated into large areas, but it must be freeholded into worth-while areas to give the desired production.

In conclusion, I ask that provision be made in future Budgets for a composite approach to the development of forestry and lands in the Granite Belt for the reason I outlined earlier. I think that by a combination of forestry and other land usage we can improve production, help to prevent erosion, and keep our land more productive. I believe we should give more encouragement to private schemes and I think those private schemes, in the hands of an owner on the job, will really go places and give us the extra production that we simply must have in the next 36 years if we are to support a population of 22,000,000 in the year 2000.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH (Tablelands) (7.40 p.m.): In perusing the pages of the Financial Statement I expected to find some mention of substantial grants for northern development, but I have looked for it in vain. On rare occasions the Treasurer mentioned the Far North, but in these instances it concerned only the extension of schemes commenced some time ago. We are getting a little browned off over this lack of northern development. Everyone seems to think it is going ahead apace, but "northern development" is defined by the area north of the Tropic of Capricorn.

Taking in Rockhampton, Mackay, Bowen, Townsville and along the railway line to Mt. Isa we have a very buoyant industrial area that is more than offset by areas that are not moving at all. I instance the Tablelands area. I challenge the Treasurer or anyone else to say that apart from the tobacco industry the Tablelands area is moving. The fact is that it is being starved for finance.

I am not being parochial and I do not wish to deny Government finance to those fortunate parts of Queensland that are receiving it. Previously I have stressed the point that there are towns in Queensland that are not advancing because of a lack of practical help. To try to convince the people of Queensland that something new is happening, the Treasurer has now turned to some new terms. He says that the pulse of Queensland is throbbing—that the circulation will be stimulated. Later he says that Queensland is bursting at the seams. A throbbing pulse sometimes indicates that there is trouble in other parts of the body. It may indicate that an arm or a leg is not in very good shape. That could be the real cause of this throbbing pulse that the Treasurer speaks of. It could mean that part of Queensland is wasting

away—a large part of the Tablelands electorate. As for the bursting at the seams—this is what happens when a person tries to put on an ill-cut suit which does not fit. I do not think the terms used by the Treasurer will hoodwink the people into believing that the whole of Queensland is thrusting ahead, that there is a giant awakening. Only parts are awakening; the other parts are very much asleep.

Before expressing some of the very many needs of the Tablelands electorate, I should like to bring forward a matter that concerns the whole of Queensland. I refer to the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade, which has served the people of Queensland well for many years, so much so that it is taken for granted. The people know that the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade will always be there and ready. Those who take it for granted almost have a right to do that. It is they who subscribe the money for the service; it is they who contribute from time to time when any extra calls are made on their finances through art unions and street collections.

I think we could say that they have every right to take it for granted to a small degree as they help to provide the finance for it. On the other hand, the Government takes it for granted also. The Treasurer and other Cabinet Ministers may say that they provide a subsidy for this service and that the Government contributes quite a large sum of money.

Mr. Thackeray: This Government permits rigged ballots such as happened in Rockhampton.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: I heard the Minister's reply recently, when he refused to act in replying to the hon. member for Rockhampton North.

I do not think the Ministers are aware, or want to be aware, of the ever-increasing strain on the finances of the Q.A.T.B. When the Minister for Health was asked a question the other day about the ambulance service, he said that the centre concerned had a large sum of money in the bank. There are quite a few instances of that. Many persons have bank accounts for a special purpose and ambulance centres are in the same position. They save the money for specific purposes; perhaps for a new vehicle or building. They know full well that unless they do so they will remain stationary. No service can remain stationary; it either goes backward or forward.

What do the people of Queensland want? Do they want the service to go forward or do they want it to go backward? I should say that every one would be only too happy to see it go forward. The type of finance that the ambulance brigade needs at present is the type that only the Government can supply. I impress upon the Treasurer the need for action by the Government to increase the Q.A.T.B. subsidy in the very near future.

Mr. Walsh: You want to be careful that you do not create the impression that you are inviting the Government to take them over.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: The hon. member says I am inviting the Government to take them over.

Mr. Walsh: I did not say that. I said you do not want to create that impression.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: I am not trying to create the impression that I want the Government to take them over. I believe they are very well run. However, now that the hon. member has mentioned the matter, I draw the attention of hon. members on both sides of the Chamber to the fact that those of us who represent centres throughout Queensland do not want the Government to take over the ambulance service. Each centre is proud of its bearers, its superintendent, and the service it gives to the people, and wants to keep it that way. Unless the Government increases the subsidy I can see no other means of giving the brigade the chance to achieve what it has set out to do.

The standardisation of vehicles is most important so that one vehicle may be able to take over from another, yet we find a motley array of vehicles throughout Queensland. I do not mean that they are broken down, but there are many varying types in use. We find too, on occasions, that stretchers are reduced from 22 inches in width to 17 inches so that two stretchers may be placed in one vehicle. I ask hon. members to visualise the Minister for Mines on a 17-inch stretcher. Who is to know at any time whether a man as big as the Minister, or even bigger, may be put on one of those stretchers? Such improvisations should not be necessary and they would not be necessary if finance was available.

Mr. Hughes: Don't you think that Brisbane has a special claim for assistance from the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: Now we hear the echo, "We want everyone to know we would like our senior brothers to take over."

Mr. Walsh: They should help in relation to pensioners.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: That is so. They should help, and I hope that those hon. members bring pressure to bear on the Commonwealth Government so that we can get help for cases that are transported free of charge.

Something else that should be hastened is legislation to implement a superannuation scheme for these employees. The brigade has been sent several questionnaires over the last few years, and it appears that legislation is all that is holding up the implementation of a scheme. I hope that the Government realises how important this is. I had a word with the responsible Minister. From his tone it was apparent that he considered it was not

very important, and that there were more important things, so he pushed it aside. Once these things are shelved, good men will be retiring onto the age pension. If they have been thrifty, they will even be deprived of that.

The fourth matter is one with which I think every hon. member will agree, namely, the provision of an aerial ambulance to serve the south, south-eastern and south-western areas of the State. Road and rail travel cannot be compared with air travel. In two hours a patient can be flown from Charleville to Brisbane and be comfortable in a hospital bed, while he would be only 70 or 80 miles from the scene of the accident if he was transported by road. The position is worse in a one-man centre, because the superintendent cannot get relief and has to drive the whole of the way and at the same time attend to the patient.

The Government could do a lot towards implementing those four matters if it felt so inclined. I hope that it is inclined to help this very worthy service, because these are matters which are very much overdue.

The Minister for Education has told me on many occasions, "You have no cause for complaint in the Tableland electorate. Your schools are No. 1." That may be, but are we to stand still and be sidetracked while large amounts are spent on big schools at the expense of smaller schools? I refer particularly to Dimbulah, where a high school is needed. As recently as two or three weeks ago a departmental officer said that a school was warranted there, yet 18 months ago my predecessor said that workmen were there waiting to start the high school. As I said a fortnight ago, "I wonder if they are still waiting." I hope that the Minister will have another look at the provision of a secondary school in Dimbulah, because it is warranted and would be a wonderful acquisition for that tobacco-growing area.

Mt. Garnet is another town that has been overlooked, and this is being done to the advantage of Ravenshoe. Children are transported by bus 30 miles in and out each day on a narrow strip of bitumen. Will this go on indefinitely? There are many more people prospecting for tin now, and if the price of tin keeps at its present level conditions could improve, and there could be an increase in population. It has not happened yet, but the price of tin is now at a record height and is attracting people from many parts of the Commonwealth. Mt. Garnet has the number necessary for the establishment of a secondary department, but unfortunately the children are being required to travel 30 miles to another school. If the present trend continues, it will not be long before approximately 80 children are being transported daily from Mt. Garnet to Ravenshoe. I do not think that it is fair to the parents to require the children to travel this distance when there is in Mt. Garnet the number necessary for the establishment of a secondary department.

The Atherton school is one of the show places of the Tableland. I admit that it is one of the finest schools that one could wish to see. The location is excellent, and all who had anything to do with its construction are to be complimented. There will be no problems of space or outlook for many years to come. It is a fine school in a very fine district. It has, however, one drawback. The domestic science school is situated over a mile away, and the children are still required to walk there and back each domestic science period. In reply to a question that I asked the other day, the Minister for Education said that no provision had been made for moving the domestic science section to the high school site.

It is a pity that such an imposing school should be deprived of one of its most important sections. I say "important" because in farming areas I believe domestic science to be a very necessary and worthwhile subject. I think that more children are inclined to take advantage of this training in rural areas. When they have to walk or push bicycles about a mile down a dusty road to reach the classroom, a little of the shine is taken from their studies. Again I ask the Minister to see if he cannot expedite at least the commencement in this financial year of this very necessary adjunct to the Atherton High School.

The last school with which I propose to deal is at Herberton, and what I have to say concerns not the building but the grounds. Herberton is situated in hilly country, and it was decided to extend the area of the school grounds by the acquisition of land situated across the road. That is as far as the project has gone. The head teacher's house, which was situated in the grounds of the school, was moved 12 months ago, yet the block of land still remains as it was when the building was shifted.

With present-day methods of levelling ground with bulldozers and other earth-moving equipment, I am sure that the whole job would take no longer than a week. In spite of this, the Minister states that a survey has been made and it will be done as soon as possible, but no provision has been made for it. The children are cramped for playing space whilst this area is there and has only to be levelled to make everyone much happier.

I have received many requests from operators of school bus services. Most of them are for increased payments, which is only natural. They do, however, at the same time point out that there is room for much improvement in the method of arriving at the fees payable to them for the transporting of children. All of us would prefer to travel 30 miles over a sealed road than to travel 10 miles over a dusty, corrugated gravel road, and

that is what these people are up against. Their buses deteriorate quickly, and the children are not happy in the dusty conditions. Unless the bus is a very good one—there are not many good buses; usually they are only improvised buses—the dust circulates among the children.

Mr. Walsh: Have you got any with wire-netting round them like the one mentioned by the hon. member for Cook?

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: Yes. I conferred with the hon. member for Cook a few weeks ago to try to do something about them. Some of the buses have either mesh or wire-netting round the back. They have been photographed by overseas visitors, who said they looked like cattle trucks. I do not want to be unfair to the people who run them, and perhaps sufficient money could be made available to them to enable them to buy a bus, or a pool of buses could be set up that they would be allowed to use on the condition that they used them for nothing else. Some people would prefer to use the bus for school purposes and then use it on the farm for the rest of the day. Inspections are carried out, but these can be circumvented by saying, "This will be done and that will be done," and it is known that if they cannot provide the service, no-one else is available to take their place.

In some instances parents transport their own children, and some of them transport four or five children a distance of eight to ten miles. In some cases they are paid for it, but they should be paid for it in every case. In the area to which I am referring there are many New Australians. They are anxious for their children to get to school, and if you speak to them and try to convey to them what they are entitled to, they will say, "Yes", but they do not really understand and do not want to admit it. If one goes back in six months' time, one finds that they still have not received payment for taking the children to school.

I believe that in some instances head teachers could take a more active and personal interest in these parents who are doing a very worth-while job. As I said, they are taking four, five or six children up to 10 or 15 miles to the school and are not aware that they should be receiving payment for it. This is saving the Government a large sum of money, and it is costing the parents a fairly large sum of money. I know that the Government will allow them to be paid for transporting children to school, but it will not pay them unless application is made.

Another problem in country schools relates to children who wish to pursue a musical career. These children are at a disadvantage compared with city children for this reason: Cairns is the nearest airport, and to come from Cairns to Brisbane for an audition or to compete for an appointment costs about £50 or £60. It might be said

that they could travel by train. I mentioned this to a music teacher, who told me that it is not possible for a student who has reached that stage to travel in a train for two or three days and then have an audition or compete. The student requires constant practice, and that is one of the reasons why a quick trip to the place where the audition is held is necessary. If any approach is made to the Minister for a rebate or a contribution towards the expenses of these pupils, I hope he will give it his favourable consideration.

I have an instance of one girl who was taught the violin in the North for eight years. It cost her in the vicinity of £60 to come to Brisbane. She was not selected and it then cost her £80 to go to Sydney and back home again. Now she is playing with the Sydney Symphony Orchestra. There are others like her who could not afford to do that, and I think that a little financial help from the Government would go a long way towards helping them.

Finally in regard to the Department of Education, I wish to put a case for the northern National Fitness organisation. The Premier has been very kind and I think he is doing something at present to offset an answer he gave to a question of mine and in which he said that nothing could be done this year and probably not until next Christmas.

The area I have asked him for is a rain forest area and once the rains start this place will deteriorate very quickly. It will be found that before long young people will be sheltering in it or camping over the week-end. They will probably light fires in the shelter and before long extensive damage will be done.

I hope the Premier and the Minister for Education are able to come to some arrangement with the Co-ordinator-General's Department to get this place for the very worthwhile northern section of the National Fitness scheme. There is an area officer there who is doing a marvellous job. I have seen these young people competing and I have seen their work. They are a credit not only to themselves but to the whole district, and more and more young people are taking advantage of the training that is being offered.

Leaving the Department of Education, I move on to a subject that has received much State-wide and Commonwealth-wide acclaim, namely, the part played by the present Queensland Government following the cyclone that devastated the two mission stations in the Gulf area. Everyone in Australia probably thinks that everything has been settled and that the people at both the Mitchell River and Edward River Missions are back on an even keel.

I made the statement before—and I make it again—that at this moment there is very little difference between the living conditions at these missions now and those that existed 24 hours after the cyclone struck. On most days one will hear over the radio that the

hottest place in Queensland was Croydon or Normanton, both of which are in this area. They experience temperatures of 103 and 104 degrees and these people are living in ordinary dark-green tents that are badly pitched and have no protection not even a fly over them to give them some cool ventilation between the tent and the fly. Anyone who has lived in these very hot, humid conditions will know that one day—or even one night—under those conditions is quite enough. That is what is happening at present and it will continue until the contractors get on with the job.

That brings me to the plans for the houses. They are simple and worth while. If there was an intricate plan of building one might think it would take some time. I had seen the plan for the whole of the settlement in June, and while I know that the closing of the tenders was set for 2 September, it took from 2 September till noon on 24 September to decide who should be given the contract. Time is moving on and last night in Cairns there was a storm that yielded three inches of rain. That indicates that the storm period has commenced, and one storm in that country could hold up the transport of this material for weeks. Unfortunately, the contractor has to get the materials there. The Government washed its hands of the whole affair in the terms of the contract.

Fancy the Minister for Works saying to the Department of Works, "Go and build a police station at Bungalloo", and after it was finished saying to the people, "You provide the policeman." That is a comparable case. A private contractor has to take his own bulldozer up there and make a road to carry this material. Those are facts. It is an indictment of the Government that six or seven months after the cyclone there is not even a road to get the material there to build the houses for these people. There was no road to Edward River Mission and a transport contractor named Kidd is trying to make that 20-mile strip with his own bulldozer so that he can transport the material for the houses. They are hoping for fine weather. I have already mentioned the storm last night. The Government will say, "It is an act of God; we did not think the storms would come so early." But from January to October nothing was done.

The Treasurer proved just what he knew of roads when he said on 25 August—

"I think a more forthright statement should be made. First of all, Burke serves three main places in the Gulf—Normanton, Burketown, and Morningson Island. A study of the geographic pattern of the Gulf shows that there is no way goods will continue to move four times a year from Normanton and Burketown around the tip of Cape York at a very high freight rate, when they can be moved in two or three times a week, except during the wet season, straight across from Cairns

to Mount Surprise and across from Mount Surprise, or from Townsville to Julia Creek and across from Julia Creek."

Here is a network of roads that will not be completed, according to the Minister, until September 1965, in the case of the Mount Surprise-Georgetown road, and not until June 1966 in the case of the Mount Surprise-Kennedy road. Is it any wonder that there are no roads where we think there are roads when members of Cabinet make these statements? When I asked that question of the Minister for Main Roads he was very scathing in his answer. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke up and said that he should give a straightforward answer. That is the sort of thing that upsets him. These roads have no bearing on the missions but it shows that Ministers are not aware of what is happening. The other business about there being no road to Edward River Mission will also upset him.

The people of Queensland should know how little acclaim the Government should receive for the job it has done for these two mission stations. Compare what has been done there with the set-up for Amoco and Ampol, where the Government will provide bitumen roads, power lines and all the necessary amenities to help that industry along. But is the Government helping the missions by the provision of roads? No! It is handing over the job to the building contractor. In effect the Government says, "You get the material there. We don't care how you get it there." The only way he can get it there is by road. The same considerations should apply to the missions as apply to industries that the Government goes out of its way to help.

In this instance the responsibility for the road was transferred to the contractor. It will be only a temporary road. In another 12 months it will be washed away. There will be no defined route, and no formation. They will get through the best way they can. It will merely serve the purpose for which it is put through—that is, if it does get through. There is such an urgent need to get cattle out of this area that the road could have served a twofold purpose. It could have served for the carriage of the material for the mission and also for the removal of cattle from that area. I do not mean cattle that can walk. I mean boner cattle, for which there is a ready market. In that area 150,000 of these beasts are lost annually. It is hard to imagine so many cattle coming out of one area which otherwise would be lost.

If the Government had provided a permanent road it could have been improved to serve a dual purpose, meeting the needs of the mission people and the station people. If there is a national emergency, will we have such muddled and confused thinking? Will we find that what we think is there is not there? Such a thought should disturb anyone in the Chamber—that amenities

which he thinks are there do not in fact exist. Transport is a great problem in many of the Gulf areas but very little has been done about it. There are large tracts of land with a sparse population scattered throughout depending on transport services to keep them going.

Just across the river, almost within a stone's throw of this Chamber, the "Waiben" is loading its last shipment for the North. She sails tomorrow from John Burke's wharf and has to by-pass Townsville because she has too much cargo. She has a curtailed quantity of cargo for Cairns, and, worst of all, she has to leave behind 32 tons of State stores which should go to the Palm Island Mission Station.

These things are happening, yet the Premier and other members of the Cabinet say there is no panic buying and that everything is going along according to plan. The very things that were to go to Thursday Island last month are still in the shed, and tomorrow, when the "Waiben" sails, they will still be there. I refer to school desks for the Thursday Island School. They total 80 cubic tons. Altogether 100 tons of merchandise will be left there.

The sudden cessation of this shipping service to the North, and to the Gulf, was very ill-timed. I admit that at the time tenders were called, they were called for Thursday Island. Why were they not called for the Gulf also? Why ignore the Gulf? Is the Government giving it away or will the Minister say, "The only transport we can provide is by road, which may or may not get there. We do not know"? A statesman-like approach to this problem could have solved it.

On its present trip the "Waiben" is taking a D9 to Weipa. I suppose all hon. members know what a D9 is. I think the hon. member who interjected should know because he spoke about nothing else in his Address-in-Reply speech. Government members say that Weipa must go ahead and this D9 will help. I think the Premier and other members of the Government parties have been to Weipa, as have hon. members on this side of the Chamber, to see the work that has been done. How could a D9 get there? Is there any other form of transport which can take it there? When the "Waiben" unloads it, it has its own gear for unloading it onto a barge. The track is laid out and it is unloaded onto the barge, the barge goes in, and then it is driven off the barge.

Is there any other transport that can do that? Do hon. members opposite think that Keith Hollands or any other transport company would be interested in it? The answer is definitely no, yet it is said that the John Burke shipping service is not a good service for the Gulf. The "Korara" has to take 400 tons from Thursday Island down to the Gulf in two trips. It cannot take 400 tons in one trip from Thursday Island to the Gulf.

The need is evident. Why has this service been stopped suddenly? Why are the people to be exploited by the new service?

I draw a comparison here with the Clausen shipping line. I think this will show the Government up in its true light. On 25 May, 1962, a subsidy of £120,000 for three years was granted to the Clausen line, £50,000 for the first year, £40,000 for the second and £30,000 for the third. That is a very nice subsidy, and is far higher than John Burke Ltd. ever got. As all the conditions were not complied with, Cabinet offered £3 a head for every beast shipped out, so they were starting to move around, probing here and probing there, to see if they could satisfy both parties.

On 30 June, 1964, the agreement was amended again, from 25 November, 1963, to 24 May, 1967, so it is still in operation and continues to provide the subsidy of up to £120,000. Of this figure £43,562 has been paid to 30 June, 1964, on 12,403 head. That works out at £3 10s. a head, so it can be seen that the Clausen line even improved on the £3 per head.

The next provision is undated and was for a subsidy of £3 for the transport of cattle from ports in the Gulf areas of Queensland, and £2 for the transport of cattle from Northern Territory ports, to the ports on the east coast of Queensland south of latitude 16 degrees. It is evident how many features come in when there is bargaining between the Government and a particular company.

There is a further undated provision that the £30,000 subsidy must not be exceeded in any 12-month period ending on 24 May in any year, and that the subsidy for the half-year 25 November, 1963, to 24 May, 1964, shall not exceed £20,000.

I again say that all forms of transport are necessary in this State, particularly in the Tablelands electorate. I welcome the sea transport of cattle, but I cannot see why the Government has made such a concerted effort to adjust subsidy payments for the purpose of having cattle transported by a non-Australian line, when it is equally determined that no subsidy will be paid to John Burke Ltd., a Queensland firm which has served the Gulf area for over 40 years.

Mr. Walsh: What do you mean by "non Australian line"?

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: A Danish company.

Mr. Duggan: Do you think that what you have said confirms our view that the Government will give the Clausen line an extra subsidy if they fail?

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: Definitely. I will go further than that. If the Clausen line could find richer returns elsewhere, do not imagine that it will consider the State Government's needs for one moment. It will be off to the richer fields, and all the subsidy that it has received will go by the board. John Burke Ltd. was always there when it was wanted.

I again ask the Government to examine ways and means of retaining the present method of meeting the needs of the Gulf people, namely, the John Burke shipping service. That company has proved it can do the job. In the last two or three years there have been four or five different approaches. In many instances it is necessary that if it is to be done in one case, it should be done in the other.

I now leave sea transport and turn to rail transport, or as the hon. member for Salisbury just said, what is left of it. I find that the pattern that has been adopted is, "We will quieten him with a little bit of lolly." That has been done, and it has been successful. I received from Mr. Dinsmore, who is next in line to Mr. Lee in seniority in the railway service, a very nice letter, and a time-table which I had submitted for the running of the rail-motor from Ravenshoe to Cairns. I thought that everything in the garden was lovely; I think anyone would have thought that. Then out of the blue came a letter from the Minister for Transport saying, "We will keep it as it is. We regret that we cannot carry out your suggestion."

Mr. Walsh: Are you suggesting that the Minister is running the Railway Department?

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: I do suggest that the Minister is running the Railway Department. That has been proved.

A Government Member: He is not doing a bad job.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: There go the cash-register minds clicking over. One can almost hear the bells ringing.

Seeing that the Minister has tried two ways of running this rail motor, neither of which has been successful, why not give it a third trial? Maybe I am sticking my neck out, nevertheless I say that I will guarantee that the patronage on this service will increase as a result. It may be said that I am foolish to make such a statement. However, I worked on that line for a number of years and I know what the people want. There was also a petition signed by 350 people who wanted it.

It is no use the Minister's saying, "No-one ever travels on it." The type of service required has never been tried. The rail motor was provided for the people of the Tableland to travel from Ravenshoe to Cairns. It has been twisted round to take tourists from Cairns to Ravenshoe. What does the Government want? Does it want to serve the people living there, or is it merely making another tourist attraction?

Mr. Duggan: Instead of talking to someone who knows something about it, they take notice of someone from America.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: That is so. The Minister said that of those to whom he spoke when he was there none was interested. I

have never known the men to whom he was talking travel on a rail motor in their lives. They are the people from whom the Government gets its ideas, and the opinions of practical people go by the board.

Mr. Walsh: The Treasurer might help you to build a harbour there.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: He would not even put a beacon there. We would never get into the harbour.

There is one thing that would help to overcome many transport problems. It is one with which I think the Minister for Mines and Main Roads would be quite happy, as I am sure would be everyone except the Minister for Transport. I refer to the construction of a rail link between Forsayth and Croydon, to complete the line from Normanton to Cairns. The route has been surveyed and is no new suggestion; its construction was meant to be carried out in the first place. If the Government is realistic in its approach to developing this area, here is the place to start.

Once the beef-cattle road is completed in June, 1966, there will be a determined effort to forget about the railways. That is why I bring this matter to the notice of hon. members in October, 1964. The distance between Forsayth and Croydon is 138 miles, it is flat country, and it has been surveyed. It is no new scheme, and, whether constructed immediately or in piecemeal fashion, it is a goal to aim at. Action along these lines would be far better than merely saying, "We will have a road in here. Away with this railway line and that line," till there are only roads left.

I ask the Minister for Transport to consider this suggestion and see in it the wisdom of providing a rail link from the Gulf to the east coast. There would then be no hold-ups through storms or washaways. The road is not even sealed, and it will be many years before it is.

I now wish to refer to those very important links between the people and Government departments, namely, the country police stations. I think that there are more one-man stations in my electorate than there are in any other, and I look upon the police officer in a small country area as the No. 1 citizen. I look upon him as a liaison officer between members of the public and any Government department with which they wish to do business. He is responsible for the electoral rolls, and the large area that he has to cover sometimes makes it necessary for him to be away from his home for three weeks at a time. That gives some idea of the area under his care. Usually he has to travel on horseback. Some police stations have a jeep, but very few. I was stranded on one occasion 50 miles from Normanton and 40 miles from Croydon. On getting in touch with the police officer at Croydon,

I found that he had neither horse nor vehicle, and he had to borrow a vehicle from a Main Roads gang.

I am not now making a point against the department. All I am saying is that the distances are so great that every small police station in the area should be manned and should be kept open. A police inspector has visited the area and some stations have received careful scrutiny, but one that I think should be kept open at all costs is the police station at Irvinebank. Irvinebank has a population of about 150. It is a mining area, and it is in the centre of the tin belt and is attracting people from all walks of life and of all nationalities. Only yesterday the first case of theft of tin mined and left at the pithead was reported. Further thefts will occur and claims will be jumped because of the very high price of tin, which I should say would be higher than the price of gold at the moment.

Police are necessary in a mining town such as Irvinebank not because of the lawlessness of its citizens but because of the type of country and the control that a policeman has to exercise. He must exercise control over the miners who are working in the battery and over the staking and working of claims in the warden's area. He has to be ready at any time to go through very rough country to areas that are in dispute. In my opinion, no police station in my electorate should be closed and there should be no reduction in the number of policemen stationed there.

Mr. Smith: Why don't you ask the Minister to consider providing a plane up there? That may be more appropriate.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: That is a request that the hon. member would be more likely to make.

I conclude on this note: the police stations in the Tablelands electorate are so important and so necessary that none of them should be closed. I am not trying to compare the Tablelands electorate with other areas. I am trying to put it in a place of its own. Settlements are scattered, and sometimes the police go alone; sometimes they meet and go in pairs; but quite often they are away for up to three weeks, which is no light matter in that country.

Mr. MURRAY (Clayfield) (8.34): I think it was very strange indeed that we should witness the Leader of the Opposition rise in his place, after recess of nine or ten days following the Treasurer's presentation of his Financial Statement, probably the most important document that comes before us, and devote the first 25 minutes or more of his time to matters quite unrelated to the Financial Statement. When he finally got to it, I was disappointed. I think he made probably the weakest contribution that we have ever heard from a Leader of the Opposition.

We expected that the hon. gentleman would make a reasoned attack on the State's finances and perhaps show us where we had gone wrong or how we might have done better. But what did we get? For the first 15 minutes he dealt with the Chairman of Committees and the Lowood Hospital. For roughly the next 15 minutes he dealt with the same matter as was just mentioned by the hon. member for Tablelands, namely, Gulf shipping.

Mr. Duggan: Don't you think that is very important?

Mr. MURRAY: Yes, but not in the manner and for the purpose for which the hon. member raised it. Of course, it is very important. After that, he got on to the Police Force and how it should be run. I suppose all matters are, in some respect or other, related to the Budget, but one would have thought that these matters could have been raised in another manner and at another time, and that he would have spent his time addressing himself to this most important paper, the Financial Statement.

I feel that the Leader of the Opposition let us down on this occasion. I normally look forward to his contribution. I think that we can learn one or two things from the attitude of the Opposition and from their thinking, and generally find out the current ideas that they have and whether they are likely to oppose and attack our measures. The Leader of the Opposition has a duty to criticise; there is no doubt about that, and we fully appreciate and respect that right. But on this occasion I do not think we gained anything, and we look to him to gain something.

The truth is—and the Opposition has pinpointed this truth—that there is very little to criticise in the Financial Statement delivered by the Treasurer. No-one can deny that he has guided the State's finances very wisely and very well during the period he has been Treasurer. No-one denies that. The Opposition perhaps might attack the angle of approach to various matters, but it is generally recognised and conceded by hon. members opposite that the Treasurer has guided the finances of the State wisely and well and that he gives us further confident hopes for the future.

It is very interesting to note the contents of the speeches made by hon. members in this debate, because few are related very closely to the Treasurer's statement. Not many of them are related to the statement itself. I repeat, all matters may be related in some way or other to the Budget but very few were related to the Financial Statement.

The Leader of the Opposition said that he would deal with certain matters and that his colleagues would deal with others, but that has not occurred.

Mr. Duggan: I don't want to be unkind. You are an up-and-rising young man but have already spent eight minutes and have not touched on the Budget. When are you going to start on it?

Mr. MURRAY: Such compliments! We are perfectly happy to leave it in the Treasurer's capable hands to deal with the feeble efforts of members of the Opposition.

Mr. Duggan: Then why don't you sit down?

Mr. MURRAY: I will emulate the Leader of the Opposition and deal with matters that are perhaps not so closely related to the Budget. Unfortunately, matters contained in the speeches of members of the Opposition were not related to the Budget. The fact is that the Budget debate is commonly used by members to get steam off their chests and to raise all sorts of matters.

Mr. Walsh: They have not many other opportunities.

Mr. MURRAY: It does add weight to the claim, as the hon. member for Bundaberg will admit, that there should be some regular opportunities for the specific purpose of raising in the House matters of members' own choice. It is unfortunate, since the hon. member for Bundaberg has raised this, that there is some misconception and doubt as to the need for any changes in the Standing Orders in that regard. Many hon. members, like myself, probably heard the Speaker as guest on "Round Table" on Sunday night making some points concerning questions without notice—for instance, relating to the House of Representatives—which were not really correct. The Speaker was doing quite well up to one stage, but towards the end of the programme Condon Byrne said that there was growing alarm at the increasing power of the Executive Government—

Mr. WALSH: I rise to a point of order. It is not in keeping with the procedure and practices of this Parliament for an hon. member to refer to "the Speaker" during Committee proceedings. "The hon. member for Murrumba" is another thing.

Mr. MURRAY: A point of order well taken. I appreciate it. I learn, not so rapidly, but slowly as I go along.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order! I ask the hon. member to please address the Chair.

Mr. MURRAY: Condon Byrne asked the hon. member for Murrumba about the power of the Executive and Cabinet in Parliament. He went on to say that it was important to know what rights members had, and he asked the hon. member for Murrumba about questions without notice. He drew attention to the fact that here in this place we asked questions on notice whereas in the House of Representatives questions, in the main, were without notice. The hon. member for

Murrumba said he thought that questions without notice were desirable from an Opposition point of view and from the point of view of a few Government back benchers. He said also that in the Federal Parliament he had noticed that quite a few members asked questions without notice, but he had a feeling that questions without notice had a tendency to develop into political sniping rather than an effort to gain legitimate information in the public interest. Condon Byrne said that he did not consider this undesirable. He said that it was a form of attack where at times one Minister may be concentrated upon for one reason or another—perhaps his portfolio might be coming under special attention that day, or he may be vulnerable to some particular public statement or action. Therefore it gave the Opposition an opportunity to concentrate on him. Condon Byrne said that he did not feel this undesirable at all. He said that, after all, Parliament was a political forum. He thought that the asking of questions without notice was one of the very sacred rights of the back-bencher.

The hon. member for Murrumba said that an hon. member still had the right to ask questions without notice, but if questions were placed on the Business Paper and the Minister's advisers had 24 hours to prepare an answer to the question, surely the member would get a more informative answer than if the Minister rose to his feet and took a wild stab at it. He also said that if a Minister knows his department—and every Minister should know his department—he can get up and give an answer. On the other hand, he said, they do have questions without notice in the Federal Parliament, but if the Minister does not have the answer he will ask the member to put the question on the Business Paper. Another thing to remember, he said, was that there was no Standing Order in the Federal Parliament dealing with questions without notice, and that it was the prerogative of the Prime Minister as to how long question time should take, he being able to rise in his place at any time—after 10 minutes, 15 minutes, or 5 minutes for that matter—and ask that the remaining questions be placed on the Business Paper. He said it was entirely in the hands of one man.

I think it necessary to put the record straight, particularly as certain proposals have been put to the Standing Orders Committee in this regard. Surely we cannot afford to have any confused thinking on this very important matter. This is a sacred right, as Condon Byrne said, and I sincerely hope that ultimately we will have it re-introduced into our Standing Orders. I was therefore a little surprised to hear the hon. member for Murrumba say these things. Questions without notice are desirable from every member's point of view, not merely for the Opposition and a few Government back-benchers. They are important from every member's point of view. I think

Standing Order 151 of the House of Representatives says quite clearly that questions may be asked without notice and the next Standing Order says that supplementary questions may be asked at the discretion of the Speaker. Standing Orders clearly allow them to be asked.

I must put this correctly for the hon. member for Murrumba: question time in the Federal Parliament extends for three-quarters of an hour each day, certainly not for five or 10 minutes at the whim of the Prime Minister. It is a strongly established practice over many years that question time takes up three-quarters of an hour and when the clock reaches a particular point usually the Minister in charge of the House, or the Prime Minister, rises and asks that further questions be placed on the Business Paper. Anyone who listens to a broadcast, or reads "Hansard", can judge whether there is over-much political sniping or whether questions are asked for legitimate reasons.

Mr. Walsh: I have heard Sir Robert himself asking that questions be put on the Business Paper.

Mr. MURRAY: That is perfectly true.

Obviously there is always some political sniping. We have seen in this Chamber that questions with notice are asked mainly for political reasons. There is plenty of legitimate information given in the House of Representatives, the New South Wales Parliament and in other Parliaments, including the House of Commons. I cannot over-stress the importance of questions without notice being the order of the day. The main point is that the Minister answers the question, and not the department or his advisors. The Minister answers the question without notice; he knows his portfolio, or should know it. He is not expected to give details, or statistical answers containing a lot of details. He answers general questions requiring a general answer and he gives answers on the spot to off-the-cuff questions on daily matters dealing with current affairs for which he is responsible. Detailed information is asked for on notice in exactly the same way as here. One finds on looking at the Business Paper here, or "Hansard" over any period, that questions that require a good deal of detailed information are treated in the same way as similar questions asked on notice in other Parliaments. When detailed information is asked the notices of question appear very much as ours do, but they are not read orally in the House; they merely appear on the Business Paper and are duly reproduced in "Hansard".

Mr. Bennett: Whom do you think is the worst offender in the Ministry for reading?

Mr. MURRAY: Generally questions are prepared in one way or another and the answers are read.

Another important point is that at question time, when there are questions without notice—this is common to virtually all Parliaments—they come equally from Government members and Opposition members. Government members have plenty of questions to ask to gain information, and I think hon. members will appreciate that at times they assist the Minister by asking a supplementary question to get perhaps a better answer to a question asked by the Opposition.

Mr. Walsh: I am surprised that you do not ask some questions here without notice. You are capable of it.

Mr. MURRAY: Nearly always the time is equally divided between Opposition and Government members. The hon. member for Bundaberg is saying that we are capable. Does he perhaps mean, "Are we allowed to?" The Standing Orders in this Parliament, as you know, Mr. Hodges, do not allow questions to be asked without notice.

Mr. Walsh: We hear them here day after day—Dorothy Dixers.

Mr. MURRAY: I say that it is with perhaps almost utter futility that Government members ask questions under the particular system that has grown up in this Parliament. I say with respect that the fact that a system has grown of questions with notice, pre-arrangement, and advice, can be clearly seen by the fact that so few Government members ask questions. Once I said to this Parliament that question time appeared to be the prerogative of the Opposition. One hon. member chipped in and said, "What rot!" I have checked the last parliamentary year and it would be interesting to go back to the years when the Opposition was in Government. I am sure one would find much the same story. A check of the last parliamentary year revealed that approximately 550 questions were asked by the Opposition and 11 by Government members, roughly 50 to 1. This seems to me to indicate something of a prerogative.

I agree that any Minister should know his portfolio, and I am sure that after a few months any Minister would be capable of answering any reasonable question that may be asked.

In any case, a question-without-notice period serves an extremely useful purpose. It keeps Ministers and their staffs well on their toes anticipating what questions will be asked on particular matters that are of current interest. I feel that this is tremendously important. It adds considerably to Press and public interest in Parliament. One has only to witness the activities of other Parliaments to see the public interest in question time. It seems to be something lacking at times in this Parliament. As hon. members will agree, the public galleries are not often filled except by school children.

Mr. Bennett: Because the questions are so often knocked out. I had two out of three knocked out today.

Mr. MURRAY: A Minister who made a wild stab at answering questions would soon realise the extent of his folly. I am pleased that Ministers can answer quite easily and without any trouble, questions without notice on public platforms for other purposes, even with a far more hostile element in the audience than they would have in this Chamber.

The Treasurer answered a question put to him not long ago dealing with this serious matter, and he said that since the earliest days of this Parliament the Standing Orders have allowed questions without notice. With respect, I say that is not correct. Between 1859 and 1892 questions could be asked without notice, as in other Parliaments, but since 1892 we have abandoned that right. We changed our Standing Orders and have carried on the present system continuously since then.

Mr. Walsh: You mean that the practice has changed?

Mr. MURRAY: The Standing Order has changed. Clearly it is in Mr. Speaker's discretion. Although it may have been built up over many years, in practice it is in Mr. Speaker's discretion whether a question can be asked without notice, contrary to the Standing Orders or otherwise. I sincerely feel that to re-introduce this very proper right of members to ask questions without notice would add to our Parliament, and be of considerable value to the institution as a whole. I think it is tremendously important.

On "Round Table" on 11 October, the hon. gentleman was complimented on refurnishing and redecorating the Chamber. He commented that of the 78 members—I presume he included himself—only two criticised. I was one. Among other things, I said that I did not like the school-type lids on our desks, and ventured the opinion that before long the Standing Orders would contain something to limit our banging them.

Hon. members will be pleased to know that I received today a postcard from the hon. member for Nundah. It shows the Chamber of the Ottawa House of Commons, and the hon. member states that each member has a desk with a lift-up lid, and members signify their approval by lifting the lids and banging them up and down repeatedly. He goes on to observe that the noise is prolonged and deafening. Perhaps you, Mr. Hodges, might convey that information to Mr. Speaker, as I feel sure that he will be interested to hear it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN
(Mr. Hodges): Order! I inform the hon. member that no business of a Committee of the Whole can ever be conveyed to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MURRAY: I think it fair to say that my principal criticism was directed to the fact that Parliament was not consulted in this matter, which is very wrong. The point

that I raised was that standing committees should report to Parliament. That was my main criticism with respect to that operation.

The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha made an excellent contribution to the debate, based on matters of land policy in Queensland. He said—

“Land usage directly and indirectly affects our whole nation, indeed, it is the basis of our nation’s wellbeing.”

I do not think anyone would have any argument with that statement.

Later, on matters of tenure, he went on to say—

“Make freehold land more liberal and security of tenure more realistic, and Queensland will achieve primary production records not remotely possible under restrictive land laws.”

He went on to say that the attitude of the Crown to the man on the land must be one of encouragement and not restriction.

It is around this particular proposition that argument mainly revolves, and where policies and philosophies differ. Members of the Australian Labour Party, for instance, do not believe in the freeholding of rural land. They want control vested in the Minister and the department by terminable leases. They like to retain a firm grip on the land. That basically is the policy of the Labour Party—an ordered and controlled society. They say, “Watch the monopolies and keep out the dreaded foreign capital.” Attempts to put it into practice reveal that it does not work in a way that pleases them.

My colleagues of the Country Party understandably have difficulties in the type of thinking found in various sections of the community on problems of land tenure. This is understandable because there are so many areas with differing attitudes. I know how difficult it is for a western grazier to see eye to eye with a Bundaberg sugar-grower on attitudes to land, and how difficult it is for a Gulf cattle-man to agree with a fruit-grower in the Stanthorpe or Granite Belt area or a dairyman on the Darling Downs. These people have differing attitudes. The existence of this problem is completely understandable.

It was for this reason that the rural committee of the party to which I belong set out a couple of years ago to endeavour to put on paper a broad formula for land policy, and an attitude to land policy that would serve as a guide to thinking and application. We endeavoured to do this, and I believe it will be quite useful. It was a very difficult exercise, but we did it because we believed it could be useful as a guide to our attitude in Government, and to the State as a whole.

The Minister for Lands, as we know, has what might almost be called an obsession against aggregations, absentee landlords, and the big boss. We have heard him say that

he does not like company ownership or the possibility of aggregations of land, and he believes that, generally speaking, employees are not happy working on large properties under particular men. That may well be true. He believes that he must have control of transfers to prevent aggregations, and his creed, as enunciated in many places, is owner-driver control—the determination of a living area by the Crown, and thereafter control in some form or other. He finds it virtually impossible to believe that the people of Queensland may be capable, if freed from controls, of working things out reasonably well for themselves and making their own determinations of what they require as a living area.

If areas of freehold have been aggregated in the past and now appear to be contrary to the public interest, or if an area is held as freehold and is now required for a specific purpose—for instance, for War Service Land Settlement or some purpose such as that—surely all the means exist, and always have existed, for resumption by the Crown.

Mr. Walsh: At a very high price.

Mr. MURRAY: Provided adequate and just compensation is provided, as it always should be. This method has commonly been used in other States and countries, where it is understood. There is no argument about these matters.

Terminable leases and perpetual leases are controllable or require consent, so we need not include them in this fear complex.

What is this fear complex about aggregations? What do we say to the industrialist, the company, the man in secondary industry, both at home and overseas? We say to him, “Bring your money and skill to Queensland. We want you.” So he sets up an industry here, prospers, and then sets up a branch in a provincial city, such as Rockhampton, Townsville, Mount Isa, or somewhere else. We say, “Well done. You are a credit to the State.” We encourage this. But when we are dealing with land matters we say, “No, we cannot allow this.” If someone wants to do something similar in a primary industry, he is discouraged. We are developing a sort of one-man, one-job or owner-driver complex about this, which I believe is most discouraging to progress in the State.

Is it not reasonable to believe that sometimes a man, by spreading himself and employing his capital more widely, may get much better results from his skills and techniques of land husbandry and animal husbandry and produce a greater reward for himself and the State than might otherwise have been produced? The fear of aggregations, I think, is quite unrealistic. Of the six per cent. of the State that is freehold, how much has been aggregated against the public interest?

Mr. Walsh: Too much.

Mr. MURRAY: I ask that question. I do not think we need fear this. How much of the Darling Downs has been gobbled up

in aggregations? How much of our sugar land, freehold and negotiable, has been aggregated? How much land has been freeholded, anyway, since the Government legislated to allow freehold? Not very much, I know. There is not very much evidence of our negotiable lands being gobbled up, although there may be isolated instances in which it has been done.

If all the terminable leases were to expire in the next five years and everyone applied to freehold a living area wherever it might be, perhaps we could have some fear of aggregation and problems in that regard. But all leases will be terminating up to perhaps 30 years from now and it would be administratively quite impossible to apply freeholding even for retention purposes to the areas of leases which will be expiring in the next few years. It is administratively impossible, so I do not think we should have fear of this.

New areas resumed showing little or no development can always be treated with conditional freehold in the same way as our brigalow blocks are now being treated. In other words, we can establish any man's bona fides if we want to, either on ballot or purchase, by imposing conditions of development. The Minister is not worried, as the hon. member for Bundaberg has said, about King Ranch, and I do not want him to be worried.

Mr. Walsh: They have 50,000 acres.

Mr. MURRAY: Well, they have 40 living areas. He is not unduly worried about it nor are any of us because the land has been wonderfully developed. I would have preferred to see it in the hands of Australian companies, because Australian companies wanted it. I would have preferred to have seen it go to L. J. Hooker Ltd., who applied for it and dearly wanted it, and for them to have received the same treatment as King Ranch ultimately got. However, it has been given to King Ranch.

When land is negotiable, when it is freed from controls and is capable of development and the application of new techniques of improvement, it tends to settle down in the hands of people who are capable of making their determination of economic areas. Probate and succession duties, the laws of heredity and many other normal factors tend to subdivide land rather than aggregate it. If the hon. member for Bundaberg examines the position in other States he will find that that is the case. I believe that we have nothing to fear from this particular problem.

Having said that, I must publicly draw attention to the case of Rayner Brothers in Condamine—David and Miles Rayner. This is a clear case of how to overdo policy and evade flexibility and common sense in our land administration. In case any hon. member wonders why I may be worrying about a case in Condamine, it is because I was asked to do it.

Mr. Walsh: It is a breach of political ethics.

Mr. MURRAY: I have been asked to do it by these people, whom I have never met before, and for the sake of the hon. member for Bundaberg, who has chided me in the past, the political ethics have been clearly satisfied. In any case, to satisfy him further because he has charged me with this, I have also raised this matter in the joint party room, very clearly and as strongly as I can, without sympathy and without success but reserving the right to take it to this Chamber if I so desire in order to secure justice as I see it. That is why I bring it to this Chamber; I desire to do it and I do it.

The Rayner family settled at Condamine in 1856 among the very early pioneers, and they have therefore suffered and enjoyed the failures and successes that go hand in hand with pioneering land settlement.

Mr. Walsh: Before we had a Government here.

Mr. MURRAY: Yes, before we had a Government in this State.

In 1856 they settled in Condamine. These two boys, or young men I suppose we should call them, to whom I will specifically refer, are fourth generation Rayners. They are great grandsons of the original David Rayner, the pioneer. If there is anything to be gained by heritage and tradition, then certainly this family, I believe, has earned it.

In 1954, as tenants in common, these boys purchased a grazing farm from one of the family—part of the original Rayner holdings—consisting of 10,400 acres, most of it brigalow. This lease at that time had eight years to run. They stocked the lease with about 500 breeders. They lived with their parents, the properties being separated only by a forestry lease of heavily-timbered country. Each also owned a small perpetual lease of about 1,300 acres, again part of the original Rayner aggregation of country or holding—it has been split down considerably since those early days—some 16 miles to the north.

About 1959 or 1960 they felt they should make arrangements for the renewal of their lease so that they could plan for the future. The Minister for Lands and the Chief Commissioner inspected the property. In later visits to Brisbane the boys were told they would lose 2,400 acres on the termination of their lease. The resumed area was going towards land being resumed from an uncle to make up an area for two ballot blocks of about 9,000 acres each. About 1962 the brothers interviewed the Minister with the hon. member for Roma, who, I believe, was trying hard to help them retain the whole of their area. When they asked whether there was anything they could do to get favourable consideration the Minister said, "Go home and improve your block. All

is not lost yet. Prove yourselves." Feeling quite heartened they went home, got some finance and cleared 6,000 acres of brigalow. They settled down to grass it in a proper manner. In spite of this they received word from the Minister that 2,400 acres would be resumed.

Several years ago one of the boys married and it was considered desirable, as is often the case with brothers in such circumstances, that they should separate their interests. What they wanted to do was split the 10,400 acres, with each having about 5,000 acres, and on that basis they would have been completely content. However, with the resumption of the 2,400 acres the remainder is too small for two. The Minister freely admits this, saying that in his opinion 8,000 acres is about 1½ living areas. If it had been good agricultural land the position would have been different. However, with the hon. member for Condamine I rode over this property because I wanted his advice. He has had wide experience of this type of country. We agreed that the size and extent of the melon-holes through the brigalow country would prohibit its use for anything other than grazing. The lease has now expired; they have an occupation licence only. They are proceeding now with the splitting of their partnership. One will remain and the other will leave. So to make up a ballot block to put one man on the land—possibly a dairy farmer from Victoria—we drive one man off the land. He is the very type of young man we want. We should be doing all in our power to keep him on the land, land which in any case is morally his, in my opinion, by inheritance. It is inheritance deserved by the industry and application of four generations of Rayners. I know they were tenants in common. I know the policy against the splitting of blocks, but don't let anyone tell me that that has not been done in the past. It has been done in special circumstances and in particular cases. If this is not an exceptional case, then I do not know one. Here is a special case. There is no aggregation here, nothing but an example of how land can be subdivided if it is left to people to carry out their own particular desires. The brother who leaves now cannot, I understand—although I may be corrected on this—enter a selective ballot for three years because he will have sold half a living area. For that reason he is barred from entering a selective ballot—how to drive men off the land in one easy, simple operation!

As the Minister said, these 8,000 acres were 1½ living areas but in the last few years he has renewed the boys' father's lease of 13,000 acres and another one nearby with the same area, although I think it is better country. Further, another family block close by—I think the name is Schwennesson—had an area of 9,000 acres resumed, with the bulk of it retained. The incoming tenant will

receive the 9,000 acres and the person from whom the 9,000 acres was taken will retain 20,000 acres of very similar country. Two sisters will retain 13,000 acres, and the father will retain 18,000 acres of his own.

David and Miles Rayner simply sought to split 10,400 acres in half and said they would be content. What is to happen to these lads, the fourth generation on the land of their birth? Surely, at the very least, their birthright to this particular land is a discretionary entitlement in the eyes of our free-enterprise Government.

Mr. Duggan: In other words, you do not think it is fair that one Minister—

Mr. MURRAY: Frankly I am at a loss to understand the reasoning behind all this. These boys were getting on with the development. They did not receive any £24,000 Government loan in this instance. They are young men, just the very type we want to carry out the job they were born and bred to do. This is a very poor example of land administration. I have raised it in this Chamber as I have failed to receive any consideration elsewhere. Surely that is not what we want to show the world.

Mr. Duggan: Why do you expect others to accept your proposition when your own party will not accept it? Why appeal to us?

Mr. MURRAY: I am not appealing to you. The Leader of the Opposition knows what the Opposition's policy is. I raise this matter publicly, as is my right, because this is the final place to which I can come.

Surely we must not show this action to the world. Is this the message the Minister for Industrial Development took overseas in an endeavour to encourage investment in Queensland? What on earth did he say? Was it, "Yes, we can do this and that in secondary industry but you are not welcome in primary industry"? We will have to ask anybody who wants to come here, or inquire about investment possibilities, "Are you an owner-driver? Will you guarantee never to aggregate or expand in any way or covet your neighbour's land and spread yourself? Are you prepared to work under some restrictive form of freehold?"

For many years Queensland has carried on a scheme of socialised control in land policies. This is reflected in the eyes of the investing world at large, especially in land tenure. No-one can deny it. One finds it dominant in many places. We were hoping that we would get away from it. We hoped we were progressing towards some real freedom at long last, but there are undenied rumours—damaging and disturbing rumours if I may say so—statements and warnings by the president of the United Graziers' Association and his officers and editorial material by "Country Life" which, after all, is the official organ of the graziers and the most widely-read rural paper in the State.

Do not let us minimise the enormous importance of what is happening with our rural policy. Already I think the most grievous blow has been dealt to the confidence of those now engaged in the use of the land, and those who may have contemplated coming to take up land in Queensland or invest in land here. Never let us underestimate what a loss of confidence can mean. Certainly we on the Government benches will never forget the lessons of 1960 and 1961, when the blows dealt by the Commonwealth Government to the economic confidence so destroyed the morale of the investing and business community that the Federal Government almost went out of office in an election, and it took some years before that confidence was restored. I say that the spate of rumours in Press articles and various journals, and among responsible organisations, has already substantially undermined the confidence of all concerned in our land policy. It is not a prospect; it could be that this Government is aware that it is a fact. All of us in Queensland know that having suffered for almost 40 years under Labour Socialism and the restrictive bureaucratic controls spawned by it—we suffered long enough—we are far behind the other States in terms of economic land usage. But we should be doing spectacular things here in this State in order to catch up with the other States. This fair State of Queensland cries out for help, for inspired, imaginative management and bold policies in order to bridge the gap that exists between this State and others.

Mr. Walsh: Answer me this: is there any freehold tenure in Canberra?

Mr. MURRAY: Your party did not give me an opportunity to find out.

Anything that would enlarge this gap is not only ludicrous but almost criminal in this State's present position. I want the Premier to come out at the earliest possible date and make it clear beyond all doubt, beyond any possibility of misunderstanding, that this Government will not contemplate any proposals that will reduce perpetual lease and freeholding prospects and will only serve to enlarge and strengthen the bureaucratic machinery which was the very sorry legacy we inherited in 1957. By all possible means we should rid ourselves of the irksome controls and restrictions of the Socialist years, and remove the penalties to freedom and development.

Private enterprise has suffered for too long. This was our hope. This was the new deal we looked for. The truth is that we should have put into effect by now—there is no doubt about this—our basic philosophy in land administration and the more specific promises of 1957, which were completely consistent with the promises made in previous election years, but we have apparently been prevented. What has prevented us? Is it the Minister, or the Cabinet? Surely it

is not the coalition members of the organisations outside. Surely it is not the Chief Commissioner, who is charged with the task of administering Government policy. I believe the Chief Commissioner would be distinctly capable of administering any policy given to him to be carried out. He obviously has not had a clear policy, otherwise we would never be plagued with these doubts and fears, and with what appears to be little more than a continuation of the Socialist creed.

Whilst there will always be those who grumble, and with any policy, there always are those who grumble, the clear fact is that there is far too much dissatisfaction throughout the land at present, and unfortunately the very nature of the type of controls persisted in, because of their very nature, tends towards inequitable treatment as between landholders. They leave a trail of inconsistencies which causes many good people who are caught in these situations, or are close enough to observe them, to wonder what the devil is going on.

Spokesmen for very responsible organisations, editorials in our newspapers, and others, have all voiced their profound apprehension regarding any proposals to perpetuate Socialism in terms of land administration. I know that in this I speak for myself and hon. members on this side of the House. I say that our basic philosophy is not, never has been, and never will be, that of Socialism. It is completely foreign and alien to us. The land policy of my party, which we have put together on paper, is quite clear in this regard when it says that the basic aim of land policy should be effective, continuous, and economic land usage, due regard being paid to the need to improve the productivity of the land. This aim can be best achieved if the form of land tenure is such as to provide adequate security to encourage and attract private capital, which is the prerequisite of efficient development.

If we are a free-enterprise Government—which, of course, we are—there can be no doubt about the type of policies that we should pursue. I look forward to some authoritative and early statement that will kill these unhealthy rumours that are going round with respect to land policy. It should be made plain that the Government will have nothing whatever to do with restrictive, socialistic land policies.

Mr. MANN (Brisbane) (9.27 p.m.): It was quite refreshing to sit and listen to the hon. member for Clayfield. First, he tried to embarrass Ministers by suggesting that questions without notice should be introduced, and then he attacked the Minister for Lands on matters of land policy. He also attacked the Leader of the Opposition by stating that he mentioned nothing about the Budget. He himself, however, wasted half an hour of our time dealing with his troubles

in Caucus, where apparently he has not been able to convince the Minister for Lands that his claim is genuine. From what I can gather, he wants to give living areas to those who already have them. I think the Minister for Lands was embarrassed by what he had to say. I hope the hon. member will continue to embarrass him, and I will help him if I can. I do not think that he really had a case. I think that his battles will have to be fought in Caucus, as he will not get any support from this side of the Chamber in the case that he has presented.

I consider that my Leader presented a good case when dealing with the Financial Statement. On looking at it, it seems to be a very simple document meant to convey to ordinary folk a simple outline of the plans that the Government has for the advancement of the State. It appears to be a document that can be easily read and understood by all. It is written in plain language, and sets out simply, according to the Treasurer, the affairs of the State and the policy of the Government since 1957.

On perusing it, we find that it is a Budget for a deficit of £585,000. The claim was made by the Treasurer that Queensland was bursting at the seams and that money would roll in from all sources. The Premier is on record as saying in February 1963 that the Government had brought real life to the State. He said that Queensland had been regarded as the Cinderella State of the Commonwealth, but that his Government had brought a new sense of vision, urgency, and purpose to the tasks confronting them, and had supplied new inspiration and incentive for the people of Queensland to work for a common objective.

Mr. Smith: It is good of you to remind us of what we have done.

Mr. MANN: I ask the Treasurer, not the hon. member for Windsor, this question: to whom has the Government given an incentive? Has it given it to the big companies mining bauxite? Has it given it to the Thiess-Peabody-Mitsui Company that has come here to mine coal? Has it given it to the big oil companies that have come to Queensland to search for oil? Has it given it to Mount Isa Mines Limited? Or has it given it to the railway workers, or to the workers at Mount Isa or the other common people? I ask the Treasurer and the Premier to answer those questions, because I believe that the answers to them will show the real cause of the trouble. American oil companies, Mount Isa Mines Limited and other big companies are being encouraged and fostered by the Government, yet the Premier refuses to meet representatives of the trade unions or to meet the common people who are fighting and struggling for a better deal in this State, which is supposed to be bursting at the seams.

The Financial Statement discloses that the revenue from the railways exceeded £40,000,000, which is almost 30 per cent. of the State's annual income. At page 3 of his Financial Statement, the Treasurer said—

“This is the first occasion for nine years that railway revenue has exceeded expenditure and the beneficial effect on the finances of the State is most marked. It is the first time in the history of the Railway Department that revenue has exceeded £40,000,000. That such a result has been obtained is due to a combination of factors. There has been a progressive increase in the number of diesel locomotives . . . ”

and so on, and he then went on to say—

“ . . . an increase in proportion of long-distance and bulk traffic has emerged, with more of it moving in unbroken train sets, without need for intermediate shunting and marshalling.”

Later he said—

“This vast improvement in railway performance is the more creditable when it is realised that fares and freights have not been increased since 1 October, 1960. Since that date, the rise in cost levels generally has been approximately 6.4 per cent.”

I ask the Treasurer and the Premier, through you, Mr. Hodges, why they refuse to meet the railway men? Why do they not listen to their grievances? If the revenue of the Railway Department is so buoyant, why not meet the men, listen to their demands, and find out what they want? The Government was pleased to meet representatives of the big oil companies that are establishing refineries at the mouth of the river. The Treasurer boasted about the agreement that he had made with them and said that it had saved the Government thousands of pounds. It also saved the companies many thousands of pounds. The Government was prepared to break an agreement and vary it to suit the oil companies, but the Premier and the Treasurer were not prepared to receive members of the trade union movement, in spite of the fact that the Financial Statement says that railway revenue has never been more buoyant.

Although it does not make a simple statement to this effect, I think the Financial Statement demonstrates quite clearly that the Government of Queensland, as is the Menzies Government, is on the side of Big Business and monopolies and against the workers and the trade union movement.

On page 2 of his Financial Statement, the Treasurer further said—

“All of these results reflected the prosperity this State was commencing to enjoy. Increases in both transport fees and railway revenues pointed to increasing commercial activity with a record volume of goods carried.”

Again I ask the Treasurer, what is wrong with the railway men? Why are they dissatisfied? Why is there disruption, stop-work meetings, and so on? Not for the reasons that the Premier gave in replying to a question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in which he tried to defame leaders of the trade union movement. He argued and implied that the workers are not dissatisfied, that the disruption has resulted from the violent agitation of union leaders. Does the Premier think that hundreds of railwaymen in Townsville and at other depots would be holding stop-work meetings if they were satisfied and content? I say that the answer is quite obvious. The Government is not prepared to meet the demands of railwaymen for wage increases, and it is commonly known that Queensland has become a low-wage State. Not only is it a low-wage State but we have the highest retail prices of any State in the Commonwealth, and our workers have to pay more for their goods and services than are paid in any other State.

On page 1 of his Financial Statement the Treasurer said about mining production—

"In mining, the value of production, excluding coal and gold, rose by 4.5 per cent to £42.8 million. The continued rise in values of copper, lead and other metals and the development of bauxite production for export more than offset the loss of uranium following the closure of Mary Kathleen Mine in September, 1963. Production and export of coal was also at record levels."

There we have the Treasurer's statement that production of those metals rose by 4.5 per cent to £42.8 million and that the rise in value of copper and other metals for export had offset the loss at Mary Kathleen.

We know that the Government deliberately introduced legislation amending the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to deprive workers in the mining industry of any share in the increased value of production by refusing to allow the Commission to increase any bonus payments it might give. The Premier told the workers to go to the Industrial Commission; they cannot go to the Commission because it is hamstrung. That brings me back to the days of Macgroarty and Moore when Macgroarty said he would ringbark the Arbitration Court. This Government has ringbarked the Industrial Commission.

The Treasurer said the other day that if the workers had a good advocate before the Commission they would get good increases. The Commission is not allowed to give them an increase under the Act. The Act specifically states that there can be no increase in bonus payments, only a lowering of such payments.

Mr. Hiley: You are mixing up the bonus and wage increases.

Mr. MANN: I am not mixing up the bonus and wage increases. I am telling the Committee why the workers cannot get an increase—because the Commission is guided by the attitude of the Government.

Mr. Hiley: That is bunkum.

Mr. MANN: The Treasurer says it is bunkum. I say that the Treasurer does not know how the Commission operates.

Mr. Smith: Are you criticising the Commission?

Mr. MANN: I am criticising the Government. The hon. member for Windsor would not know anything at all about industrial matters. He is like the Treasurer. The Treasurer said that if the unions had good advocates they would get decent wages from the Commission, but he does not understand the functioning of the Commission. I say that the Government refused to allow the Commission to increase bonus payments to Mt. Isa workers and they and the railwaymen have no alternative but to resort to strike action to get wage justice. At the same time, the Government is willing and eager to confer with overseas monopolies and giant mining companies. They have steadfastly refused to confer with the unions. I say that the Budget proves that the Government is two-faced. On the one hand it confers with big companies and on the other refuses to meet the workers.

When the Premier talks about incentives, he means incentives to monopolies and favours to the millionaire Mount Isa company and to big oil interests. I say the Treasurer is a piker so far as money is concerned. He budgets for a £500,000 deficit. He should have budgeted for £2,500,000 deficit. He refuses to give workers justice because he is going to balance his Budget. He will suggest that we ought to put a tax on the workers or something else. He should increase the royalties payable by all these mining companies. The companies receiving all the benefits from the Government are the prosperous people in the community. The workers are being denied wage justice.

Mr. Hanlon: The Government got only £3,000 out of £500,000 worth of bauxite.

Mr. MANN: I was just going to mention that. I know that the Treasurer knows that what I am going to say is true. He will agree with me. In the coming three years the production of this mining company will rise by many millions of pounds. I think it will rise to £30,000,000, yet the Government received less than £500,000 in royalties last financial year. The Treasurer eulogises these big firms and yet he receives less than £500,000 in royalties from them.

Mr. Hiley: We are honouring the rates fixed when you brought in that scale.

Mr. MANN: The Treasurer tries to camouflage the issue. I know that he is a pretty smart accountant. He can almost make you believe that 2 and 2 are 5 if you listen long enough. Compare the attitude of the Government towards the working people in the community with its attitude to Big Business in the community. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked a question about the royalties paid by the oil companies. We feel that they are not paying nearly enough in royalties. The Government should get many more thousands of pounds in royalties. If it did it would not have to go to the Industrial Commission to oppose a 2s. increase in the basic wage.

I have here a report on the judgment of the Commission which states—

"In its judgment recently the Commission said that, on the consumer price index movements for the quarter ended 30 June, 'the Commission could be justified in awarding an increase of the 2s. a week for males and 1s. 6d. a week for females sought by the applicants.'

"But, it said, 'We are of the opinion that, with a basic wage of £15 for males and £11 5s. for females, the award of 2s. and 1s. 6d. a week respectively sought would constitute a very ineffective addition to the wages of employees subject to awards of this Commission'."

The Commission agreed that the cost-of-living index provides for an extra 2s. a week for males and 1s. 6d. for females, but according to it this is ineffective. The report continues—

"Because we believe that the consumer price index figures for the quarter ending 30 September—which should be available to this Commission and the parties within a matter of weeks—will furnish evidence of a more realistic character, we are of the opinion that the application should be refused'."

The Treasurer has said that if they would go to the Commission and make out a good case they would get an increase. They went to the Commission for a 2s. increase in the basic wage. The Commission has admitted that the quarterly increase at the end of 30 June entitled them to a payment of 2s. yet it refused it and intends to wait until the end of September—when it gets the next quarterly adjustment—before it will again have a look at it.

From the end of June to the end of September the wage plugs have had to go without their 2s. a week. The Treasurer had the hide to state, "If you go to the Commission with a good advocate you will get something worth while." For the wage plug, 2s. is perhaps as good as 10s. a week for the Treasurer. It may be worth more to some of them because the Treasurer

is in the wealthy class and the plug on the basic wage needs every 2s. he can get to help pay off his TV set or some other appliance. I place on record the fact that the Government sent a representative to the Commission to oppose a 2s. basic wage increase, yet every hon. member on the other side of the Committee knew that the quarterly index showed that the workers were entitled to an extra 2s. The hon. member for Windsor looks astounded. If he does not believe me I ask him to go to the Commission and read the judgment.

Mr. Smith: I am not astounded.

Mr. MANN: The workers of this State were denied wage justice in the refusal of the 2s. a week increase. The Government should be ashamed.

Mr. Smith: Will you now tell me whether you are criticising the Commission or not?

Mr. MANN: I am criticising the Government for sending a representative to the Commission to oppose it. The hon. member is a snide barrister and he wants me to make a statement that you, Mr. Graham, will make me withdraw. I do not wish to attack the Commission. If the hon. member moves a motion about the Commission I will support him. I will have plenty to say about the Commission and the Commissioners.

According to the Financial Statement the Government intends to channel £1,500,000 into the building of roads for the oil companies in the State. I ask the Treasurer what is wrong with offering another £2,000,000 to the Brisbane City Council to fix up the crossing at the Normanby and other crossings, and construct a flyover from Petrie Bight to New Farm. If the Government were to spend £2,000,000 carrying out that work it would earn the approbation of every motorist in the State because it is badly needed. It is channelling £1,500,000 into works for the big oil companies. Why does it not do it for the motorist at the Normanby crossing and other spots in the city? The hon. member for Yeronga knows all about this as he referred to it in his Address-in-Reply speech. A sum of £4,000,000 is to be spent on extensions to bulk-sugar terminals. That is further assistance to the big monopoly, Colonial Sugar Refinery Co. Ltd., which will get the major benefit. An hon. member has asked whether the cane farmers will benefit. I know that they will get a benefit, but the Colonial Sugar Refinery Co. Ltd. will get the most benefit. Last year the Colonial Sugar Refinery Co. Ltd. made a profit of £7,395,000 as disclosed by its balance sheet.

Mr. Marsden: What did the worker get?

Mr. MANN: He did not get the 2s. he was entitled to. That is another indication of helping monopolies.

Not only is the Government's policy one-sided, but it is not firm in regard to prices. For a long time the hon. member for Salisbury has had a motion on the Business Paper but the Government will not allow it to be debated. The prices of potatoes, bacon, ham and all the necessaries for the kitchen table are rising, as can be seen from yesterday's paper. Every man in the community needs potatoes.

Mr. Smith: Their price is down again.

Mr. MANN: It is all right for the snide barrister to make such remarks. He can afford to pay for them.

Mr. Smith: Why don't you give that information to Mrs. Horan?

Mr. MANN: I don't want anything to do with Mrs. Horan, or the hon. member either. I have this document before me and I will tell my story about it. Prices, as shown by the consumer price index, went up 2s. per week in the three months ended 30 June. But workers were refused an increase by the Commission. I do not know. There is such a thing as psychology and there is such a thing as having ideas of what the Government wants. When the Government sends a representative to the Industrial Commission to oppose the 2s. a week which the Commission admits the workers are entitled to, doesn't that influence the Commission? Has it no influence on the Commission? It must have an influence because the Government has a representative there to oppose the 2s. increase. That makes me think of the old days of Macgroarty and Moore when they wanted to ringbark the court. I challenge the Premier to remove the particular clause from the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, and let the men at Mt. Isa get a fair deal. Delete the clause from the Act that was put in when Senator Morris was Minister for Labour and Industry, and let the Commission deal with prosperity loadings. The Commission stated definitely that it cannot award bonus or prosperity payments because the Act prevents it from doing so. If the Premier wants to give the Mount Isa Mines men a fair go he should delete the amendment put into the Act and let the Commission deal with the prosperity at Mt. Isa and let the bonus go up or down as it did before. I issue this challenge to the Treasurer: has he the courage to admit that he gave a favour to Mount Isa Mines Limited that we know nothing about? Why did he do it? He did it for some reason—to assist Mount Isa Mines. That is causing all the trouble at Mt. Isa. The workers are being robbed of their just dues because of the Act introduced by this Government. The amendment put in by this Government was an indication to the Commission of how it should operate. The Government has

sponsored fines, and is pushing the Commission to fine the trade unions. It threatens that action would be taken by the Minister for Transport against the railway men. That aroused thousand of workers in the State to the realisation of the attitude of this Government. That attitude will not stop the workers from demanding, by strike action if necessary—and that is all that is left to them—the justice to which they are entitled. The Government's policy and that of the Menzies Government is to attack the trade unionist's rights to wage increases, and to give support to big businesses and monopolies. I challenge the Premier to meet the trade unions and hear their grievances. They won't eat him. They won't hurt him. He should talk to them and see what they have to say. He should meet the railway men, because the Minister for Transport is so dogmatic and domineering that he doesn't want to see anyone. I ask the Premier to meet the railway men and listen to their demands and see what their grievances are. I feel that he could come then to some reasonable decision. It is no good running away. If the men feel they are suffering an injustice, they will fight. It is no good getting half a dozen trade-union leaders into trouble. The men are determined. They realise that the trade unions and the Labour movement have to be united against the attacks made upon them by the Menzies Government and this Government. I make no bones about saying that.

Mr. Smith: Is what the hon. member for Townsville South said correct?

Mr. MANN: Anything I say is correct. Anything I say in this Chamber is correct. It is put into "Hansard", and the hon. member can check it tomorrow. I might make a few small alterations, but I won't alter the context of anything I have said. The Premier was approached 12 months ago and asked to meet a deputation from a women's organisation and asked to discuss equal pay for women in this State.

A Government Member: Which organisation was that?

Mr. MANN: An organisation set up in the Trades Hall. Miss Collins was the secretary of it. The Government should give consideration to the matter of equal pay for women. In 1960 the International Labour Organisation sought the opinion of its delegates as to this country's attitude to this most important question. The A.C.T.U. has asked the Menzies Government why it has flouted international standards on wages of women workers. The Commonwealth Government representatives at the International Labour Organisation consistently refrained from voting whenever this subject was under discussion.

I believe that the A.C.T.U. will this year again focus attention on the failure of the Commonwealth Government to honour its

international obligations. I believe that there should be a nation-wide campaign to focus attention on the injustice perpetrated on thousands of women workers throughout Australia. The attitude of this Government is even worse than that of the Menzies Government. The Premier refused to meet a deputation to discuss the matter; he said that it must be left to the Industrial Commission. He knows full well that the powers of the Commission, given under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, are limited.

Equal pay for women can be granted only by legislation, not by the Commission. The Premier says, "Take it to the Industrial Commission." This is similar to his refusal to meet railway men. In Australia there are no statistics on the number of women employed in particular industries, nor are there available particulars of the amount of training that they have, whether or not they support dependants, and the many other things required to present an accurate picture of women in industry. I feel that the attitude of the Government towards this matter is wrong. As I said before, it is worse than that of the Menzies Government, whose representatives at I.L.O. consistently refuse to vote on the matter.

The Financial Statement proves that the Government is two-faced, and against workers and the trade-union movement. I feel that it is time the matter was brought to a head. Agitation by workers on the job will prove conclusively that they are not going to be brow-beaten by fines, and the Government will have to take stock of itself in the near future.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (9.58 p.m.): Before proceeding to deal with some aspects of the Budget to which I feel obliged to draw attention, there are one or two important matters to which I wish to refer because I consider them to be of paramount interest to Parliament, and the Government of the State. I refer to what might be termed colloquially as our State rights which have been set down in the Commonwealth Constitution, and which the present Federal Government is making determined efforts to overrule.

Mr. Smith: Would it be correct to say that State rights are not set out in the Constitution, but that the Constitution gives Federal rights?

Mr. BENNETT: I should like to indicate to the hon. member for Windsor that in this particular brief I do not require the services of a junior. I am quite capable of handling it myself.

The position is that the Commonwealth Constitution clearly sets out the rights of the Commonwealth and, in effect, virtually the rights of the States. I feel that it behoves every State Parliament to ensure that the rights of the States are safeguarded and not

completely overrun by the Federal Government whose leader, Sir Robert Menzies, has been referred to in several quarters in serious vein as a benign dictator. I think that on many occasions he has become a malicious dictator, and it behoves the Parliament and the Government of this State, independent of the politics of the day, to safeguard jealously the rights of the people of Queensland. I believe that the Government, if it did not lack intestinal fortitude, would do its best to ensure complete and wholehearted support for and co-operation with Mr. Renshaw, the Premier of New South Wales, in resisting a determined effort by the Menzies Government to ride roughshod over what are fundamentally State rights.

Sir Robert Menzies's knowledge of law must surely and clearly indicate to him that he has no constitutional power to do what he is doing in relation to air navigation. However, being power-drunk because of his long years in office, and knowing that he can superimpose his will on that of his own party and that of the Country Party, he believes that he can encroach on the rights of the various States of Australia. I have always believed that, in spite of his dictatorial attitude, he was really a Federalist; but it is becoming abundantly clear and completely obvious that he is now so drunk with power that he believes in centralisation because he wants to control everything.

In this regard I am rather sceptical of his motives, because the interests involved are those of Reg Ansett, who is clearly a close personal friend of Sir Robert Menzies—the selfsame Reg Ansett who upset the solemn undertakings in relation to the new television station to be constructed in Queensland that were given to a commission of inquiry. An assurance was given in evidence under oath that the majority of shares in the new television station would be held by Queenslanders. Because of his friendship with Federal Ministers, the Federal Government, and Sir Robert Menzies, Reg Ansett was able to wriggle out of the undertaking that had been given by his interests before the commission of inquiry when the particular licence was allocated, and this will, in only a few years, mean millions of pounds to him.

I think it is completely improper that one person in Australia should have the ear of a Federal Government to such an extent that he can influence it to ignore completely the Federal Constitution that has been held sacrosanct in the minds of Australians since the days of Federation. He has no right to do it, and Sir Robert Menzies knows that he has no right to do it; but he is using steam-roller tactics in the hope that the various States will cave in under the greater weight of the financial resources of the Commonwealth Government. I am sure that hon. members in this Chamber who have even a little knowledge of the Constitution know only too well that he must be beaten if he is resisted.

Section 51 of the Constitution says—

“Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to—

- (i) Trade and commerce with other countries and among the States.”

Section 107 says—

“Every power of the Parliament of a Colony which has become or becomes a State, shall, unless it is by this Constitution exclusively vested in the Parliament of the Commonwealth or withdrawn from the Parliament of the State, continue as at the establishment of the Commonwealth, or as at the admission or establishment of the State as the case may be.”

Away back in 1910 it was held by the High Court that this Section 51 (1) does not empower the Federal Parliament to enact Section 4 of the then Seamen's Compensation Act of 1909 which, *inter alia*, purported to regulate purely intrastate trade. It was again held in 1936, by the High Court of Australia, that Section 4 of the Commonwealth Air Navigation Act of 1920, which purported to give the Governor-General power to make regulations for the purpose of providing for the control of air navigation generally throughout the Commonwealth, was invalid.

I should like to refer in some little detail to an authority which clearly shows that Sir Robert Menzies is wrong. He is endeavouring to bluff his way through in the interests of Reg Ansett and, as I say, Reg Ansett has no rights in this matter unless, unbeknown to us all, he has suddenly become king of Australia.

I refer to the case of *The King against Burgess*, reported in 55 Commonwealth Law Reports at page 608, which reads—

“Appeal, by order for prohibition from a Court of Petty Sessions of New South Wales.

“Upon an information laid by Vernon William Burgess, an officer of the Civil Aviation Branch, Department of Defence, and the District Superintendent of Civil Aviation in Sydney, Henry Goya Henry was charged before a Court of Petty Sessions of New South Wales that on 30th September, 1934, an aircraft of which he was then the pilot and personnel did fly in contravention of the Air Navigation Regulations made under the Air Navigation Act 1920, within the limits of the Commonwealth, namely near Mascot in the State of New South Wales, without the personnel of the said aircraft being licensed in the prescribed manner.’ The defendant, whose pilot's licence had been suspended for fourteen days from 28th September, 1934, admitted that on the date charged in the information he, as pilot, made several

flights in an aircraft. None of the flights extended beyond a short distance from the Mascot Aerodrome, Sydney, nor beyond the boundaries of the State of New South Wales. The defendant was convicted.”

He appealed to the High Court of Australia. This, as I say, was back in 1936. Sir John Latham, Chief Justice of the High Court, as he then was, held as follows—

“This appeal raises the question whether the Commonwealth Parliament has power to legislate with respect to flying operations carried on within the limits of a single State. It was proved in the court below that the appellant was the pilot of an aeroplane which he flew at Mascot in the State of New South Wales on 30th September, 1934. The Air Navigation Regulations (S.R. No. 33 of 1921) provide in reg. 6 that ‘no aircraft shall fly within the limits of the Commonwealth or the territories or the territorial waters adjacent to the Commonwealth or the territories unless . . . (c) the personnel of the aircraft is licensed in the prescribed manner.’ ”

Skipping a large part of the judgment, at page 627 he says—

“The subject of aviation is not mentioned in express terms in the Commonwealth Constitution. Aeroplanes and other power-driven aircraft did not exist in the year 1900 when the Constitution Act was passed. The provisions of the Constitution, however, are not to be limited by the denotation in 1900 of the terms used in its various sections. It is well established that any statute may properly be applied to new facts and new conditions if the words of the statute properly construed are such as to include such facts and conditions. If the Constitution had vested in the Commonwealth Parliament the power to legislate with respect to ‘transport’ there is no doubt that air transport as well as methods of transport known in 1900 would have been included within the scope of the power.

“The illustrations which have been given indicate the difficulties of any double control of aviation and might well be used to support the contention that it is wise or expedient that there should be a single control of this subject matter. Considerations of wisdom or expediency cannot, however, control the natural construction of statutory language. The Constitution gives to the Commonwealth Parliament power over inter-State and foreign trade and commerce and does not give it power over intra-State trade and commerce, although these subjects are obviously in many respects very difficult to separate from each other.

“A similar argument could be applied to railways the property of any State with respect to which the Commonwealth

has power to legislate under the trade and commerce power. This argument, however, has always been rejected by the court.

"Applying the decision of this court to which I have referred, and in the absence of any evidence of the character which I have just mentioned, I find myself compelled to reject the contention that if the Commonwealth Parliament has power to legislate with respect to inter-State and foreign aviation, it must therefore also have power to regulate intra-State aviation.

"If all the States had passed and brought into operation legislation referring powers to deal with aviation generally to the Commonwealth Parliament, the Commonwealth Parliament would have possessed the powers referred. In the absence of such action I am unable to support the validity of the second part of sec. 4 of the Air Navigation Act 1920, which provides for the making of regulations for the control of air navigation generally throughout the Commonwealth. This conclusion does not affect the power of the Commonwealth to control aviation in the territories, or in Tasmania within the limits of the Tasmanian statute."

It is clear from the judgment of the court back in 1936 that the Commonwealth Parliament has no power to do what Sir Robert Menzies is endeavouring to bring about by deception. Furthermore, the law is quite clear and definite on that matter. He obviously proposes to plunge the taxpayers of the Commonwealth and, in turn, the taxpayers of New South Wales into expensive litigation to prove what was proved in 1936, and what was written into the Commonwealth Constitution in 1900.

The only people who will profit eventually from the controversy, argument and battle over Reg Ansett will be the top Q.C.'s in Australia who will appear in expensive litigation to argue a fundamental point of law which any law student passing through the university would understand. I am afraid that even the hon. member for Windsor will not get a jersey because it will be only the top boys in the Federal sphere who will be appearing for the Federal Government, men who have a close affiliation with the Country and Liberal Parties, as did Arnold Bennett in the recent royal commission. He is going to be the next Chief Justice of Queensland. You have to play your politics strong in order to get that appointment.

Mr. Ramsden: You would not get a bob out of it yourself under those conditions.

Mr. BENNETT: As usual, as I have done over the years in Queensland, as I have been doing today in certain instances, and as I have done tonight, I have given a free legal

opinion for the benefit of hon. members sitting on that side of the Chamber, an opinion for which Sir Robert Menzies and others would charge at least 100 guineas.

Mr. Davies: At least the hon. member for Windsor destroyed the tunnel of the hon. member for Merthyr.

Mr. BENNETT: That is right.

I think a very important principle is involved. If the Government of this State was seriously concerned about the welfare and preservation of prestige of this Parliament it would join forces with Mr. Renshaw and protest publicly against the proposal of the Federal Government. The scheming that is going on in relation to this proposal is perhaps one of the best modern arguments for the abolition of the Federal Senate. According to the Commonwealth Constitution—time will not permit me to read the clauses relating to the Senate—there was only one reason in 1900, when the big constitutional lawyers of the day were considering the structure of the Federal Parliament, for constituting a Senate, or Upper House. It was to safeguard the interests of the States. As everybody knows, each State has elected representation in the House of Representatives according to the proportion of electors in the various States, but in order to safeguard the interests of States as States the Senate was constituted so that senators could look after the interests of the States irrespective of the various political numbers in the House of Representatives. As the hon. member for Sandgate has said, the Senate has control if it carries out its duties and responsibilities.

However, the Senate does not vote according to State rights; it votes according to its political affiliations. If it is in favour of the Government of the day it votes for Government legislation independent of the principles of the legislation and its interference with State rights. Sir Robert Menzies has already said that if any endeavour is made by the Senate to exercise its constitutional rights in resisting this proposal, he is absolutely certain that his political numerical strength in the Senate will superimpose itself and override any constitutional rights of the Senate in safeguarding the interests of the State. His senators will vote according to party-political affiliations rather than for the purpose for which they were elected. That is the best argument for the abolition of the Senate. Senators are not interested in the welfare of the State, but only in safeguarding their positions in the Senate. This has indicated just how useless the Senate is. If it chose to exercise its obligations, and pursued its functions as a Senate, Sir Robert Menzies would take the Senate to the electors to deny it the opportunity of casting its vote.

He would call on the Senate election before the Senate had an opportunity to vote on the legislation if, in fact, he believed that any of his party members would vote according to their consciences and according to their obligation to safeguard the State's interests. One of the most important aspects of parliamentary life at the present time is whether we agree to forgo the rights of the States and have centralised Government at Canberra or, alternatively, we closely safeguard the rights for which we have been elected to State Parliament.

My next point has been dealt with quite adequately by my colleague the hon. member for Brisbane. However, I wish to make one or two additional observations as a man with legal training who has some understanding of legal ethics. I am rather disappointed that the Treasurer is not in the Chamber to hear these remarks because I believe that his comment about the advocacy for wage increases during the course of this debate is perhaps the most damaging comment ever made about the Industrial Commission in Queensland. He said, rather fallaciously, I think, that with competent advocacy all metal trade unions would get an increase in wages. Firstly, he is obviously claiming that there is incompetent advocacy. I do not concede his contention in that regard. I feel it is fully competent, and I believe that research in relation to that advocacy is all that it should be.

Even if we concede the Treasurer's claim that the advocacy was incompetent, what a damning indictment he has made against the Government which, in effect, he is claiming is sheltering behind incompetent advocacy and denying the employees their just entitlements in wage increases. He is saying that there is a convincing and valid argument for wage increases which has not been discovered by those who are employed as advocates before the Industrial Commission and, for that reason, the Government, employers generally, and the employers' federation, are sheltering behind the incompetency and denying the ordinary worker his proper entitlement. That is downright shocking and scandalous. It is one of the most damning indictments that any Treasurer can make against his Government, against the Industrial Commission, and against those who have been employed by the Government and by employers' organisations to put up what he says in effect are fallacious arguments against a claim for a wage increase. I have never heard anything so shocking. I believe that if the Government's representatives in the Industrial Commission are opposing a wage increase, they should be opposing it on valid and sound grounds, and with conclusive arguments.

The Treasurer said that their arguments are designed only to conceal the truth from the Industrial Commission, because if the correct argument was discovered by the advocates,

they could not fail to get an increase from the Commission. That is the most shocking admission any Treasurer has ever made in any Parliament that I know of. It is completely unethical and improper. If any legal man was guilty of arguing a case which he considered to be absolutely wrong, withholding from the court the correct facts and circumstances, deliberately misleading the court, and allowing arguments that are not true, or misrepresentative to go to that court, he would not be allowed to continue to practise as a legal man.

I feel that the statement made by the Treasurer is the most damning that any Treasurer or any other Cabinet Minister could ever make. It is obvious that there are, in these disputes, arguments for and against. It is true to say that union leaders are pushed by their members from time to time to make certain endeavours on their behalf, and I know that union leaders, like all human beings, sometimes come to a mistaken conclusion. But in view of what the Treasurer has said, they are entitled now to take any action to get their just demands, because the Treasurer said that they are entitled to have their increase if they can discover the correct argument. If they cannot discover it, there is no answer. I am surprised that he said that. I think that he may have said it in his egotism, trying to make out that he is the only one in this Parliament with knowledge of these matters, but if he believed what he said, and if what he said was true, it is damning.

Mr. Ramsden: It is no more damning than if a fellow got a sentence because his solicitor could not make out a case for him.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not analogous at all. If you want an analogy with a conviction in a criminal court, it is this: it is just as damning as a Crown prosecutor concealing from the jury facts that would entitle that particular accused person to be acquitted. Any Crown prosecutor who would do that—and I do not think there is one in Queensland who would—should be behind iron bars and certainly should not be wearing a wig.

There is one other disquieting aspect of the industrial world at the moment, namely, the regular claims made by Mr. Jack Egerton, the president of the Trades and Labour Council. I consider one of them to be a very serious allegation to make, because it too strikes at the heart and the root of our industrial arbitration system. He has published this question to the Premier—

"Is he (the Premier) aware that the Industrial Commission has made statements on at least three occasions that it would be futile for the metal trades unions to apply to the Court for an increase, and dishonest to advise them otherwise unless they first had been able to reach agreement with the employers?"

There again I readily concede that that is a most serious allegation to make. If that allegation is true I say unhesitatingly, even though I am a barrister and practising in various courts, that the Industrial Commission has "had it". It spells finale to any respect that a fair-minded man could have for it.

I did not come to any conclusion on that statement. I directed a question this morning to the Premier in which I asked if these allegations made by Mr. Jack Egerton, President of the Trades and Labour Council, were true, and, in particular was that statement true. I did that because, as a lawyer, parliamentarian, and a man who likes to respect constitutional and valid authority, I was definitely anxious about the truth or otherwise of it as, if true, I considered it was a shocking thing for the Commission to determine.

I have never yet known the Premier to answer that question. As a responsible member of the Opposition, I consider that I have not only the right but the bounden obligation to ask the Premier if he was prepared to answer that question because, in my opinion, if the allegation is true it must shatter the faith of any Government in the Industrial Commission. It certainly must shatter the faith of any lawyer in it, and I certainly would not blame advocates and trade unions generally for completely losing respect for it and faith in it. It is imperative that the whole matter be clarified and ironed out.

I asked the question this morning, and I have already been told that it has been removed from the Business Sheet and will not be answered. I think that that is damnable. I asked the question with more motives than one. I was not trying to embarrass any individual. If Parliamentary democracy is to be preserved and respect retained for the Industrial Commission, statements such as this have to be clarified. When the Government runs away from such situations and the Premier is afraid to answer questions, the only conclusion to which I can come is that Jack Egerton is right and other action is justified if the Government will not attend to the matter by democratic means.

As a Parliamentary representative of a Queensland electorate, I am entitled to demand answers to questions of this nature for the preservation of Parliamentary democracy and retention of respect for the Industrial Commission. If the Premier runs away from them, I can conclude only that Egerton is completely right. If he cannot get any satisfaction from the Commission, and the Premier refuses to answer questions and runs away—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order! I remind the hon. member for South Brisbane that matters in relation to questions are handled not by the Premier

but by Mr. Speaker. That is his prerogative. I ask the hon. member to direct any questions that he may have on this subject to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BENNETT: I accept your ruling, Mr. Hodges. I have, however, been knocking round the world long enough to know that there are more ways of killing a cat than choking it with butter. I am not foolish enough to believe that these matters are not discussed in high circles. This is a matter of high policy. Although I agree that Mr. Speaker has the final decision in such a matter, I flatly refuse to believe that he would come to any final determination without discussing it with his leader. I know what Parliamentary politics are.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order!

Mr. BENNETT: I would not come to any serious decision, either, without discussing it with my leader. I believe that anyone who did would be disloyal to his party. Hon. members can take it in whichever way they like.

I consider that here are two very serious matters concerning Parliament, and I, as a constitutional lawyer, feel great anxiety about the position in regard to each of them. I feel that the Government runs away from too many situations that call for strong and positive attention.

Mr. Windsor: Like you did from the National Hotel inquiry.

Mr. BENNETT: From the interjection of the hon. member for Ithaca, it would appear that he has just arrived from there himself.

Let me deal now with the Financial Statement. I believe, as my Leader said earlier, that this particular period in Australia, and indeed in many countries of the world, is one of affluence. It has been a time when, through no fault of the Government—no credit is due to it—but through sheer coincidence, sufficient funds have been available to enable the carrying out of many Governmental works. We must not forget that most of the money spent by the State Government has been supplied by the Commonwealth Government, and that its taxation is at a very high level. In fact, it is taxing pensioners and others with exorbitant telephone charges to obtain funds, and it is portion of those funds that is being supplied to this Government.

I might mention, too—I will give the figures in due course if I have sufficient time—that in the limited field of taxation in which the Government of Queensland is empowered to levy charges, charges have reached a record level and some of them are of almost astronomical proportions.

However, in the financial year 1964-65 charges under the State Transport Act are to be reduced and takings this year are expected to be £104,978 less than they were last year. This comes as something of a surprise to me. I concede that there is a place in Queensland, and, for that matter, in every State in Australia, for road hauliers. They have a duty to perform, as also have the State railways. However, when there is a conflict of interests between the railways and the road hauliers, I come down heavily on the side of the railways. I believe that they are more important to the development of the State for many reasons, financial and otherwise, and their interests should be safeguarded where a conflict of interests occurs. In spite of the fact that branch railway lines have been closed—quite a number of them have been closed—which necessarily means, of course, more available business for road hauliers, the revenue from charges on road hauliers is to be less. As I said before, under the Act, the fairly large sum of £104,978 less will be received this year, which seems to mean that the Government is leaning heavily in favour of road hauliers. No doubt they have a direct voice in this Government, and that may be the reason.

Mr. Hiley: Before you leave that, have you forgotten that last year we had six months' air tax? It was cut out in December, and there is none this year. Apart from that, we had some High Court judgments under which we recovered sums of money from the road hauliers. We cannot get them again this year.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, but the very valuable Brisbane to Southport run will be taken over completely by the road hauliers.

Mr. Hiley: And they will be free of tax.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the very point I am making—they will be free of tax. In other words, in my opinion they are receiving preferential treatment.

Mr. Chinchin: Would you like the people's fares to Southport to go up?

Mr. Sherrington: They have not come down.

Mr. Chinchin: My word they have, and you know they have.

Mr. BENNETT: The argument put forward by the hon. member for Mount Gravatt about fares going up is a complete non sequitur. If he really wants to know what I want, I want the line reopened.

Mr. Windsor: Would you use it?

Mr. BENNETT: I look after the interests of the people of West End, and I usually spend most of my time with them. I do not

laze around the South Coast beaches with girls in bikinis, as the Minister for Labour and Industry does.

I believe that much provocative action has been taken against railwaymen and, in spite of what has been said about them in this Chamber and in other places, I believe that there is a great deal of justice and merit in their case. If I can get down to one personal case of an individual railwayman who worked all his life in the Railway Department, with his superannuation, long-service leave payment, etc., he bought a small home from the Railway Department on one of the branch lines, believing he could live his days in retirement, peaceful and happy. But what has happened? After they took what in effect was all his superannuation money from him, to sell him this home which was Railway property, they closed the branch line and left him marooned and stranded. He cannot sell the house; he has no transport. They used that old railwayman to offload a house that is no longer any use to him and they will not buy it back. He cannot live in it. When that information gets around railwaymen generally it does not boost their morale.

Mr. Hanlon: They talk about a Bill of Rights.

Mr. BENNETT: That is so, they talk about a Bill of Rights.

I do not propose at this stage to enter into any real controversy about the liquor trade because as yet we do not know what the proposed amendments, if any, will be. It seems that the Government has postponed any action till March next year, if we can accept what we read as correct.

Mr. Windsor: How do they know what we are going to do?

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Ithaca does not take me into his confidence as to how they propose to deal with the liquor problem and I make only one observation about the liquor interests. Of course, I am not empowered to express my party's point of view because we do not know what our point of view will be until we know what the Government's proposals are. But I do say this by way of observation: the Police Department and the Police Commissioner made this State look absolutely ridiculous during perhaps our greatest week of the year, Exhibition Week, and the festivities associated therewith, by saying, "You can sit in a hall and drink all night but you cannot dance, or you can dance all night in the hall but you cannot drink."

This Act has been in operation for a fair number of years without being severely administered, and by taking this action at the time they did, they made us the laughing stock of the Commonwealth. I do not know whether the Commissioner was trying to embarrass the Government, or the people, or

whether the Government directed him to do what he did in order to embarrass country members during Exhibition Week. Whatever the reason, it was a complete farce.

I have read the speeches of the Treasurer—Mr. Hiley as he then was in Opposition—those of the Premier and those of Mr. Munro, as he then was, as the hon. member for Toowong when he was in Opposition, and they were horrified by the Liquor Acts that then applied and were completely opposed to any relaxation in the liquor laws. In fact, one would almost believe that they were all temperance men, to read their speeches when in Opposition.

All the morals that motivated them when in Opposition have been completely jettisoned since they became the Government and I would think that has only been done because of the money involved for the Government.

Last year they took in from liquor interests £1,742,802 and this year they propose to take an amount of £126,264 more. Obviously it will be taken from the worker who likes his glass of beer. I feel that their arguments in this regard are not motivated by the standards of drinking but by the amount of money that can be won by the Government through a relaxation of the liquor laws.

Time will not permit me at this stage to refer to their speeches on betting or to deal with some of the iniquities that occur in T.A.B. shops, particularly those across the road from hotels, but this year the Government proposes to take £1,363,000 in betting tax. The morals involved are being completely ignored or sidestepped in the interest of winning further funds for the Government.

I notice that District Court judges' salaries are to remain static at £30,000, at which figure they have stood for the last two years. It is not without significance that the Vote for the Supreme Court judges' salaries has been increased from £81,352 to an anticipated amount this year of £90,200, in fact an increase of £8,848. It makes one wonder whether it is proposed to increase the judicial strength of our Supreme Court by two Supreme Court judges, one of whom obviously must be Arnold Bennett. He has done a good job for the Government and he will rank in the same category as Percy Wright who, after doing the electoral boundary redistribution, was rewarded by being appointed to the Land Court.

I notice another important Vote, although it is not important in the amount—indeed, it is rather insignificant. I refer to the Civil Defence Vote which, incidentally, was underspent last financial year by £1,796.

Mr. Dean interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: As the hon. member for Sandgate says, that is very serious. When arguing in industrial circles, when attempting to create fear in the community and to raise irritation in Queenslanders generally, this Government and its Federal colleagues frighten people by making suggestions about what might happen as a result of attacks from the near North. That anticipation is not without some real foundation but the insincerity of the Government's argument and the hypocrisy of its attitude is clearly voiced in the cold hard Budget itself.

Either this Government does not believe what it says about the dangers from attacks of those embracing foreign ideologies or, alternatively, if the Government does believe what it says it is completely recreant to the trust imposed in it because it is doing nothing about civil defence to protect the lives and safety of the men, women, and children of this State. It spent £5,977 on civil defence last financial year, underspending by £1,796. The Vote last year was £7,773 but even less is allocated this year, namely, £7,321.

I refer now to the Licensing Commission which costs the State some £45,000 to operate each year. I was rather amused at a somewhat anomalous decision of the Licensing Commission early this year, not so many months ago. The Ulster hotel was charged under a particular section of the Liquor Act, convicted and penalised to the extent of having to close down for a couple of days. An ordinary licensee or publican at El Arish was convicted for selling liquor to a person under the age of 21. He would not have had more than one, two or three convictions for this offence. It was clearly established that he did not have a personal knowledge of the particular sale, but as the licensee and publican he was responsible.

There was some suggestion, but it was not proved because he was not convicted, of his having attempted or threatened to assault some other person. But that assault could not be taken into consideration because he was not convicted for it. His convictions were for comparatively trivial offences of having sold liquor to a person under the age of 21, which was done without his specific knowledge. Hotel-keeping was his occupation and the Licensing Commission refused to grant him a licence, thereby depriving him of the opportunity for life of earning his own livelihood. In relation to the National Hotel, the Government-appointed judge, Mr. Justice Gibbs, found conclusively that the National Hotel had committed many breaches of the Liquor Act and although the hotel management may have been warned they were not penalised.

Earlier this session I was interested to hear the claim by the hon. member for Windsor that he is making great progress with his committee on legal aid for the poor—to help

those who need assistance in litigation. I notice that he has not made many practical advances because the fees last year for legal aid appear at £25,000, and they are the same for this year.

There is a Vote for the Police Department which requires some explanation. The sum of £205,868 has been set aside to replace existing police vehicles for one year. That is hard to understand when, as I understand it, there is a reduction in the price when vehicles are purchased by the department. The department does not pay the same price as the normal customer, and surely there must be some trade-in value for vehicles that are replaced.

The Budget also shows that in the last financial year the Government received £5,337,603 in excess of the estimated revenue. There is some explanation for part of that figure but surely the Treasurer should not be so far out in his Estimates. He should not have to admit at the end of the financial year that he received nearly £5,500,000 in excess of the Estimates. One almost wonders whether he knew of it and concealed the fact, or whether he just did not know where he was getting his funds from.

I referred earlier to the closure of railway lines. The Budget shows that the total capital cost of closed lines last year was £1,148,164. That is virtually for assets completely lost to the people of Queensland; it represents over £1,000,000 of assets virtually ploughed into the ground. Most of them will not be profitably used again because of the activities of the Government. The line is taken up, and buildings and ballast associated with it are virtually abandoned. That £1,000,000 represents one year's closure of 289 miles of road.

The increase in revenue from State sources—that is virtually from taxation of this Government and otherwise—amounts to quite a large sum of money. The Government has been “skiting” about the wonderful financial picture painted in the Budget, but the people are certainly providing the funds that appear in the Budget. I point out that the Commonwealth Government reimburses the State Government from the record taxes extracted and, from our own sources of revenue over the year, there was an increase in revenue of £7,456,518 over the previous year. While the Government has only a limited field of taxation, by jove it exploits it to the extreme. It does its best. I would hate to think what the Treasurer would do if he had complete powers of taxation, because with his hands tied behind his back, and using the opportunities and possibilities he has available to him, he has increased taxation in the last year by some £2,189,597. I do not know whether he ought to expand his chest and say with complacency and satisfaction that his has been a great record of Treasurership.

My friend and colleague, the hon. member for Norman has already dealt with hospitals during the course of this session. Again in a typical fashion this Government attacked him personally in an endeavour to bludgeon him with their weight of numbers, and influence and power, being in the Government benches, because he had the temerity and audacity to relate to the Government certain complaints that he had received in relation to hospital administration.

First of all, he had an obligation to do so. Secondly, it was manifestly obvious that many of the contentions—and I can only speak in relation to some, because I haven't knowledge of all—were quite correct and should have been dealt with promptly by this Government, and the appropriate Minister. In typical fashion the substance of the allegations was side-tracked, and an endeavour was made to scorch him by ridiculing him personally, and dealing with matters relating to him personally.

What do we see today? We see that an independent committee from the South has justified the arguments of the hon. member for Norman. That committee has completely exposed this Government. The Minister said that nothing should be done, and that he did not propose to have any investigation into the hospital system, because everything was 100 per cent. But this investigating committee—

Mr. Tooth: The Minister said nothing of the sort at any time.

Mr. BENNETT: I cannot read the Minister's whole speech.

Mr. Tooth: The hon. member for Norman has not yet produced any of the evidence he said he had. I have yet to receive it.

Mr. Bromley: I did, in the room there.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order!

Mr. BENNETT: I am dealing with tangible evidence. I know that the hon. member for Norman has real evidence.

Mr. Tooth: Let him produce it.

Mr. BENNETT: I know what the Minister and the Government would do. They would like Tony Murphy to go out and investigate it, and give the hon. member for Norman a rubbing in the Press, and try to intimidate him, and also make out a story about these people. We know what the Government does. The hon. member for Norman knows the attitude of this Government.

But we have an independent committee, not invited officially by any member of the Labour Party, a non-political independent

body of technical experts, trained and qualified chemists, who have come here and said that our hospitals, in relation to their particular department, are shocking. They said that they spent 20 minutes at Goodna, which was 19½ minutes too long. The speaker used a polite term, but what he meant was that the chemistry shop there stank, and that they were glad to get out into the fresh air. What is the Minister going to do about that? What will the Minister do about the findings of these qualified men? No doubt he will come out in a day or so—perhaps not until after the week-end, to make it a decent length of time so it cannot be said he is rushing in in indecent haste—and tell us that appropriate investigators of his have investigated these allegations, and found that they are completely untrue. That will be his answer. I can anticipate it. He might as well not investigate it, because it would be a waste of time. I can give him right now the report he will produce to this Parliament.

Mr. Hanlon: He will do a Westbrook on it.

Mr. BENNETT: He will do a Westbrook on it. Of course he will.

Mr. Tooth: I am still waiting for evidence from Mr. Bromley. I asked him to produce evidence to me and he has not done so.

Mr. Bromley: I produced it when we were in the room there.

Mr. Tooth: You did not produce one scintilla of evidence.

Mr. BENNETT: The spokesman for this committee, which examined and inspected these hospitals, said in effect that it was dangerous, and that somebody would be poisoned before long. Will the Minister institute an investigation into the hospitals only after somebody is killed as a result of the inefficiency of pharmacists in hospitals throughout Queensland? I have noticed that public hospital patients' fees have increased in the last four years from £2,087,578 to £3,125,086. There is an increase of £1,037,508 in fees in four years. The Treasurer is an expert in mulcting money from the public of Queensland, even allowing for the fact that, because of uniform taxation, his hands are considerably tied.

He has not told us about the Public Debt, which has now reached the staggering sum of £410,734,685, representing an increase of nearly £26,000,000 in one year. What is the Government doing? It is plunging the State almost into bankruptcy with an increase of this magnitude in the Public Debt in one year of office.

I was chided by the Treasurer over the fact that the National Hotel Royal Commission cost £13,428. Actually it cost £2,091, the difference representing legal fees that the Government did not have to pay. An amount of £6,297 went to Arnold Bennett and his junior, Lindsay Byth. Knowing Arnold Bennett as I do, he would have received the greater proportion of that sum. The Government put on a feast for their pet lawyers. The actual cost of the commission itself, without legal fees payable to favourite barristers, who are all to be judges, was £2,091.

Mr. Hanlon: It looks as though Arnold Bennett got more than the Commissioner.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course he did, although Arnold Bennett did more for the Government. He carried out his duties well. If there were a place in the Olympic Games team for the man best able to carry out political skulduggery for the Government, Arnold Bennett would be our No. 1 athlete.

The Government has introduced in the last 12 months a system of joint trials. This is working very unsatisfactorily. Because of this legislation, and on the insistence of the Crown Prosecutor operating under its provisions, two men went on trial before a jury the other day, one being charged with common assault and the other with deliberate rape. Is it fair to have a man charged with common assault associated with one charged with deliberate rape? Bearing in mind how juries can be inflamed by rape charges, the man on the lesser charge could well have been convicted also.

(Time expired.)

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 10.59 p.m.