

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 1964**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

*Answer:—*

"The Honourable Member might address his Question to my colleague, the Treasurer, within whose administration the Fisheries Department comes."

ADVERTISING OF STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION LOANS.—Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Industrial Development,—

(1) What is the name of the advertising firm which arranges the advertisements in connection with State Electricity Commission loans?

(2) Has this firm always done the advertising?

(3) How much money was allocated to this firm for Loan No. 35?

(4) How much money has been allocated for advertising in (a) press (b) radio and (c) television for each Commission loan since 1957?

(5) What percentage does the agent receive per loan and what amount of money is paid by the Commission to the agents for advertising each loan?

(6) Have loans since 1957 all been filled? If not, what are the figures concerning them?

*Answers:—*

I am advised by the Commissioner for Electricity Supply on these matters as follows:—

(1) "Le Grand Advertising Pty. Ltd."

(2) "Yes, beginning in April, 1952, when the Commission made its first public issue."

(3) "A provision of £30,000 was budgetted for, to cover all costs of Queensland and interstate advertising including press, radio, television, screen slides, posters, agents' fees, and other miscellaneous advertising expenditure to support Public Loan No. 35 for a total raising of £2,250,000."

(4) "In view of the amount of detail required the information has been included in a document entitled 'Statement of Press, Radio, and Television advertising costs for each State Electricity Commission Loan since 1957—Statement No. 1' which I lay on the Table of the House."

(5) "The agency's percentage varies according to the media used. In the main media this varies between 10 per cent. and 12½ per cent. These percentages are standard to all accredited advertising agencies, and are not a cost to the Commission. In general the agency charges the Commission

## TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER, 1964

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

### QUESTIONS

GERIATRIC WARD, TOWNSVILLE GENERAL HOSPITAL.—Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

Has any finality been reached with regard to the replacement of the present obsolescent and inadequate geriatric ward at the Townsville General Hospital with a modern building capable of accommodating all patients who require admission and, if so, will he give relevant details?

*Answer:—*

"The Townsville Hospitals Board has a number of projects for extensions to the Hospital services in Townsville which will cost in the vicinity of £700,000. These projects, which include the proposal for a new geriatric ward, are at present being re-considered. Previous planning in relation to these projects is required to be reviewed in the light of Commonwealth legislation, but it is hoped finality will be reached at an early date."

SARDINE CANNERY AND FISHING INDUSTRY, TORRES STRAIT ISLANDS.—Mr. Walsh for Mr. Adair, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

Owing to the urgent necessity for the development of industries in the Islands of the Torres Strait, will he have responsible officers of the Fisheries Department visit the Islands with a view to ascertaining the possibility of establishing a sardine cannery and fishing industry in the area?

a service fee of 2½ per cent., 5 per cent. or 7½ per cent. whichever is relevant to ensure that its remuneration conforms with the minimum specified by the Australian Association of Advertising Agencies. In certain media no service fee is charged having regard to the rate of commission received from the media. These arrangements have been in force since April, 1952, when the Commission issued its first Public Loan. The amount of money actually paid by the Commission to the advertising agent

varies from loan to loan according to the media used, and the amount of advertising for which financial provision is made. The amount of advertising undertaken for any loan and the media used is subject to Commission direction and approval, and depends principally upon the size of a particular loan, the state of the loan market at the time, and the progress of the loan from day to day. Payment of service fees to the agent for the past six loans have been as follows:—

Year and Loan No.		Fees Paid	Amount of Loan
		£ s. d.	£
1962-63—			
Public Loan No. 29	.. .. .	1,237 16 9	3,065,000
Public Loan No. 30	.. .. .	875 16 3	1,500,000
		£2,113 13 0	£4,565,000
1963-64—			
Public Loan No. 31	.. .. .	1,037 15 4	4,575,000
Public Loan No. 32 (conversion only)	.. .. .	Nil	416,500
Public Loan No. 33 (conversion only)	.. .. .	Nil	368,000
		£1,037 15 4	£5,359,500
1964-65—			
Public Loan No. 34	.. .. .	£1,331 0 10	£2,750,000

(6) "A total of 7 out of 19 Public Loans raised by the Commission since 1957 have been filled by public subscription. The total face value of public issues made since that date amounts to £28,974,500 by way of cash and conversion loans, and the total value of direct subscriptions from the public amounts to £22,461,950, an average public subscription of 77·5 per cent. With the addition of Public Loan No. 35 which has just closed the total face value of loans raised by the Commission since 1957 becomes £31,224,500. The details requested are included in a document entitled 'The State Electricity Commission of Queensland Public Loan Raisings, 1957-1964—Statement No. 2' which I lay on the Table of the House."

*Papers.*—Whereupon Mr. Munro laid upon the Table of the House the Documents referred to.

**GROUP TENDERS, HOUSING COMMISSION HOUSES.**—Mr. Sherrington, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

Has a decision been made not to let further group tenders as far as Housing Commission homes are concerned? If so, does this indicate a slowing-up in the provision of homes throughout the State and particularly in the metropolitan area, so that the supply of houses on account of the Comalco refinery, Gladstone, may be concentrated upon?

*Answer:*—

"No. In addition to completing 1,876 houses in 1963-1964 as against 1,798 in 1962-1963, the Housing Commission at June 30, 1964, had let contracts for a further 1,131 houses as against a comparable figure of 1,023 houses at June 30,

1963. The most recent closing of group tenders was on 13th instant for 100 houses at Mount Isa and the tenders received are now under consideration."

**CRITICISM OF PUBLIC HOSPITAL PHARMACIES.**—Mr. Herbert, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

Will he detail the background to the criticism levelled by visiting chemists from Victoria against the public hospitals in Queensland and advise the House regarding the enquiries he has initiated?

*Answer:*—

"On October 9 the Federal Conference of the Society of Hospital Pharmaceutical Chemists of Australia assembled in Brisbane. They were provided with accommodation for their meeting at one of our hospitals, the Princess Alexandra Hospital, and were assisted by the Department in other ways including granting of special leave with pay to enable hospital employees to attend. At the conclusion of the conference visiting chemists from Victoria, Messrs. F. J. Boyd and S. W. Hayes took part in a tour of a number of our hospitals. They then launched an attack on the pharmaceutical services in Queensland hospitals. This onslaught, which appears to have a rather complex background, was in part an attack on our free hospital system and in particular on our system of centralised control and bulk buying of pharmaceutical needs for our hospitals. This practice, which is unique in Australia, saves the public purse a sum greatly in excess of £100,000 annually. It is, however, viewed with disfavour by some members of the Society of Hospital Pharmacists and by

some large wholesale druggist organisations. In the context of this situation I feel I should relate to the House the circumstances surrounding my presence at a dinner at Lennon's Hotel at the beginning of the Society's conference. This function was represented to me as a social gathering at which my presence as Health Minister would be welcome. At some personal inconvenience I attended the dinner and was more than a little disconcerted to have to listen to an attack by Mr. Boyd on Queensland's health policy including our free hospital system. I was prepared to accept this incredible piece of rudeness as a personal lapse on Mr. Boyd's part, and to disregard it, but was seriously embarrassed to be told later in the evening that the entire cost of the function was being met by one of the big international drug houses, and to discover that I was, in effect, their guest rather than the Society's. Let me say here that the limited contacts I have had with this firm's representatives have always been very cordial, but I think it most improper that any person bearing public responsibilities should be placed in the position of receiving hospitality from a large commercial organisation without being made aware of it. I have since had further advice that transport for our southern visitors in their tour of our hospitals was provided by another large firm of wholesale druggists. A second factor in this situation is the desire to have more positions and bigger and better positions for pharmaceutical chemists in Queensland hospitals. This desire is understandable but it is the duty of the Department to hold the scales evenly between the ambitions of the hospital chemists on the one hand and public interest on the other. It would be unnecessary to employ a pharmacist at every hospital in Queensland, as in many, the amount of work would not warrant it. In these cases any necessary dispensing is done by a sister under the supervision of the doctor. Some of the members of the Society of Hospital Pharmaceutical Chemists are opposed to this arrangement and seek a much wider extension of the pharmacy services than is warranted or could be sustained by the public purse. The position seems to be further complicated by the fact that some of our hospital pharmacists are not members of Mr. Boyd's Society and attempts are being made to enroll them and act as their spokesmen. This is resisted by a number and it would seem that part of the reason for the tour of the hospitals was to try to enlist or dragoon recalcitrant chemists into membership. This may explain the apparent contradiction in Mr. Boyd's behaviour in that, whilst proclaiming his concern for the welfare of our chemists, he has made public allegations which reflect seriously on the professional competence and integrity of some of them; and unfortunately has been supported in this by the Honourable Member for South Brisbane, Mr. Bennett.

I am happy to inform the House that my officers, after investigation, have assured me that the allegations against our pharmacists are unfounded. In this connection it is of interest to record that in June last, I received a letter from an industrial union which made the following points: 1. An objection had been lodged with them by hospital chemists against Mr. Boyd's organisation. 2. Mr. Boyd's organisation does not speak on behalf of hospital chemists generally. 3. That I as Minister should refuse any representation from them in regard to industrial matters. Honourable Members will, I am sure, appreciate my reluctance to become involved in what appears to be the beginning of a demarcation dispute between an industrial union and the Society of Hospital Pharmaceutical Chemists. I have therefore exercised some caution in conferring with either body. I do however reserve the right to consult with the Society on professional matters whenever the occasion warrants. It will be of interest to the House to know that I received yesterday a long letter from the Queensland Branch of the Society which in effect repudiates the behaviour of their Federal President, Mr. F. J. Boyd. After recording that there had been a pre-conference agreement that no statement should be released without the joint permission of the Federal President, Mr. Boyd and the Queensland Chairman, Mr. J. Wrench, the letter goes on to say, 'Mr. Wrench received little co-operation from Mr. Boyd in this matter, the latter person apparently believing that, as Federal President, he could make his own rules while visiting Queensland. It must be pointed out that the statements released after the conference by several Victorian members were not made with the approval or even the knowledge of the Queensland Committee'. As requested by the Honourable Member for Sherwood I have endeavoured to set out the background of the activities of our visitors from the deep south. Notwithstanding the fervent support they received from the Honourable Member for South Brisbane"—

**Mr. BENNETT:** I rise to a point of order.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member will not interrupt during question time.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. BENNETT:** It is not very nice to be attacked like this by a Minister in a privileged statement.

*Answer continued:—*

"I think it is fair to state that their motives are suspect, their manners are deplorable and their contribution to the solution of any difficulties we may have is worthless. I am happy to say we are receiving far greater help from the Queensland members of the Society who recently sent me a lengthy

memorandum which I hope to discuss with them some time before the end of this Parliamentary session."

**EXPERIMENTAL PLOT, GILBERT RIVER.**—Mr. Davies for Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Primary Industries,—

In view of the decision to have experimental plots established in irrigation areas and the fact that plans were previously made to have such a plot established at a Gilbert River property, will he consider the establishment of this experimental area at the previously proposed site?

*Answer:*—

"The position has not altered materially since this Question was raised in March, Staff available in North Queensland is fully engaged on existing research and experimental stations and in extension work. Funds are not available to permit of the establishment of additional stations. Experimental plots which are located on farmers' properties are under the control of research or extension officers stationed at various centres. These centres are naturally in the more closely settled districts, where the greatest number of primary producers can obtain the benefit of the officers' services. This applies more particularly in areas where irrigation is available. A limited number of staff coupled with transport difficulties make it impossible to give the detailed service I would like to see in many

of the more remote areas. However, as staff and facilities have become available pasture experimental plots have been established in parts of the Gulf country, for example on Abingdon. My Department is investigating the possibility of making wider use of aerial transport in order to improve its services. When opportunity permits consideration will be given to the establishment of experimental plots on suitable sites on the Gilbert River. I must point out though, that it will be unlikely that such plots will be serviced as closely as they would be in areas where transport difficulties do not exist."

**REPLACEMENT OF STEAM LOCOMOTIVES WITH DIESEL-ELECTRIC LOCOMOTIVES.**—Mr. Ramsden, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

(1) At what rate of replacement will diesel-electric engines replace coal-burning engines?

(2) What proportion of these engines will be allocated to the metropolitan area to assist in reducing the smog problem emanating from Mayne and Woolloongabba railway yards?

(3) What is the earliest date it is anticipated the last of the coal-burning engines will be replaced economically?

*Answer:*—

(1, 2 and 3) "A comparison of the steam and diesel-electric locomotive position as at August 12, 1957, and October 19, 1964, is as follows:—

	12th August, 1957	19th October, 1964	Reduction
Steam locomotives on books .. .. .	793	660	133
			Increase
Diesel-electric locomotives on books .. .. .	44	116	72
On order .. .. .	19	25	..
	63	141	78

"The diesel-electric locomotives are being allocated for the operation of trains where their greater hauling power will return to the Department the greatest economy. However, as the numbers increase, there will be greater assignment to the metropolitan area, and I repeat my forecast made in July 1963, that—with the exception of a few country lines which present some difficulty on account of bridge structures—the Queensland Railways will be dieselised by the end of 1968."

**SEPTIC SYSTEMS, MAIDAVALE AND RITA ISLAND STATE SCHOOLS.**—Mr. Coburn, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

As there are no public sanitary services available in the Maidavale and Rita Island areas and as it is well-nigh impossible to ensure satisfactory hygiene at the schools

there under existing conditions, will he approve, as soon as is practicable, the installation of septic systems at the Maidavale and the Rita Island State Schools?

*Answer:*—

"Every endeavour is being made to have septic systems installed in schools as soon as possible according to the degree of urgency in the particular case. Each case is considered in the light of the condition of the existing toilet facilities, the location (e.g. areas of intense fly infestation), the availability of an adequate and suitable water supply, the suitability of the soil for disposal of effluent and the number of children involved. The installation of septic systems at Maidavale and Rita Island State Schools will receive consideration in accordance with this policy and in relation to available funds."

REVENUE FROM STORAGE OF BARLEY ON RAILWAY PROPERTY.—Mr. Davies for Mr. Thackeray, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

What is the revenue received by the Railway Department for the 80,000 bags of barley of this season's crop stored in sheds and dumps on railway property between Allora, Clifton, Nobby and Cambooya?

*Answer:—*

"I would refer the Honourable Member to my Answer of August 27, 1964, to his Question of the previous day."

QUEENSLAND POLICEWOMEN.—Mr. Dean, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

(1) How many policewomen are on the staff of the Queensland Police Force?

(2) What qualifications are required of women for entry into this service?

(3) Are they sworn in the same manner as male applicants?

(4) Are they trained in (a) the use of firearms and (b) the making of arrests under difficult circumstances?

(5) What duties do they perform?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Eight."

(2) "Applicants should be between the ages of 25 and 35 years, and of average appearance and good health. Applicants must be competent shorthand typists and must have had some experience in general business practice."

(3) "No."

(4) "(a) No. (b) As policewomen are not sworn in under the Police Acts, they have not the powers of arrest bestowed on a police officer."

(5) "The work generally deals with women and girls including the taking of statements concerning sex offences. I would add that I have always recognised the value of police work performed by policewomen, particularly in the field of child welfare. Consequently, upon the administration of the Police Department and the State Children Department coming under my portfolio, future activities of policewomen have been receiving active consideration, and I hope that a decision in this regard will be made in the near future."

#### PAPERS

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

Report of the State Government Insurance Office (Queensland) for the 1963-64, together with Schedules and Returns as at 30th June, 1964.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1964.

The Southern Electric Authority of Queensland Acts, 1952 to 1958.

#### FORM OF QUESTIONS

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's question does not appear to be in order. I will have a good look at it.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Questions are getting a little bit out of hand. It sounds as though the hon. member is prosecuting a quarrel.

#### PRIVILEGE

##### ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (11.30 a.m.): I feel it necessary on this occasion to rise to speak on a question of privilege, one that concerns particularly hon. members on this side of the House. On a previous occasion I commented on the fact that questions asked of Ministers are very closely scrutinised; in fact they are rather rigidly censored. If questions are out of order I agree that something should be done about them. At the same time, we have a set of Standing Orders covering this matter and under them Ministers are required to answer questions in the correct manner. Ministers must not debate matters contained in questions asked of them by hon. members on either side of the House. Under the Standing Orders as they exist it is rather difficult for any hon. member who feels he has a grievance with something contained in a Minister's statement, and the answer given this morning by the Minister for Health was in fact a ministerial statement—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have ruled in the past that to discuss answers to questions is highly irregular. There is a time and place for the discussion of questions. If at any time an hon. member wishes to discuss questions with me I am quite happy to do so. It is highly irregular to discuss a question in the Chamber.

I think the hon. member for Kedron has raised the point sufficiently. Standing Order No. 70 provides that in answering a question a member shall not debate the matter to which the question refers.

Mr. Aikens: Could not an offended member make a personal statement later on?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LLOYD: You have anticipated me, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member has previously raised this matter, and again I would say that his action is irregular. However, I am prepared to listen to what he has to say.

**Mr. LLOYD:** The matter could be raised by way of personal explanation by an hon. member who may feel himself aggrieved by a Minister's statement in reply to a question, but that would be rather difficult because under the present practice of the House the answers given by Ministers are not immediately available to the hon. member who may feel so aggrieved. In other words, hon. members must wait until after the answers to all the questions are given and before the ordinary business of the day commences before he can actually sight the answer given by the Minister. If an hon. member wishes to make a personal explanation on any matter or accusation contained in the reply to a question, or any motive imputed against him by a Minister in such reply, he should have the opportunity to study the answer to the question before the completion of question time. It is not possible to do this under the present practice.

I should like a little more disciplinary control or, should I say, I request that Ministers do not go into irrelevant detail in replying to questions.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member has been given quite a deal of latitude in being allowed to discuss answers to questions. I gave him that latitude because I wanted to bring it to the attention of hon. members that as the Standing Order provides that in answering a question a member shall not debate the matter to which the question refers, I think it evolves into a matter of what is a debate. A debate, according to my information anyway, is a dialogue between two persons. At least two persons must speak on any matter before it becomes a debate. We had two very lengthy answers to questions this morning. There was not one murmur when the Minister for Industrial Development gave a lengthy answer to the hon. member for Norman. The answer to the question under discussion was one of similar length. I think the answer given by the Minister for Health was one of great importance to the State. I consider he was quite within his rights in outlining the details at length.

**Government Members:** Hear, hear!

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) (11.35 a.m.), by leave: I thank hon. members for their indulgence. The answer given by the Minister for Health was in reply to an inspired question following a matter raised by me in the Budget debate last Thursday evening. I considered that any Minister concerned would have an opportunity to speak on the matter during the relevant debate. I raised the issue last Thursday

night because a matter of a serious nature, as you referred to it, Mr. Speaker, was raised in the columns of the daily Press—it was given prominent headlines on Thursday—concerning examinations and investigations carried out by what appeared to be reputable and outstanding pharmacists with high qualifications who were visiting this city. They were unknown to me personally; certainly their organisation or their sponsors were not known to me. I considered that, as their integrity was not doubted in any fashion known to me, their statements could be relied upon or, at least, they could be considered. Therefore, being the one who spoke in the Budget debate immediately after the publication of their claims and indictments against our hospital system, I considered it my bounden obligation as a Parliamentarian to raise the matter here so that it could be suitably dealt with.

**Mr. Walsh:** You do not necessarily support their views.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I do not necessarily support their views.

However, in relation to that matter, I do know that many of our pharmacies are undoubtedly understaffed.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member is making a speech. I think he has given sufficient reason for his raising this matter. He has been given sufficient time to make his personal explanation. He may not raise any matters for debate on this particular question.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I am not raising any matter for debate, but by way of personal explanation. May I make an observation on your ruling, in this fashion: I not only acted on the claims made by these people; I also considered it my obligation to do so because some of their claims corresponded with my personal experience. I merely wish to point that out. I believe that when such serious allegations are made it behoves the Minister concerned, and the Government, to suitably investigate all the allegations rather than engage in a personal attack on those who make them, or on those who regard it as their duty to raise the matter in Parliament.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! There will be no further debate. I am afraid that we cannot hear this personal explanation any further. The hon. member has explained his reason for raising the matter in the Chamber. I think that is sufficient.

**Mr. BENNETT:** With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I have just one final reason. I raised the matter because I knew that, following the publication of these serious allegations, there was public unrest and disquiet about the pharmacists and pharmacies in our hospitals throughout Queensland.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

MAIN ROADS ACTS AMENDMENT  
BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Evans, read a third time.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—  
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 16 October (see p. 833) 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. EWAN (Roma) (11.40 a.m.): On behalf of the people of the Roma electorate and on my own behalf I desire to place on record our sincere congratulations to the Treasurer on his presentation of the Financial Statement, covering as it does a concise and clear account of this Government's stewardship of the affairs of the State during the 1963-64 financial year, and the Budget proposals to be given effect to during the present financial year.

It presents a record of achievement, development, and progress in all avenues of human endeavour—not merely in words, but a verification of the visual knowledge of all who have travelled throughout the various districts of Queensland during the last few years—engendering pride and confidence in all sections of the people, and a desire to participate in the great work in all spheres.

What of the future? The Treasurer's words in the concluding paragraph of his Budget speech, in my opinion, should be shouted from the housetops. I make no apology for quoting them. They are—

"But the value of the development will endure. Great new industries and additions to the existing activity will shortly be adding their throbbing output to the economic life-blood of the community. The years of waiting and of planning are ending. The years of dramatic growth and expansion are now with us. They will present their peculiar problems but Queensland will enjoy their infinite rewards."

These words express the confidence so necessary for the continuance of Queensland's development and wellbeing, the confidence that the Government has worked so hard to establish since assuming office in 1957, the confidence that had ebbed away year by year until it ceased to exist during Labour's many tragic years in office, with a consequent lack of development and initiative.

With the return of confidence, the development of this State compares more than favourably with that of any other State in Australia. This is evidenced by the great activities in most districts and industries—roads, schools, hospitals, electricity, water, sewerage, housing, the bauxite at Weipa, the alumina factory at Gladstone, coal, oil, oil refineries, natural gas, Mount Isa, the copper refinery at Townsville, land settlement, the brigalow scheme, and beef roads, to name a comparative few.

As one travels through Queensland the improvements become apparent in many forms, and the transformation during the last seven years in many towns such as Mareeba, Biloela, Townsville, Mount Isa, Gladstone, all the sugar towns, Toowoomba, Warwick, and many western towns has to be seen to be believed. I suggest that members of the Opposition should travel about more in the inland areas so as to gain cognisance of the tremendous development which has taken place.

As an example, in 1957 my own home town of Roma had a population of 4,500, and there were 1,100 homes. Today, the population is 5,800, an increase of 30 per cent., and there are 1,380 homes, an increase of 25 per cent. in the last seven years. Of course, those figures are better than the average for the State but knowing me, that is understandable.

Having got hon. members in a good frame of mind, I should now like to place on record my appreciation of the Treasurer's efforts and my thanks to him for the invaluable advice and assistance he has given over a long period. He was instrumental in no small measure in placing the Roma meatworks on a workable and business-like footing. Following legislation introduced by him, this meatworks was taken over by A. W. Anderson Pty. Ltd. and is now functioning very successfully. I am informed that the plant is to be extended at an approximate cost of over £100,000 to enable the killing rate to be increased to about 500 head of cattle a day. We in Roma are proud of the work done by the Treasurer in this matter.

I now want to deal with something very important to the Roma electorate. Last August, in my speech during the Address-in-Reply debate, I dealt with the production of natural gas and the possibility of its commercial use. At that time I told hon. members that Australian Associated Oilfields Limited had proven reserves of gas of approximately 75 billion cubic feet, and 10,000,000 cubic feet of gas could be supplied daily from the reserves over a period of 20 years.

Since then, further exciting discoveries have been made. Proven reserves, it is claimed, have increased 125 billion cubic feet, which would provide a daily supply of 15,000,000 cubic feet of gas for 20 years, or 10,000,000 cubic feet of gas for 32 years, or could supply

the city of Brisbane, at the present consumption rate of 4,000,000 cubic feet of 1,000 British thermal units gas a day for over 80 years.

Further drilling is taking place, and it is reasonable to assume that these huge reserves will be materially increased in the immediate future. In fact, it is the intention of the company to drill an additional 100 wells during the next 12 months, at an estimated cost of over £2,000,000. Only yesterday we received the very pleasing news that Raslie No. 2 had come in on a basis of supply of 2,250,000 cubic feet of gas a day, and Pickanjinie No. 8 had come in on a basis of 6,400,000 cubic feet of gas. Those two wells alone have a production of 8,600,000 cubic feet of gas a day, thus materially increasing the reserves that I have already quoted. It must not be forgotten also that the Arcturus well, situated some 20 miles from Springsure, came in during the last couple of days, giving an output of 7,350,000 cubic feet of gas a day.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** You cannot claim credit for that; it is not in your electorate.

**Mr. EWAN:** I shall deal with the hon. member for Barcoo later.

On the first of this month it was my pleasure to accompany representatives of gas distributors from all over Australia on an inspection of the Roma gas and oil wells. Mr. Hume, general manager of the Brisbane Gas Co. Ltd., who is probably well known to many hon. members, said—

"It appears there is sufficient reserve of gas established in the Roma area to meet our needs for many years to come."

He estimated the present needs of the two Brisbane gas companies at about 5,000,000 cubic feet a day, but the balance of the possible outflow of 10,000,000 cubic feet daily might be absorbed by Brisbane industries. He stated that if a pipeline was constructed by the end of the year, conversion to natural gas for household use in Brisbane would be accomplished within 18 months.

Then let us see what Mr. R. Wagstaff, president of the Australian Gas Producers' Association and managing director of the South Australian Gas Company, Adelaide, said—I have pleasure in quoting his exact words—

"We have been excited and stimulated by what we have seen during our visit to Roma. My colleagues and I feel that Queensland is entering a period of major development. It is already recognised in the eastern States that Queensland is developing rapidly and we feel that the citizens of Queensland must be optimistic about their future. I believe this new source of fuel will induce overseas industries to come to Australia because of the advantages of cheap fuel: the implication of natural gas is that it is one of our biggest raw-material products."

Continuing, Mr. Wagstaff said that the potential use of natural gas in South Australia was on a vast scale and it was anticipated that by Christmas sufficient reserves of gas at Gidgealpa, South Australia, would be proved to prompt the laying of a pipeline 500 miles long to Adelaide during 1965–66 at an estimated cost of £20,000,000. When it was available his company would use natural gas exclusively, and he had strong reasons to believe that the South Australian Government would also use it as a fuel for its huge power stations, which would consume about 70,000,000 cubic feet of gas a day.

Of course, in this connection it would be well to remember that South Australia has very small natural coal supplies and imports most of its coal. To allay the fears of the hon. member for Ipswich East, I would suggest that, with our cheap mining, particularly by the open-cut method, there is a long life ahead of the coal-mining industry in Queensland and that it will not be affected materially by natural gas.

Mr. Wagstaff went on to say—

"The discoveries of natural gas in Australia are on such a vast scale that they must be exploited. When they are, I foresee that every capital city will, some time in the future, be using natural gas, as it will substantially reduce production costs."

**Mr. Bennett:** You will bring in some company from overseas to exploit them, all right.

**Mr. EWAN:** It is marvellous how some people rush in where angels fear to tread. I shall deal in a few moments with the interjection of the hon. member for South Brisbane.

It is indeed refreshing for me personally to quote these expressions of opinion. They fortify my hopes that every effort will be made to construct the 275-mile gas pipeline from Roma to Brisbane at an early date, at an estimated cost of between £4,000,000 and £5,000,000.

The Australian Associated Oilfields is an all-Australian company, with 90 per cent. of Australian capital subscribed by 30,000 shareholders, including 10,000 Queenslanders. That replies to the interjection of the hon. member for South Brisbane. The company has spent over £2,000,000 in the Roma area developing gas reserves since 1960. It is working towards the finalisation of plans for a pipeline, and it is determined to preserve at least 50 per cent. of equity in such pipeline. I am strongly convinced that we, as a Government, should endeavour to expedite our current investigations with the object of determining whether or not an approach should be made to the Commonwealth Government for assistance in exploiting our seemingly huge resources of natural gas, which must, provided continuity of supply is established, reasonably attract further industry to this State, as well as consolidate existing industry.

In view of the splendid record of the Australian Associated Oilfields company and its associates, I would strongly recommend that sympathetic consideration be given to an extension of time over existing prospecting areas when this matter comes up for determination. We appreciate that these prospecting areas are granted for a certain period and certain statutory requirements are imposed on the company. At the expiration of that time certain other action is taken with, perhaps, a reduction of the acreage or square mileage of the field involved. Because of the splendid record and the wonderful courage exhibited by this company, I should say that sympathetic consideration should definitely be given to it when this matter is being determined.

Coupled with the rapid expansion of industry in Queensland is the provision of electric light and power, and I should like to place on record our appreciation of the wonderful work performed by the State Electricity Commission under the Leadership of Mr. Neil Smith and his officers, together with associated reticulating bodies such as local supply authorities and shire councils.

At the present moment a new and modern powerhouse is being erected at Roma at an estimated cost of £500,000. It will be powered purely by natural gas. All going well, it will be in operation early in 1965 and will supply power and light needed by Roma, Wallumbilla, Yuleba, Surat and Mitchell, as well as many rural consumers adjacent to the existing power lines. It will be under the control of the Roma Town Council, whose engineer, Mr. Charles Shand, is worthy of commendation for his splendid work in so successfully adapting the existing machines in the Roma power Station to the use of natural gas.

Under agreement with the State Electricity Commission, the eastern end of the Roma electorate is served by the Dalby Town Council, which serves the towns of Miles, Drillham, Dulacca and Condamine, as well as numerous rural consumers.

In 1961 I had the pleasure of switching on the lights at Drillham and Dulacca. The capital cost of this extension was approximately £50,000. Last Saturday evening it was again my pleasure to switch on the lights at Condamine. This project serves 50 consumers in the town of Condamine as well as 100 rural consumers, at an estimated cost of £75,000. The towns of Taroom and Wandoan are to be supplied by the Capricornia Regional Board in the very near future. Many hundreds of such examples of the network of power reticulation can be cited throughout the State, bringing much-needed amenities to country people.

In covering the Budget, I think I should be remiss if I did not deal with education and say that on many occasions since 1957

I have placed on record my personal congratulations and expressions of the appreciation of the people whom I represent of the services rendered by Hon. Jack Pizzey, Minister for Education, his administrative staff, and teachers of the Department of Education. I do so again in the knowledge that they have introduced a new era in the important field of education.

During the last few weeks I have visited several schools in my electorate and my already high opinion of our educational standards, amenities and progress has been confirmed to such an extent that I marvel at the Opposition's futile attempts to criticise. They do not delude anyone but themselves. It is appalling to hear these attempts being made in this Chamber. It is a reflection on the intelligence of the average adult in this State.

In the field of secondary education one cannot fail to be impressed by the standards of the new buildings erected or in the course of erection all over the State, with amenities undreamed of a few years ago. An indication of how the young people are reacting to the Minister's control of higher education, and of the parental desire that their sons and daughters should take advantage of the opportunities to equip themselves adequately for the future, can be gained, to some extent, by the following facts: the first State high schools in Queensland were established in 1912. In 1952 there were 7,600 high-school students accommodated in 20 high schools and 19 secondary classes. In 1957, that well-remembered year when the Labour Government went out of office, there were 14,000 high-school students accommodated in 36 high schools with 34 secondary departments. In 1963, under this Government, there were 40,000 students—remember that there were 14,000 six years earlier—accommodated in 73 high schools—as against 36 high schools in 1957—and 56 secondary departments—against 34 under Labour. In 1964 there are 65,000 students accommodated in 87 high schools and 70 secondary departments. I have been supplied by the Department of Education with an estimate for 1965 which leads us to believe that in that year there will be 87,000 secondary students accommodated in 88 high schools and 72 high-school tops.

The extension of primary school transport services and the establishment of secondary school transport services—remember there were never any secondary school transport services under Labour—are playing a most important part in enabling country children to avail themselves of education. Let me cite the Wandoan school, of which I am very proud. It compares very favourably with any school in Queensland. There are 321 primary and 89 secondary students, making a total enrolment of 410. Today we have nine transport services conveying 230 primary pupils and 77 secondary students, or a total of 307, representing the transport of no less than 75 per cent. of the total

number of children attending that school. This may not be a record in Queensland but I believe it is. If anyone has better figures I should be delighted to hear them because I am intensely proud of the system prevailing at the schools in my electorate. The annual cost of providing transport to the Wandoan School alone amounts to £13,635. I know that there are similar services all over Queensland but if any hon. member has the same pride as I possess for the manner in which our children are being educated under this Government I ask him to become vocal.

The hon. member for Barcoo is very vocal this morning. Earlier in the debate we witnessed him making a complete ass of himself when he tried to gain political advantage over the proposed closure of the Roma-Injune railway branch line. Without even attempting to equip himself with facts he blithely stated that, as the hon. member for Roma, I was completely unconcerned and did nothing about the matter while my friends, the Graziers' Association, were howling to high heaven. Of course, the hon. member would be completely unaware that from 1944 to 1950, when I entered this Parliament, I had been president of the Maranoa Graziers' Association, and that on my resignation on entering Parliament life-membership was conferred upon me. So I really believe that I would be somewhat better equipped than the hon. member for Barcoo to know about the matters that are exercising the minds of graziers in general.

However, he gave us his version, and now it is my privilege to give mine.

Unlike the hon. member for Barcoo, I have been very concerned about the continuous annual decline in the economics of the Roma-Injune branch line since away back in 1958, particularly because of the strenuous efforts which were being made by the Minister for Transport to rehabilitate the Queensland Railways and place them on a sound business footing. The Roma-Injune branch line was completed in 1920 and consists of 62½ miles of track, representing at 30 June, 1963, a capital investment of £271,019. The loss in operating for the year 1963, excluding interest on capital, was £62,337—on a capital investment of £271,000! Three services to and from Injune a week are provided. The maximum gross train load hauled by a C17 engine is 235 tons.

**Mr. O'Donnell** interjected.

**Mr. EWAN:** If the hon. member listens he will gain some knowledge and thus equip himself to speak intelligently on the subject. For the 29 trains which ran during June and July 1963, excluding departmental loading—that is sleepers, ashes and the like—14 trains from Roma to Injune carried an average maximum payload of only 20 tons. The 15 trains from Injune to Roma carried only 32 tons each including live-stock.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** We know all these things.

**Mr. EWAN:** The hon. member does not know the figures or he would not have made such an ass of himself when he spoke on the subject. For the year ending 30 June 1963, 1,630 tons of goods were railed to Injune, a little more than five tons a day, excluding Sundays. The total quantity of goods outwards from Injune was 1,797 tons, or less than 6 tons a day.

From the foregoing facts it is obvious to any business man that the operations of this branch line had to be reviewed. I had a full and frank discussion with the Minister in September 1963. I doubt if the hon. member for Barcoo was even in Parliament then, although he may have been. Early in October 1963 I attended a meeting of Injune residents and, after I presented the relevant facts to them, the following resolution was carried unanimously—

“That it is the considered opinion of those present that because of the uneconomic position and the apparent inability of sufficient patronage being procured in the future to keep the line open, it is felt that provided, in accordance with Government policy, a suitable all-weather road from Roma to Injune is constructed, no objection will be advanced against the closure of the Roma-Injune branch line.”

Later, in October 1963 I placed the whole matter before the Minister for Main Roads. Further roadworks were immediately undertaken and a programme was laid down to provide for an all-weather bitumen road connecting Roma with Injune to be completed by 1968.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** Last year I thought it was to be 1965.

**Mr. EWAN:** There he comes in again; the uninformed always rush in where angels fear to tread.

This does not necessarily mean that the road will not be reasonably trafficable before 1968, despite what the pessimists and Jeremiahs, like the hon. member for Barcoo, may say. Further, I have been in full consultation with the Bungil Shire Council concerning the Injune Road and access roads to serve the people at present served by the railway line, which is situated some miles from the new road, and steps are being taken to extend or divert the existing road mail and goods services, in conjunction with the Postal Department, so as to cause as little disruption as possible when the rail service is discontinued.

I have introduced deputations to the Minister, including one from the Graziers' Association, and I have quite a big file of correspondence on the matter. I have attended meetings of interested parties and I feel that, despite what the hon. member for Barcoo may say, most people concerned are fully informed on the matter. Perhaps it may be appropriate at this juncture to say that the whole matter of

the proposed closure of the Injune line will be reviewed in January 1965 before a final decision is made on when the closure is to be effected.

I place on record my sincere thanks to the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Main Roads for the courtesies that they have extended to me in this matter, and for the very helpful attitude they have adopted so as to enable the closure of this line, if that is found necessary when it is reviewed in January, to take place with the minimum of disruption.

**Mr. Tucker:** A ministerial explanation through a member!

**Mr. EWAN:** That is a remarkable interjection by the hon. member for Townsville North. Of course, in his capacity as a member of the Opposition, he would not be confided in by the leaders of the Australian Labour Party. Perhaps they think their confidences may not be reposed successfully in that gentleman.

The hon. member for Barcoo made a great play about Arcadia, which is in his electorate. I do not wish to interfere with another member's electorate, but he spoke about the settlers' needs. They are in his electorate, but what did he do for them? In desperation, many of those settlers approached me. I told them who their representative was.

**A Government Member:** They did not want him.

**Mr. EWAN:** Apparently not. What has he done?

Let me outline what I have done. Following an approach by these people, and not infringing the rights of the hon. member for Barcoo in accordance with my principle of not infringing on another member's electorate, these people came to me and I said, "All I can do to help you is to try to give you an outlet road from the southern end of Arcadia to Injune, which will give you communication with Injune and give you a township." Consequently I approached the Bungil Shire Council and the Department of Lands on quite a number of occasions, in the realisation that this is a Commonwealth-State scheme. In company with Mr. Muir, the Chief Commissioner of Lands, I attended a meeting of the Bungil Shire Council. We were successful in making suitable arrangements for the building of an access road from Roma to Arcadia. The shire council will build approximately 9.9 miles of road at a cost of £20,000, and the Department of Lands will build a road down the long escarpment, which is 600 feet deep, and across the Dawson River, all in the Roma electorate, at a cost of approximately £60,000, joining up with the existing road in the Arcadia settlement.

We did not stop at that. We made representations to, and had consultations with, the Federal member for Maranoa, Mr. W. J. Brimblecombe, and have practically arranged

that a telephone service go in along the road when it is cleared—we hope it will be finished by Christmas—and an exchange established at Mr. Vacher's residence, which is in the Barcoo electorate.

We are now working with the full co-operation of the Department of Lands in trying to convince the Department of Civil Aviation of the necessity to lay down an all-weather aerodrome for the use not only of the Injune people, but also of those who live in Arcadia. This road will bring over 40 families to Injune, and it is reasonable to assume that 40 families represent a population of 100. We know that they can market their cattle at the Roma meatworks £2, £3, or £5 better than in Rockhampton.

The hon. member for Barcoo has the impudence to say that I was unconcerned and did nothing, and was not even worried at all about the position of these people in Arcadia. I told him at the time, by way of interjection, that I would deal with him, and I think I have done so very effectively. The people at Arcadia will be grateful to me, at the expense of the hon. member for Barcoo. I suggest that he get out among them and try to make his alley a bit better than it is today.

I now want to return to my old subject of land settlement in Queensland. Although I was away in my electorate for a couple of days last week, I have read in "Hansard" proofs several speeches that were made in my absence, and also remarks in the daily and weekly Press concerning a Bill expected to be presented to the House at a future date. All I can say is that this kite-flying by the Press is designed for the sole purpose of trying to discredit the Government over the freeholding provisions of its land policy.

I stand here and say that I am proud of Queensland's land policy. Mistakes have been made, and no doubt they will be made in the future. Analysing land administration in the period from 1927, which includes 30 years of Labour administration, I say unequivocally that the land policy of this Government stands head and shoulders above that followed in Queensland during the 30 years of Labour maladministration. I am very proud of the policy of this Government as enunciated by the Premier in 1953, and again in 1956 and 1957, when we assumed office. I want to state that I played a small part in the framing of that policy. Unlike the position that obtains in the ranks of the Opposition, back-benchers in the Country Party are consulted on policy matters. I am proud of that policy, which, despite what may have been said in the heat of the moment, has not been departed from intrinsically. We as a Government do not hesitate to consider—indeed we welcome—sensible suggestions designed to assist the furtherance of the land policy of Queensland, because of its very great economic importance in the overall scheme of things.

I now wish to deal with the freeholding of certain areas of land, which is a subject that has been so freely discussed in this Chamber and in the Press. Before the Labour Party came to power in Queensland in 1916, land could be freeholded. Much of Queensland's railway system was built as a result of the sale of freehold land. When Labour assumed office, freehold tenure was immediately abolished.

**Mr. Graham:** That was the wisest thing they ever did.

**Mr. EWAN:** The hon. member for Mackay says that that was the wisest thing they ever did. On innumerable occasions when speaking in this Chamber I have had clear acknowledgment from the Opposition benches that if ever, by some strange set of circumstances, the Labour Party was returned to office, the existing freehold provisions would be abolished. Let hon. members opposite deny that if they can. They will not, because they know that that is their policy and that they have committed themselves on it on many occasions.

What has been spoken of in this Chamber was the difficulty of freeholding certain areas in Queensland. Let us take, for example, pastoral leases. Those who understand the history of land know that in the outback areas, where considerable numbers of cattle are required, it was almost impossible for small men to go out and undertake land development. Consequently, and wisely, a tenure known as pastoral lease was established. That was provided for the big companies. Away they went and did splendid work. I have no quarrel with them. But let it be remembered that, in accordance with the policy laid down at the time, pastoral leases carried with them no priority rights over a living area at the termination of the existing lease. That verifies the interpretation that I placed on it—that it was a temporary tenure designed to bring about the opening of the land.

Following on the heels of the pastoral lessees when their leases expired without any priority rights, grazing selections were formed. That was the next step towards developing the area. Then, if they were in areas that had agricultural potential, as the years went by and the demand for land increased they became agricultural blocks. But Labour, of course, would not give security of tenure even to the selectors or the agriculturists. In fact, it carried out a crucifixion campaign the whole time it was in office to try to drive people off freehold land, and the hon. member for Bundaberg, when he was Minister for Public Lands, said quite honestly and sincerely that he would not agree to freehold and that if he had his way he would not agree to allow anyone to sell leasehold land at a profit. What an extraordinary statement! That was made when he was a member of the Australian Labour Party.

**Mr. Walsh:** I do not take back anything I said.

**Mr. EWAN:** No wonder he got out of the Australian Labour Party. I sympathise with him.

When the Country-Liberal Government assumed office, the late Sir William Payne, who was recognised by many people as one of the greatest living authorities on land in Queensland, was asked to furnish a report, and it was on my motion that his report was received. We, as a Government, agreed to implement it substantially. That did not mean that it was our intention to implement every part of it; we intended to implement it substantially. Sir William Payne recommended that freeholding should not be permitted above 5,000 acres. We gave the people of Queensland the privilege of freeholding areas up to 5,000 acres, and later we extended it to 10,000 acres if that was not more than a living area.

In accordance with the policy of the Government, and according to the kite-flying we have heard recently and seen reported in the Press, it seems that legislation is to be introduced—if it is, it will have my full endorsement—to extend the privilege of freeholding up to a living area in the case of grazing selections.

**Mr. Graham:** What is a living area?

**Mr. EWAN:** That will be determined from time to time.

**Mr. Graham:** It could be 20,000 acres.

**Mr. EWAN:** It will be determined according to the economic conditions existing at the time in the industries concerned. The hon. member would understand very little about that.

Even the most rabid freeholder—I could be classed as one, probably—would agree that some action must be taken to prevent possible aggregations of huge areas, particularly by companies. I am not worried about family aggregations, because death is inevitable and the distribution of estates is inevitable. As a result, subdivision of land in family estates occurs from time to time, and my experience prompts me to say that these are the most suitable subdivisions that we could have in Queensland. However, some provision must be made to prevent aggregations by companies, and again I stress that I have nothing against companies. Several methods could be adopted if this proves to be a stumbling block to the introduction and extension of the principle of freeholding to cover all grazing lands in Queensland. One method used in other States is to introduce a land tax solely for this purpose, that is, to break up big aggregations of freehold land. This is effective up to a point; but Labour, with its socialistic attitude and its hatred of security of tenure, misused the underlying principle of freehold land tax and placed a prohibitive tax on areas

far less than those that could be classed as living areas. In 1952, in response to a challenge from the hon. member for Bundaberg, I cited one instance of a small property in Roma carrying 2,500 sheep. I produced a table during the debate on the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill and it was published in "Hansard" for that year. On this freehold land they were paying land tax of 1s. 7½d. an acre whilst comparable leasehold land adjoining and carrying the same number of stock was attracting 9d. rental an acre. It was purely and simply a penalty on freehold land. The Labour Party tried to break it up, and they were succeeding temporarily.

During the period 1928 to 1932 the Moore Government reintroduced freeholding but the moment Labour were returned to power they abolished it again. Hon. members opposite have stated here repeatedly that if they are ever returned to office one of the first things they will do is abolish this Government's freeholding tenure. I should like the landholders of Queensland to remember that, to remember Labour's past history and their statements as to the future.

I think our object should be to extend the provisions of freeholding to cover all grazing selections and to give the Minister discretionary power to deal with applications by companies. I can find no quarrel with that because there is another way of combating aggregation, even under existing conditions. Under the Land Act a pastoral lessee cannot hold a grazing selection. There is quite a number of ways in which this can be dealt with.

I agree wholeheartedly with the school of thought that believes that some provision must be made to prevent aggregation by companies because companies never die and the only way the Crown can re-acquire the land, if it is aggregated too much to the detriment of the State, is by way of repurchase. In New South Wales—and this is to the credit of the Labour Government there; it is not often I commend a Labour Government—Mr. Renshaw, when he was Minister for Lands, gave notice to many people in this category that if they did not subdivide their land voluntarily he would do so for them within two years. Consequently, he brought about a voluntary subdivision. If we were ever forced to do that it would mean the floating of huge loans to purchase such land and the incoming tenants would have to be given 20 or 30 years in which to repay the money.

**Mr. Aikens:** Do you believe in unlimited freeholding, irrespective of acreage?

**Mr. EWAN:** No. I believe that the people of Queensland possess an inalienable right to freehold up to a living area without regard to acreage. I have here a Press cutting which I suppose some of my Opposition friends who have a smattering of knowledge of land matters would like me to quote. I think the hon. member for Bundaberg, although he is busy making notes,

would have seen published in "The Courier-Mail" a report that a gentleman paid more for leasehold land than he did for freehold land.

**Mr. Walsh:** Is that not true?

**Mr. EWAN:** Of course it is true, but there are many factors to be considered. This gentleman bought 8,500 acres of freehold for an unimproved value of £16,000. His name is Mr. E. D. Mills, of Longford, Tasmania. Then he bought a leasehold property not very far from the freehold land and paid more for it.

**Mr. Walsh:** What did he pay for it?

**Mr. EWAN:** The hon. member knows the many factors that come into this. The gentleman concerned may have two or three sons; he may have been so impressed with the potentialities of the brigalow land that he wanted more than the 8,500 acres he bought so he purchased the leasehold knowing that under the sound policy of this Government he could benefit from it and freehold it at a later date.

**Mr. Walsh:** Why did Ampol pay £125,000 for a service-station site in Canberra the other day?

**Mr. EWAN:** The hon. member could well ask the Leader of the Opposition that question.

I say very clearly that there will be no repudiation of this Government's land policy. We have introduced freeholding up to a living area, but not exceeding 10,000 acres. I am sure every hon. member on this side, from the Premier down, will back me when I say that there will be no repudiation. The conditions under which people acquire their freehold title under the legislation allowing freeholding up to a living area but not exceeding 10,000 acres will be preserved. I do hope that in any amending land legislation we extend the right to anyone in the grazing selection field, no matter what his area may be—remember that under the consolidated Land Act it was limited to 45,000 acres but there are quite a few 60,000-acre grazing selections—to freehold that portion of his holding which may, in consultation with the Department of Lands, be declared a living area, and to have a special lease over the remainder of his existing lease until its expiration. That would enable him to develop his freehold portion, knowing full well that in 10, 15 or 20 years' time he was going to lose his leasehold portion. At the same time the department would know full well that the land would be handed back to them and they could make provision to have it surveyed and ready for occupation almost on the expiry date—so different from the policy of past Labour Governments when after leases fell due, up to 16,000,000 acres of land was held under occupation licence while people were screaming out for selections to be opened. Of course, the Government did not have enough

surveyors and it could not handle the position. By the adoption of the method I have suggested we could have the surveys carried out and have everything ready for opening the land as soon as the lease expired. Above all, there will be no repudiation of existing leases.

I hope some effort will be made to endeavour to streamline valuations for freehold purposes. On the existing basis the Crown values the land, the lessee or the applicant for freehold values it, and if there is any timber on it the Forestry Department values it. The matter is then submitted to the Land Court and in some cases there is an inordinate lapse of time before it is dealt with. I am not going to bore the Committee by explaining the many ways in which valuations could be streamlined but I hope that in any legislation brought down to extend the freeholding provisions a provision will be included to attain that very desirable end.

I was amazed to read in the "Hansard" proofs that the hon. member for Clayfield saw fit to bring the case of the Rayner brothers into this Chamber. It is with great regret that I have to say this. I am of a kindly nature, and always have been. I try to assist everyone to the best of my ability. Do not forget that I handled this case before the present Government came into power. I tried to get a renewal of lease for these boys from the Minister for Public Lands under the Labour Government, but the application was rejected. Later, when this Government came into power, under the lands administration of the hon. member for Fassifern I was able to secure a full renewal of lease for the father, who owned 13,000 acres. He had to carry out stringent development conditions within a period of five years, but they were carried out within 12 months. We must congratulate Mr. Les Rayner, the father of Miles and David Rayner, for the magnificent work he did. Of course, the boys came to me and said, "We would like to start developing our land the way Dad developed his. What about an extension or renewal of lease? We have only five years to go." I said, "All right, we will do our best." There were several other properties in the area due for renewal of lease. The Department of Lands must try to subdivide land to the best possible advantage in accordance with its beliefs, but I believe that it tried to open too many blocks. It was decided at first to open three blocks, but now the department has decided to open only two. To do this it was necessary to take a small portion of 2,400 acres from the Rayner boys. I believe that only one should have been opened, but I accept the decision in the knowledge that firstly the department was prepared to give the Rayner boys only 5,000 acres, remembering that, in accordance with the provisions of the Act framed by the Labour Party, two people, as tenants in common, have only one priority granted to them at the expiration of a lease.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** You have not altered it.

**Mr. EWAN:** I know we have not altered it, although we have altered a lot of Labour's maladministration. We have not altered that provision, but I hope we will at some time in the future. The department intended to give only 5,000 acres to these boys but, following my representations, they got 8,000 acres. They then decided to approach the hon. member for Clayfield.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** Why?

**Mr. EWAN:** Apparently they thought he could handle the case better than I, and they are justly entitled to their opinion. However, in spite of all the hon. member's efforts, they did not gain one iota more than I achieved for them. If I were representing an electorate such as Clayfield, I might be tempted to interfere in other members' electorates.

**Mr. Murray:** You must clearly admit, surely, that I approached you on the matter and you said, "If you can help these boys in any way, go for your life. I will give you all the help you want."

**Mr. EWAN:** I admit that quite freely. However, I believe that it was highly improper that the hon. member for Clayfield, after putting forward his best efforts and failing, should bring a matter vitally affecting another hon. member into the forum of this Chamber.

**Mr. Walsh:** You invited him to do it.

**Mr. EWAN:** I did no such thing. I deplore that statement. I give hon. members my word that, so long as I remain in this Chamber, I will not interfere in another member's electorate.

I have another important matter to bring forward in the few minutes at my disposal. This concerns the inroads of New Zealand spinach in the Wandoan area. Hon. members will appreciate that the wheat crop is retarded because of drought conditions. The New Zealand spinach has grown strongly, which means that growers cannot harvest their crops. Over 10,000 acres are affected. The harvester will not handle the wheat because of the moisture in the spinach. The growers have tried aerial spraying and all sorts of things, but they have not been successful. Immediate action must be taken within the next two weeks to assist them. I spent half a day with the Government Botanist, Mr. Everist, at the Botanic Gardens. I received every courtesy and assistance from him, and from other officers of the department. The only spray that is likely to do the job is Diquat used in the ratio of one pint to five gallons of water, but it costs £3 18s. an acre for the spray treatment. This is far beyond the means of the people in the Wandoan settlement because of the poor crop.

I am pleased that I can get the Minister's ear as the matter is urgent. I should be grateful if he would consider subsidising the purchase of Diquat so that the spraying can

take place, thus enabling these people to harvest their wheat. There are over 30,000 acres of wheat in the Wandoan area. Following advice received from the Department of Primary Industries, some of the land was sprayed with 2,4-D. However, I brought down some samples which show that it had no effect. I also brought down some samples sprayed with Diquat. I think it is the answer, but because the cost is so great, unless they get a subsidy they will not be able to do anything with it.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. GRAHAM** (Mackay) (12.40 p.m.): The most important statement in the Financial Statement appears in the second sentence, which reads, "It was a year of increasing economic activity and development." We in the Australian Labour Party accept that fact, because we are not blind to Queensland's development. We have seen this State developing, not because there is a Country-Liberal Government in office, but in spite of it. The improving world economic position was shown not only in Queensland's activities, but was evident in the activities of every other State of the Commonwealth. What has happened in Queensland in regard to increased expenditure has also happened in the other States of the Commonwealth.

It is pleasing to see the great economic improvement that is being experienced, especially by the under-privileged nations of the world. This means a great improvement in the living standards to which they have been accustomed, and is creating a greater climate for our exports of primary production. Without being too critical of the Government's handling of the finances of the State, I find it hard to accept the statement of the Treasurer and other members of the Government that the improved conditions existing in Queensland are solely due to the fact that we have a Country-Liberal Government in office. The activity we are experiencing in this State has resulted from the demands that have been placed upon the Government for the expansion of the State. I might say that Queensland's expansion was evident before the advent of the Country-Liberal Government. In retrospect, we find that Queensland was on the move at the beginning of the century, but because of changing conditions, more especially in the world's economic standards, Queensland has not moved apace with the rest of Australia. I am prepared to admit that Queensland has experienced a very satisfactory year.

One has to remember that up to 1960 the present Government was in financial difficulties, mainly because of the raw treatment it received from the Federal Government. It has been said and accepted that the results of the 1961 election brought about a different position, so far as the Queensland Government was concerned, because it was then that the Federal Government realised, by the voice of the Queensland people, that more had to be done for Queensland. It

can be said that since then the Federal Government has been more generous in its approach to Queensland needs by providing to the present Government a much greater amount of finance than formerly.

**Mr. Aikens:** The 1961 elections put the wind up them.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** That is accepted. I think we all agree on that point. It has been to the betterment of Queensland that since then the Federal Government has made much more money available to Queensland. Consequently the Queensland Government was able to do so many things in the last year, and I presume it will do more this year because of the improved finances available to it.

The present Government is very fortunate in that the nation's economy has shown a satisfactory improvement. Considering the amount of money that has come to the Government from the T.A.B. and other avenues of revenue which the Government has introduced, we find today that the Treasurer has as much money as he needs at present, if not more. We hope that the Government will pay due regard to the future. While it is accepted that there is a great demand today on Government expenditure because of the expanding economy, this position may not be the same in a few years' time. Unless the Government is prepared to put aside finance for the time when it may be needed, the State could again be faced with what was experienced following the depression of 1960-61.

It is an old saying that any fish can swim downstream, but it takes a good, live fish to swim upstream. That can be applied to the present Government. Today it can point to great activity because of the amount of finance available. It will be a different story if, by any chance, adversity comes to the State. I believe that conditions existing throughout Queensland today are somewhat similar to those prevailing prior to the two World Wars. There was prosperity in the years leading up to the second World War, and between 1910 to 1914. After each war there was a wave of prosperity similar to that being experienced today. In the light of present-day conditions, it is not impossible that there will be another world conflict within a reasonable time, as a consequence of which, unless the nation and State are prepared, disaster could overtake us.

The Government is boastful in claiming under present conditions that all the things happening in this State are the result of their policy. The spending by the Department of Works, the Department of Education, and other departments is merely what must be done to meet growing needs. The Department of Education has had to meet the demand for more schools, especially those providing secondary education. Where would the Government have been if these schools had not been built? The demand exists for new schools, and the Government has had

to undertake the building of additional high schools and the expansion of primary schools. That is no great credit to the Government; it is merely something that the Government had an obligation to do. The Labour Party did exactly the same thing when in office, and similar expansion will be found in those States in which the Labour Party is in power. The Government has done no more than was expected of it. Everything that has been done to provide additional school facilities was essential.

A comparison of expenditure by some Government departments in Queensland would show that it falls far short of what is being spent in other States. Expenditure per head of population on education in Queensland is one of the lowest in Australia. There may be some reason for that, nevertheless I do not see how the Government can claim the credit for which they are looking in these achievements.

The wheel of political fortune has been turning at a pace that has been favourable to the Government. The Premier is quoted as having said that Queensland has never had it better. That may be so. It can also be said that the Government has never had it better, either, when consideration is given to increased assistance provided by the Federal Government. The amount of finance that has been available to the Government has enabled spending to be increased in all departments. The Treasurer admits that the great surge in revenue has permitted the Government to undertake a number of tasks previously excluded by lack of funds. Most significantly, buoyant overseas markets for primary products have been largely responsible for making increased finance available. There has been no great development in secondary industries in Queensland compared with what has taken place in the other States, particularly New South Wales and Victoria. There has been a marked expansion in the sugar industry, admittedly, which has brought increased wealth to the industry and to the State.

**Mr. Davies:** There was under Labour, too, was there not?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** That is so.

While I am speaking of the sugar industry, let me say that some dissatisfaction has been expressed by people in the industry with the granting of new assignments. The hon. member for Townsville North mentioned the dissatisfaction existing in North Queensland in this respect, and although I am not going to claim that dissatisfaction to the same degree exists in the Mackay area, there have been whispers of dissatisfaction about the granting of new assignments, particularly in some mill areas in which people already engaged in the industry have been given preference over those desiring to come into it. I have some doubts whether granting additional assignments to existing growers, especially those

who already hold big assignments, is of more benefit to the industry than would be an intake of new growers.

With the granting of increased assignments there has been a considerable increase in the tonnage of cane produced this year, and it is possible that a large amount of cane will be left in the fields at the end of the season following the inability of the mills to cope with the increased production. According to my information—I think it is correct—some mills will have to crush into late January or early February 1965 if they are to take all the cane produced in 1964. What will happen in the 1965 season? If the end of the present season is delayed till February of next year, the mills will not have sufficient time to undertake routine maintenance or to effect improvements before the commencement of the 1965 crushing season that are essential to enable them to handle the increased tonnages that will certainly be available in 1965. If a greater number of new assignments had been granted to new growers we would not have had the greatly increased tonnages this year, and this would have given the mills a greater chance of crushing all the 1964 cane and a longer period in which to install new machinery and improve their crushing rate for the 1965 season. Some dissatisfaction has arisen in some mill areas because of the methods of harvesting. For example, some growers in the Oakenden district in the Mackay area, so I have been informed, will not crush their peak, while others in the same mill area will crush over their peak.

As I said earlier, there is some dissatisfaction relative to new assignments, Sons, sons-in-law, and other relatives of existing growers, have been given preference over others, and in many instances in the Mackay area it has been of advantage to be closely associated with a director of a mill or a mill manager. For example, some cane inspectors have been given new assignments and others who wanted to come into the industry as new growers have been prevented from doing so. I am not making any assertions against anybody, for I think that the two committees that were established in the Mackay area with regard to the granting of new assignments, one under the chairmanship of Mr. Jim Baker and the other under the chairmanship of Mr. Kelleher, did a reasonably good job. Generally speaking, I do not think there has been the same degree of dissatisfaction in the Mackay area as there has been in the northern part of the State.

I make these comments because I know them to be true. Whilst this great improvement has occurred in the sugar industry, I am afraid that unless further regard is paid to the development of the North we will mark time in this respect.

As hon. members probably know, there are operating in the North today certain committees, such as the People the North Committee and regional committees and

advisory committees in the various centres. There is one operating in Mackay. The need to develop the North has been accepted by most people—it has been spoken of for many years—and in this regard I quote from an article in "The Daily Mercury" in which even the Premier is reported as saying, when opening a Southport conference, that the development of the Far North is a vital need. The article reads—

"Development of Queensland's far northern areas was vital for this State and for the whole Commonwealth, the Premier (Mr. Nicklin) said at Surfers Paradise today."

The Premier was officially opening the annual conference of the Cement and Concrete Associations of Australia.

As I say, the need to develop North Queensland is apparent to any right-thinking Queenslander. There has been large-scale development in the southern States and substantial increases in population have occurred in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. Whilst there has been some increase in population in Queensland, it has occurred mainly in the southern portion of the State.

Many plans have been advanced for northern development. One way in which the North could be developed is in the expenditure of more Commonwealth money in that part of the State. Money has been made available by the Commonwealth for development in the South. Millions of pounds have been spent in the South, particularly on military establishments, whilst virtually nothing has been done in this regard in the North, which is said to be the most vulnerable part of the Commonwealth. The establishment of defence bases in Northern Australia would have a tremendous effect on northern development.

I have here a publication on northern development prepared by the Mackay Advisory Committee in which it is stated—

"Those of us who are associated with the Mackay Advisory Committee desire to endorse individually and collectively the plan for development envisaged by the Prime Minister and the Premier to induce substantial amounts of private capital investment in the north and to organise some analogous government expenditure.

"We are all agreed, we think, that this development will depend upon (among other things)—

"Natural Resources (e.g., sugar and cattle lands, minerals, water, tourism)."

There has been a tremendous increase in the number of tourists travelling to the North, and tourism has become one of our most valuable industries.

The document goes on to give the second aspect on which development will depend as—

"Availability of labour (this tends to follow prosperous northern industries)."

This is especially so in the sugar industry, into which there is a large influx of southerners during the crushing season. However, as soon as the crushing season finishes these people wend their way back to Sydney with the result that the earnings they accumulate during their period of employment in the North are taken to the South for spending.

To continue with the publication—

"Accessibility to Markets (geographical position, ports for sugar, meat, ore, &c., railways, beef and other roads, proximity to Asia).

"Capital (i) Private (sugar farms, mills and terminals, cattle stations, mines, &c.); (ii) Government (Commonwealth, State and Local—Railways, roads, harbours, power, water and 'other')."

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

**Mr. GRAHAM:** Like many other people, the Mackay Advisory Committee is concerned about the lack of development in North Queensland. That development will not come until the Commonwealth Government plays a greater part in providing increased opportunity for capital investment in the north of the State. The views of the Mackay Advisory Committee, as set out in this document, continue—

"We desire to speak today principally about this 'other' governmental capital, particularly Commonwealth Government capital expenditure, whether it be from the Loan Fund, the Consolidated Revenue Fund, or the Trust Fund. Even if we exclude the expenditure of those great Commonwealth Statutory Corporations which operate outside the Treasury system, the annual Commonwealth total expenditure runs at approximately two-thirds of total government expenditure in Australia, all State governmental expenditure being about 26 per cent. and all local governmental expenditure being about 8 per cent of the Australian total. That is why we regard the expenditure by the Commonwealth upon its own functions in the various regions as so very important in any plan for development.

"This kind of expenditure in fairly massive amounts, even though it be not directly related to specific regional development, is usually necessary to give an initial impetus and a sustained thrust to enable private capital to flourish in a particular area."

We have only to look at the development that has taken place at Mount Isa. That development has occurred mainly because of the tremendous amount of American capital used in that area.

**Mr. Davies:** And the encouragement given by the Labour Government.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** And the encouragement given by the State Government.

The document continues—

“Haphazard examples of areas where the initial impetus and sustained drive appear to have been substantially affected by the Commonwealth's own expenditure are shown in the attached appendix.”

If we take Melbourne, as an example, the effect is heightened because Melbourne was the Federal capital for the first 27 years of Federation, and the momentum gained early still persists. There are in Melbourne the Department of Supply headquarters with its great control over Commonwealth contracts and its many munitions, aircraft and other factories as well as its many research establishments. In Melbourne there are the headquarters of the Departments of Civil Aviation, Postmaster-General, Labour and National Service, Repatriation, Social Services, Shipping and Transport, and Works, although some of these have been transferred to Canberra in recent years.

Many other sections of Commonwealth administration have been established in both Sydney and Melbourne. Sydney is the centre for regulating the Australian banking system, currency, coinage and monetary control, and foreign exchange control. It is the headquarters of the Reserve Bank of Australia, the Commonwealth Banking Corporation, and so on. Even in South Australia we have the Weapons Research and Development establishments at Salisbury and Woomera. At Canberra we have the Commonwealth Parliamentary Centre, the Commonwealth Administrative Centre, the Australian National University, the National Capital Development Commission, and so on. What do we have in Queensland to offset these things? The only Commonwealth activity of any great size is the Army, and it is centred in the southern portion of Queensland.

The document from the Mackay Advisory Committee continues—

“In order to provide a proper economic climate for private capital in the development of the North it is necessary that a much greater proportion of the Commonwealth's own expenditure be spent in the northern half of the continent which at present appears to contain only 3½ per cent. approximately of the Australian population. We have been unable to obtain a proper and complete assessment of regional natural resources, but it is more than probable that the northern half of the continent has a very much higher relative percentage than 3½ of Australia's natural resources.

“It also has the economic advantage of being near to the East and South-eastern Asia, and enjoys a much better climate than the South. We do not necessarily seek a much greater overall Commonwealth expenditure but a more equitable geographical distribution of the Commonwealth's own existing expenditures. We do not contend that aircraft factories, large munitions establishments or large naval dockyards

could or should be set up in the northern half, but it is our firm opinion that a number of Army and Navy units and their base establishments, such as those in Ingleburn, Watsonia, Bandiana, Flinders Naval Base, &c., could be set up in the northern half, where there are several fast growing centres, including the industrial centres of Townsville, Mackay and Cairns, where these things should be done. The R.A.A.F. base at Garbutt, near Townsville, is the only worthwhile Service establishment in the north of Queensland. The tropical training centre at Canungra, near the New South Wales-Queensland border, ought to have been established in North Queensland, where maybe the men could have got better jungle training.”

If we are to have development in North Queensland it will be essential for the Commonwealth to play a greater part in providing finance for that portion of the State.

Despite the progress and development that have taken place in Queensland—and not one member of the Opposition or any other Queenslander can be other than happy with the development that has taken place—one wonders why, in view of the fact that we are passing through an era of apparent prosperity, when industry is advancing and there is a fairly sound economic standing, there is so much industrial unrest. If this industrial unrest was confined to one industry we could say there was something wrong with the union concerned. However, when we know that there is industrial unrest in every industry in the State—the mining industry, the sugar industry, the metal trades industry, and the building trades industry—we realise that Queensland today is passing through a phase of industrial unrest that is not good for its development.

It is hard to understand the Premier's attitude in this matter. He has never been unwilling to meet the champions of industry—those who subscribe to his brand of politics—but unfortunately it is very noticeable that he has gone out of his way to sidetrack the unions in their request that he should meet them and discuss the problems associated with their disputes so that some amicable settlement may be reached. Not only has he taken unto himself the right to refuse to meet the unions, but he has also been very unfair in his attack on trade-union leaders, and even on the Leader and the Deputy-Leader of the Opposition. One would think from the utterances of the Premier and those associated with his party that everybody associated with the trade-union movement is a Communist, with no sense of loyalty to this great State and to the Commonwealth, and that they were all out to defeat the ends of justice. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Premier has said that officials of certain unions, following the dictates of foreign ideologies, had fabricated the present industrial situation by the coercion of workers to take part in stop-work meetings and strikes with loss of pay.

Again, nothing could be further from the truth. Those statements have no foundation in fact. If it could be said that there are guilty men in the trade-union movement, as the Premier implies in saying that they follow the dictates of foreign ideologies, I say that if there are guilty men in Queensland who are preventing progress and development of this great State they are on the Government benches, not in the trade-union movement. Government members are doing more to destroy the future of Queensland by their neglect of matters that are essential to its development than are members of the trade-union movement.

Nothing that the Premier or the members of the Government can say or do will prevent the trade-union movement from demanding its just rights. It has been too long in operation and is built on too solid a foundation to be destroyed by utterances such as those which emanated from the Premier.

Officials of the trade-union movement are only seeking justice for their members. If the Premier and the Government were aware of the need for co-operation with the trade-union movement the Premier would undertake to meet it and discuss its problems. The trade-union movement is only seeking social justice and common justice for its members.

The unions are prepared to co-operate with the Government in an effort to attract skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled workers to this State. Union leaders have said that the way would be made easier if Queensland wages were raised to the level of those in southern States. The Premier has heard from lips other than mine that Queensland is becoming recognised as a low-wage State. There is no incentive for skilled workers to come to Queensland, and as a result this State is experiencing a shortage of skilled men. The blame for that can be laid at the door of the Government. If encouragement was given to the industrial movement, workers might be attracted to Queensland. While the Government adopts the attitude of trying to annihilate the trade-union movement by utterances such as those made by the Premier, it can achieve nothing. The trade-union movement has been built on the sacrifices of the working class. Its members were always prepared, and still are, to make sacrifices in defence of their claims. It ill behoves the Premier and those associated with him in the Country-Liberal Government to disparage the names of trade-union leaders merely because they make these demands on the Government.

If the Government had done the right thing in regard to the Industrial Commission perhaps justice could have been given to members of the trade-union movement. We have seen the trade unions making requests to the Industrial Commission for some measure of justice. The Mt. Isa dispute developed because of anomalies created by the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. If

the Government had left to the Industrial Commission the decision of granting bonus payments, the present dispute at Mt. Isa would not have developed. It was because the Government decided to interfere in the affairs of the Commission that there is this trouble.

It is not surprising that the Government interfered. If we go back into history a little, we find the attitude of the anti-Labour forces towards arbitration. We read in "Notes on the Political History of the Labor Movement in Queensland" by Mr. J. Larcombe, M.L.A.—

"Some indication of the industrial policy of the Moore Government can be gleaned by a study of the Industrial Arbitration and Conciliation Bill, which it passed in 1929. That measure repealed the statutory basic wage of £4 5s. per week, passed by the Labour Government. It repealed Labour's 44-hour week enactment. It repealed the long-standing statutory eight hours' day law . . . It repealed certain statutory overtime pay rates."

That is what this Government has been doing by interfering with the Industrial Commission.

To continue—

"It interfered with the domestic control of unions."

This Government tried to do that.

It continues—

"It destroyed the right of the Arbitration Court to grant preference to unionists . . .

"The Moore administration's . . . promise of 'no interference with arbitration' was contemptuously ignored and the protection of the Industrial Court withdrawn from thousands of workers, including the railwaymen and the public servants.

"Awards were suspended in a wholesale manner . . . The basic wage, which was £4 5s. per week under Labour, was reduced in two years, under the Moore Government, to £3 14s. per week . . . The workers lost at the rate of many millions of pounds per annum."

That is what the Government is doing. It is denying to the workers, through the agency of the Industrial Commission, wage increases to which they are entitled.

To continue reading from these notes—

"Nicklin-Morris Government made four attempts to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, two attempts being abortive. A Bill introduced by Labour Minister Morris on November 22, 1957, got no further than the initiation, and the Bill was still on the business paper of the House when the Session finished five months later on April 17, 1960. The amending Bill providing for Court-controlled ballots of Union elections, which was strongly opposed by the Australian Labor Party, and represented only an

unwarranted intrusion into the domestic affairs of the unions, was put through in November, 1958."

Down through the years it has been the practice of anti-Labour Governments to interfere with the industrial tribunal.

**Mr. Windsor:** If we did all those terrible things, why weren't we kicked out?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** The hon. member will be kicked out, all right.

The Premier said in 1960 at Longreach that the State Government wanted to make the Industrial Court more flexible. In this he had the full support of the chairman of the graziers' association in that area. Following criticism of the present system by several delegates, the conference of the Central and North Queensland Graziers' Association decided that the United Graziers' Association should take the necessary action to have a review made of all aspects of arbitration. The Government was there being dictated to by the graziers.

Thousands of references can be found in many publications to show that at no time has the Nicklin-Munro Government ever been in sympathy with the trade-union movement or the working class. They are prepared to give, sometimes without even being asked, concessions to those who support them. The same Government, however, is outspoken in its attempts to destroy the working-class movement. As I said before, nothing that the Premier and the Government can do will ever destroy the trade-union movement. It will be there fighting for the workers when this Government has gone to political extinction. It ill behoves the Premier to adopt that attitude towards the working class.

Let me now say something about the development of industries in Queensland, for which the Government claims credit and on which it looks with so much admiration. Let me deal for a moment with the oil industry. One of the greatest things ever to happen in Queensland has been the finding of oil, and not one Queenslander is not thrilled with the prospect of great development following it. Already, however, the control of it, and profit from it, is passing from the hands of Queenslanders to those of foreign investors. The chairman of Planet Oil Company, Mr. John Fuller, in addressing a luncheon of the Chartered Accountants' Research Society, said—

"There is a race for oil in Australia. Australian companies are in a hurry. Frankly I think that in the discovery of new fields Australia will have a better record than that overseas."

He went on to say that Australian capital had lost its opportunity to participate in the development of the nation's oil resources. He said that the Australian oil industry is already under foreign control, and continued—

"But there is a danger that rising share prices will tempt shareholders to sell out.

I know of one American oilman who placed an order for £50,000 worth of A.O.G. shares last week."

We find, not only in the oil industry, that Australians are not being given an opportunity to have a say in development of their own country. For instance, no Australian shareholder has any interest in General Motors-Holden's Pty. Ltd. Yet this action has the support of the Federal Government and the Nicklin-Munro Government of Queensland. They are prepared to hand over the control of these industries to foreign capital, for what reason I do not know. Mr. W. C. Wentworth, speaking during a debate in the House of Representatives, pointed out that our resources of iron ore, copper, lead, zinc, oil and natural gas are already mostly wholly under foreign control, and we look like handing over the bauxite deposits, the largest in the world, to foreigners. That is a very definite statement.

What is the position of Comalco? Admittedly it is establishing an industry at Gladstone. But who is going to get the profits from it? What is the position relative to the export of bauxite? The Minister has admitted that we are getting a lousy 6d. a ton royalty on bauxite exported to Japan. I say to the Premier that the Government of the day would be doing a much better job if it encouraged foreign investors to establish industries in Queensland and utilise our ore production for the development of industry here instead of sending raw materials to Japan to be used in developing low-wage industries there.

Commenting on Mr. Wentworth's speech, the report went on to say—

"The damage has been done with most of our minerals. Are we to allow bauxite, the raw material of aluminium, to go the same way?"

"Mr. Wentworth made a strong and logical plea for a last-minute effort to prevent the bauxite deposits on the Gove Peninsula, in the Northern Territory, passing into foreign hands.

"The aluminium business has largely got into the control of several international cartels, but that need not deter us. Because we hold so large a proportion of the world's bauxite deposits we are in a strong bargaining position."

Even the Prime Minister made a plea that efforts be made to allow Australian investors to share in the equity of overseas companies. In a newspaper article under the heading "Menzies plea to foreign firms", this report appeared—

"The Prime Minister, Sir Robert Menzies, tonight appealed for overseas investors entering Australia to admit Australians to some share in the equity of their companies.

"He was speaking to 750 political, industrial and business leaders at the 1964 dinner of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures."

Recently we have seen reports of a clash between the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. McEwan, and the Treasurer, Mr. Holt, over foreign investment in Australia.

Unless the Government takes some positive action to control foreign investment, where will we end up? I believe that I have the support of all Australians when I say that unless we, as Australians, control industries, we will not get the benefit from them. Take the oil industry. When the hon. member for Brisbane was speaking in this debate last week he made some comment on royalties, and the Treasurer said, "We are only following on the policy of the Labour Party."

**Mr. Ewan:** You would not expect us to repudiate it, would you?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** The Government does not have to repudiate it. It comes under different terms of agreement. I am certain that the companies controlling oil production in Australia realise that Queensland is entitled to a greater percentage return from oil production than it is getting. We have only to look at the position in other oilfields of the world to know that this is true. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition made clear what is happening in regard to oil royalties, and if the Government of Queensland is not getting its proper share from oil development it is time that it took some action to ensure that it does. A state of affairs is developing that is not in the best interests of the State.

Turning again to the establishment of industry in Queensland, Dr. Summerville, the new Agent-General for Queensland in London, said that industrial organisation in southern States presents one of the main difficulties in attracting British secondary industry to Queensland. As we all know, in recent years several Ministers have gone overseas and visited various countries in an endeavour to attract industry to Queensland, but I do not know of one industry that has been established in this State as a result of those visits. I am not opposed, nor would I ever be opposed, to members of the Government going overseas to try to attract capital to Queensland for development purposes, but I believe that until there is some dynamic change in the policy being followed by State and Federal Governments we will not attract industry here, more especially to the far northern parts of the State.

Dr. Summerville is of the opinion that one of the main difficulties associated with the task of attracting secondary industry to Queensland is that most of the larger British organisations that may be contemplating expansion in Australia have agencies firmly established in the southern States. Who is to blame for that? I believe that the Government of the day is largely to blame in not giving sufficient encouragement or for not

having the know-how to attract these industries to Queensland, and particularly to the North.

As I said previously, Brisbane and the southern portions of the State have already shown some development, but with one or two exceptions the northern portion has remained static, more particularly in regard to secondary industries. We must have more people in the North. Again I blame the Federal and State Governments for this lack, because little or no encouragement is given to migrants to settle in the North. Despite the fact that we have had a record migrant intake into Australia—some 30,000 assisted British migrants have come to Australia in the last 12 months—very few of them have settled in the North. One cannot help wondering how many of these migrants have come to Queensland and how many of the 30,000 would be scattered throughout the State.

**Mr. Windsor:** If they read your speech, none of them will come.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** They will come if they get the right encouragement and the right protection from the Government of the day. Only a couple of nights ago I read of a flare-up among migrants at Wacol over some problem associated with their food. Things of that kind should never happen. When they do, they give migrants the opportunity to say, "We will get out of this and go south."

Not many months ago a very serious unemployment problem existed in North Queensland. In the past 12 months the position has been rectified to some extent, but unless the Government takes some dynamic action who is to say that a similar position will not again develop at the end of the crushing season this year? In 1962 there was a very high percentage of unemployed in Mackay. It was estimated that 1,200 people were unemployed in that town and there is no reason to suppose that a similar position will not recur at the conclusion of the present crushing season.

The 30,000 assisted migrants of whom I spoke, according to a newspaper cutting I have here, represented a record number in any July-December period—the first half of the financial year—and I say to this Government that if it wants to do the right thing by Queensland, if it wants to develop the North and maintain the development already in existence, it will have to spend more money in the North. It will have to assist industries that are already there as well as those that desire to go there. They will have to be given a greater degree of assistance by the Commonwealth Government. When those things are done we may see some development taking place.

Let me now refer for a moment or two to the speech of the hon. member for Roma on the question of land policy. I do not profess to have a great knowledge of land matters but I believe that the policy formulated and followed by the Labour Party over many years when it formed the Government of Queensland from 1915 to 1957, with the

exception of one short period between 1929 and 1932, was not detrimental to the development of Queensland, and I defy anyone to show otherwise. Despite what the hon. member for Roma might say, I know that he and other members of the Country Party would freehold every acre of land in Queensland if they had their way, their main reason being to enable them to exploit freeholding by disposing of the land. I do not accept the statement of the hon. member for Roma that we should freehold areas up to 10,000 acres. Large aggregations of land could be formed under family ownership. I think he would agree with that. He was not in favour of large aggregations of land being given to companies; he cannot deny that the same thing could happen with families. In matters of land usage we must have regard not only for Queensland's present needs but also for those 100 years hence. The hon. member for Roma would be one of many who accumulated great wealth by taking advantage of the Labour Government's leasehold policy. The Labour Government retained control over the land of the State. Graziers and other landholders were given the use of that land on long-term leases.

The freeholding of large areas will be detrimental to the State's future. If the Government's present policy is continued, children yet unborn will be denied the use of land unless they can afford to pay enormous prices for it. There is not one member of the Country Party who would not exploit the freeholding of land if they had an opportunity to get control of it. They would exploit it to the full. It is wrong to have large aggregations of land. The Labour Government's land policy has been of great benefit to the State.

I have endeavoured to show what has happened under the present Country-Liberal Government; I have endeavoured to show how unfair it has been in the handling of industrial disputes; I have endeavoured to show where its policy of the use of foreign capital is wrong. I issue this warning to the Government: do not expect present-day conditions to continue. It is possible that social crises will develop by 1968 or 1970. We must take heed of what transpired before the two World Wars. Depression days could come again. Unless the Government is prepared for such eventualities nothing but tragedy can come to the people of Queensland. The Government must be forewarned. It must do its duty to future generations by making the best use of the State's resources.

**Mr. HEWITT** (Mackenzie) (2.49 p.m.): I congratulate the Treasurer for the manner in which he has again presented his Financial Statement. Representing a Central Queensland electorate and having had a particular interest in that area for the whole of my life, I naturally claim to know something about it. I am pleased to have been associated with this Government in the way it has helped to develop that area. In recent times we have

seen great development taking place on the Moura-Kianga coalfields; the alumina plant that is to be established at Gladstone; the Calcap power station, and the Callide Dam. At Theodore Wilson Hart & Co. Ltd. have erected a new £100,000 sawmill.

There is need for further investigation into water storage possibilities in the upper reaches of the Dawson River. We have had spectacular developments. The Department of Primary Industries has established an experimental station to work in harmony with the new brigalow land development scheme. Over the years, the people in the area have done much to show what can be done with brigalow land. The early settlers paid £3 10s. to £4 an acre for scrub pulling, and in those days cattle brought much lower prices than today.

We all know that the cost of scrub pulling has dropped. When the brigalow scheme was getting under way a request was made to me by the Bureau of Economics in Canberra for information on the estimated cost of pulling brigalow and softwood scrubs in the area. My estimate at the time was 28s. 6d. overall. The first contract for 20,000 acres was let at £1 an acre and the overall cost for scrub pulling in the area, I believe, will not exceed 28s. 6d.

The present development is boosting the Dawson Valley. The people who went to the area originally should get just recognition because they pioneered the development of the area and many gave a lifetime of service to it. I think I can justly claim that I played my part. Firstly, as manager for Australian Estates Co. Ltd., Eidsvold Branch, I was able to persuade the company to establish a branch in Theodore and purchase suitable safeyards. I was later able to convince the company that it was worth while establishing a branch at Moura, and today the only brick building in Moura is the one it erected. This demonstrates that the company has complete confidence in that area.

The brigalow lands development scheme will benefit many people. There has been a great increase in land values. When we look back we remember that in this area, for which Labour is claiming to have such a good record in land settlement, not many years ago Labour opened up blocks varying in size from 56,000 acres to 80,000 acres. When one of these blocks, containing about 60,000 acres, was resumed for closer settlement under the brigalow land development scheme the only improvement on the block was a hut built of kerosene tins. There were no stockyards or other improvements, although the owner had been on the block for 10 or 12 years.

My brother, in partnership with another man, drew a block of 56,000 acres.

**Mr. Houston:** Wasn't he lucky.

**Mr. HEWITT:** He will admit that he was lucky. He has made a success of his block. If everyone else does as well as he has, we will not have many failures in land settlement. When he and his partner took up this block they realised they could not develop it because it was beyond their means, and they sold it for £22,000 after having complied with the conditions laid down by the Department of Lands. The sale included a new home, stockyards, dip, fencing and other improvements. Only the other day, under the brigalow land development scheme, 9,000 acres of this property was sold for £24,500, without a home, without yards, and with only half the water improvements. Members of the Opposition may laugh and say that they were lucky, but they pioneered the way and did the best they could with the capital they had. They are still in the industry, in a smaller way.

I feel that I can take some of the credit for starting the brigalow lands scheme. In 1958 I urged the Government to look into the possibility of establishing this scheme. The then Minister, Mr. Muller, and the Chief Commissioner of Lands, looked into the matter and considered establishing a small scheme in the Baralaba area. At a later date there was a change in ministers, and also in Government thinking. After many consultations it was decided that the scheme should be put up to the Commonwealth Government, and that brought about its start.

**Mr. Davies:** It was not the first time brigalow land was cleared and developed.

**Mr. HEWITT:** I have already said that many people in that area paid £3 10s. to £4 years ago and developed it, but the way the Labour Government opened up blocks of 56,000 to 60,000 acres, nobody could afford to develop it.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Except rich graziers' sons.

**Mr. HEWITT:** Rich graziers' sons had a lot of success. I am not worried about who gets into anything as long as he makes a success of it. I want to see Queensland, particularly Central Queensland, developed.

I am critical of the Main Roads Department, although I have backed the Government to the hilt in its education and hospital policies. I will always be that way if I think a thing is right. That is my make-up, and that is the way it has to be.

**Mr. Tucker:** You were "done" like a hot dinner.

**Mr. HEWITT:** I may have been, but at least I have an opinion of my own. I fight for the people I represent. The Main Roads Department has, in the main, done a good job. In the last six years of Labour's term £52.4 million was spent on roads. In the first six years of this Government's term £95.3 million was spent, an increase of 82 per

cent. In the last six years of Labour's term grants to local authorities totalled £5,000,000, and for the first six years of this Government's term they totalled £13.4 million, an increase of 168 per cent. However, that does not alter the fact that roads which need attention have not received it. I refer particularly to the road from Wowan to Theodore. When I became a member of Parliament, the 53 miles from Rockhampton to Wowan was bitumen. In the intervening years, of the 80-odd miles from Wowan to Theodore only eight miles have been bituminised. I am not happy about that. It serves a quickly developing area. No other shire is going ahead more quickly than the Banana Shire in regard to land put under agriculture, the development of huge tracts of brigalow lands and softwood scrubs being pulled down. In that area we are trying to do what the Government wants—to turn off young cattle—but we must have good access to markets. The road from Theodore to Banana is not trafficable to semi-trailers after two inches of rain. It is not trafficable to motor-cars if there is much more than two inches of rain. There has been a great deal of correspondence with the Main Roads Department on this subject, but each time the Main Roads Department comes back to the section from the aerodrome to the Lonesome Creek turn-off, which has only recently been gazetted. It is approximately seven miles, yet miles and miles of road have been gazetted for years. It is absolutely essential that this road receive attention. Of the road from Theodore to Taroom, only 3.6 miles have been done west of the Dawson River.

**Mr. Evans:** You want to get the council to look at the roads.

**Mr. HEWITT:** It seems strange that the Minister should say that. Look at what has happened on the western road from Rockhampton to Emerald. No-one can tell me that the Emerald area has expanded to any greater extent than has the Dawson Valley. In fact, I should think that it has developed to a lesser extent. In spite of that, 120 miles of that road have been sealed with bitumen during the term of this Government. I do not mind hon. members opposite smiling as long as I make my position clear. This is very important to the people in the area, and I know that in what I am saying I have a lot of backing.

The Minister was reported in "The Morning Bulletin" of Rockhampton on 2 February, 1960, as saying that all parts of the State would get a good deal in accordance with the money the Government had to spend, and that two-fifths of the beef cattle in Queensland were produced within 300 miles of Rockhampton. The Banana Shire is not far behind. The area is developing rapidly, with emphasis on fat lambs and the vealer trade. It is essential that we have this road.

I want to see Queensland developed, and credit can be given for the development of the Moura-Kianga coalmine. What has this

meant, however, to people wanting to move stock by railway between Theodore and Rockhampton? The line has become congested. Let me give an example of what happened recently. Cattle were loaded in Rockhampton at 7 p.m. on Tuesday, 15 September, and arrived in Mt. Morgan, approximately 20 miles away, at 2 a.m. on 16 September. They arrived at Moura, their destination, approximately 115 miles away, at 5.20 p.m. on 16 September. The trip of 115 miles took 22 hours and 20 minutes. My anxiety and desire to have something done can be understood, because this is important to the people who live in the area. I have a diary that was written in 1898, but I cannot help but wonder whether some of the thinking of officers of the Main Roads Department in this area is not in keeping with the age of that diary. Whether I am being victimised for a certain difference of opinion that I had with an officer of the department, I do not know. All I can say is that I will discuss that matter if I am forced to, but I do not want to do so.

In most of the State the Main Roads Department has done a remarkably good job. I believe I am justified in saying this because I am interested in cattle sales and I travel the roads of the State more than do most hon. members. In the main, roads have been very much improved. In the particular instance to which I have referred, I feel that we have been to some extent victimised. The Minister blames the council. If the decisions of the council are so bad, it is time the Minister overruled them. It is clear that most of the money spent in this area has been used for the benefit of the coalmine. The Minister might reply, "A great deal of money has been spent in Divisions 1 and 3 of the Banana Shire." However, the major part of it has been spent on developing the Moura-Kianga coalfield and the road from Moura to Biloela. Before the railway line was built the coal had to be taken out in trucks, and many of the employees lived at Biloela. My argument is that the development there should not have taken place at the expense of people who have lived in the area for many years.

**Mr. Walsh** interjected.

**Mr. HEWITT:** The hon. member for Calide can talk about his area; I am particularly concerned with my own area. I have done all I can by letter, but the matter has dragged on over a long period. I have done my best to convince the department that our need is urgent, and I hope that it will look at the matter and realise the difficulties we are experiencing because of the state of the surface of the road and because of the huge volume of traffic each week on the railway line to Gladstone carrying coal for export.

**Mr. Tucker:** Is this the road beyond Mount Morgan?

**Mr. HEWITT:** Beyond Wowan.

I wish now to make a suggestion or two relative to the hospitals in my area, which are under the control of two boards. The

Theodore Hospital comes under the control of the Banana Hospital Board, and the hospitals at Monto, Eidsvold and Cracow come under the control of the North Burnett Hospitals Board. Over a number of years there has been a great deal of correspondence with the Department of Health about these hospitals. The one at Theodore, as hon. members know, is a new hospital, and we are very grateful to the department for it. The late Dr. Noble saw fit to recommend its erection when he recommended the erection of the hospitals at Injune and Sarina, and it is a great asset to the district. We have had a doctor there ever since the hospital was opened, and for several months the 10-bed capacity of the hospital has been exceeded. We were given to understand that a small maternity section would be provided, and I urge the Minister for Health to investigate the possibility of building it in the near future. He realises, I am sure, that when the daily average of patients is in excess of the hospital's capacity, further accommodation is needed.

Turning now to the hospitals at Eidsvold and Monto, let me deal first with the hospital at Monto. It is a fairly old hospital and has been visited recently by the Premier and the Minister for Education. They have had an opportunity of seeing the state it is in, and I think they are convinced, as I am, that it would be very difficult to carry out the repairs to it that are needed. I think they are of opinion that it would be better to consider building a new hospital, even though not quite as large as the present one. If necessary, it could be built in sections.

For a considerable period, too, we have been making representations for the establishment of a dental clinic at Monto. Although we have had the approval of the Department of Health to go ahead with this, firstly the suggestion was made that we use the old domestic building at the Monto Hospital, which was ravaged by white ants and completely unsatisfactory. Naturally, the board was not happy with that suggestion so it wrote back to the department, which then suggested the use of the old isolation ward. Let me say that that also was totally unsatisfactory and I hope that the Department of Health will now examine the possibility of building a new dental clinic, because I have no hesitation in saying that it would be the most economic way out of the problem. I feel sure that anyone who is "clued-up" on finance will agree that the only thing to do is to build a new dental clinic because the equipment and everything else that has to be used in it is already there. I urge that that work be carried out as quickly as possible.

The other hospital of which I wish to speak is the Eidsvold Hospital, which is very old. Most members will know that Eidsvold is one of Queensland's very old towns—it is well over 100 years old—and the hospital there would have been built very many years ago, perhaps before the turn of the century. The

is no doubt that this hospital must be completely renewed. Anyone who has a close look at it will immediately realise that it is simply a mass of old buildings stuck up on stilts and that a completely new building is required. As I said before, perhaps it cannot be fully completed in one stage but whatever is done should be done on the basis of new buildings so that they can be added to and will not continue to be a drag on the Government in maintenance costs.

They are the pressing problems with which I am concerned. The main roads one that I have mentioned is of interest not only to me but to the State as a whole. It is the road from Taroom to Banana and on to the Leichhardt Highway connecting the South with the central portion of Queensland. If we are to market our cattle and obtain our just dues something must be done to improve it.

Land policy is something that will be discussed in this Chamber, no doubt fully, at a later stage of this session. I think all hon. members know that I have certain views on land policy. As to whether I agree wholeheartedly with all measures and everything that has been said, I will discuss that matter when the Land Bill is before us.

**Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (3.13 p.m.):** There was an old saying here many years ago that when the jacaranda was in bloom one had always to be on guard because one never knew the kind of disturbance that might take place in this Chamber. I do not know whether the pollen from the jacaranda blooms is affecting members on the Government side today but there seems to be a feeling of uneasiness among them regarding not only governmental policy but also the relationship between the two parties.

It was somewhat intriguing to hear the hon. member for Clayfield emphatically outlining his views on certain phases of land policy. I think he gave everybody here the impression that he was doing it after full consultation with the parties affected, even the lessees themselves. That is the impression I gained, anyhow. Today the hon. member for Roma has brought some of the parties' dirty linen into the Chamber.

If I may say so to him, I think we can all congratulate the hon. member for Mackenzie on the very emphatic way that he approached his particular problems, mainly the roads in his electorate. The only conclusion I could come to was that he had been backing the wrong horse up to the present time.

Many important matters have been raised in the course of this debate. As much as the Treasurer may dislike sitting for so long listening to a lot of speeches, he must concede that a few from this side as well as from his side should give the Government cause for thought and concern. It is no use the Government's closing its eyes to the fact that there is a certain amount of industrial unrest among trade unions. The point raised by the hon. member for Aubigny the other

day about a particular phase of the Government's housing policy cannot be merely brushed aside by the Government and no concrete explanation given as to why there would appear to be this favouritism for a company that could easily pack up their chattels and go out of the State tomorrow.

Having made that passing observation I want to come onto what I think is a very important matter, and I am sure a lot of people would agree with me on that. I am surprised that the official Labour Party has not taken the opportunity to raise the subject involved in the remarks made by the president of the Trades and Labour Council, Mr. Egerton, as reported in last Saturday's "Courier-Mail". I have a lot of things to say about the Budget and I could easily have let this go by, but having regard to the gravity of the charges made by Mr. Egerton, I should have imagined that some member of the official Opposition would have taken advantage of the sitting today to raise this question. I will quote only the relevant parts of the article in "The Courier-Mail" of 17 October under the heading "Egerton accuses of graft." It reads—

"Accusations of graft and corruption were levelled at 'some' State Cabinet Ministers and Government members by Trades and Labour Council president (Mr. J. Egerton) yesterday."

It continues—

"I believe that a thorough inquiry into the affairs of some Cabinet Ministers and Government members would disclose such graft and corruption that the Government would be forced out of office," he said."

It goes on—

"There was reason to believe that Ministers held shares in oil companies and in overseas transport companies, and that some of these shares might not necessarily have been properly acquired.

"We believe some of the trips of members overseas are financed by overseas business interests and could well ask why," Mr. Egerton said."

To maintain continuity of the comments, I point out that the report says that he continued—

"Since commencing this report I have been telephoned by a prominent public servant who informed me that a certain Minister has received very expensive presents from Japanese interests. It is stated that a car has been numbered among these."

Let me say first and foremost that I think everybody here knows my attitude towards the irresponsible type of individual Egerton is. I regard him—and have said so in this Chamber and elsewhere—as the Jock Garden of Queensland who normally does everything that he can to take away the support that otherwise would be coming to Labour candidates or Labour Governments. As to Mr. Egerton's making these charges publicly,

I have in mind the sentiments expressed here by the Treasurer himself when dealing with the retirement—I say “retirement”—of Mr. Muller from Cabinet. The Treasurer then said he believed it was very necessary that there should be a high standard of public morality among those occupying public positions, such as ministers and parliamentarians, even more so than those engaged in commercial activities or even public servants. I do not think I am misrepresenting the Treasurer’s sentiments. I recall that when we were the Government the Premier of today—then the Leader of the Opposition—moved a motion that was not usual, when he asked the House to agree to the proposition he had submitted that Mr. R. J. J. Bukowski be called to the Bar of the House and examined by the House. I suggest that if the Premier wishes to make history he should proceed to move a similar motion as Premier and ask the House to agree that Mr. Egerton be brought to the Bar of the House to be examined by the House about the charges he has made as reported in the paper. That is a fair enough proposition. I am not asking for anything more than the Government—when in opposition—asked for in 1955. Some people may say of him, “This is an irresponsible person.” I could not agree more. Nevertheless, that would not satisfy the public at large.

We must remember that it was the flimsy allegation—and I use those words advisedly, because it was a very flimsy statement—made in the Senate by Senator Wood that a man named Fleming was the “fixer” in regard to certain renewals of Crown leases, repeated in this Chamber by the present Minister for Mines, that was the justification for the Government of the day to appoint a royal commission to investigate the charges made in “The Worker” newspaper, no doubt through the attitude of the then branch secretary of the union. We all know what happened to Mr. Fleming, a man who was completely innocent in the matter. He was brought back from his holiday and was left with a big bill for legal costs though there had not been one scintilla of evidence to support the charges.

On this occasion we have a man who makes statements just as specific except that he has not nominated the particular ministers, although he says “some ministers,” which, of course, immediately suggests that he could nominate those who were guilty and those who were not guilty. It is not for us to judge the accuracy of Mr. Egerton’s statements unless we can get him to the Bar of the House. I am giving the Premier a chance. If between now and Tuesday next he is not prepared to move a motion, and if the Opposition is not prepared to do it in its official capacity as Her Majesty’s Opposition, I will feel disposed to give notice of a motion to call Mr. Egerton to the Bar of the House to see what attitude the Government will adopt. I do not wish to say any more about

it than that. I will probably have something to say about Mr. Egerton in another capacity as I continue. I do not think any hon. member will disagree that the charges made by him to a public audience were of a very serious nature. They should not be allowed to drift on as the sentiments of an irresponsible person.

I hate to disappoint the Treasurer by not quoting a few figures. It is not that I am short of a few figures, but I do not want to go into a long discourse about how much money the Treasurer has and how much he has not. I think it is plain to all of us that the Government is very much relieved that it is not called upon to meet the same financial commitments regarding employment as it has had to undertake in previous years.

I agree with any policy that the Loan Council may adopt to more or less level the loan allocations this year because there is evidence of near full employment. It would be plain stupidity for any Government, irrespective of politics, to keep on borrowing and then become a competitor for the limited work force available for a particular undertaking. Someone will have to tell the local authorities that, and the Commonwealth Government, this Government, and the local authorities must conserve their financial resources to meet the situations that were evident 12 months ago and two years ago in this Parliament.

Before I get on to the Treasurer’s figures I have one observation to make. I shall be sorry if I have to bypass any of his figures because I have references to make to the political scene, too, and they will not be all one-sided either. Reference has been made during the speeches, particularly from this side, to the Government’s industrial policy and its attitude towards trade unions. Any Government, irrespective of politics, must govern. The Labour Government in this State, over the years, proved it could do that. In the face of all the pressure exerted by those doubtful sources in the trade-union movement, it was still able to uphold the principles in the background of democratic government. This Government has the same right to resist agitation that is coming from doubtful sources, and that has as an objective the undermining of any one of the fundamental institutions of this country.

No Government in this country in my political knowledge was faced with the same pressures as that led by that grand old man Ben Chifley in the period 1948 to 1949, after he had done so much for the trade-union movement as a whole and for the people of Australia as a whole. What he was made to submit to by those influences within the trade-union movement is again becoming well evident. Chifley did things that no Labour man who knew Labour policy would have expected to be called on to do; he did things that none of us ever dreamt he would have to do; but he had the courage to do them because he was a Labour Prime Minister. He

was the man who had to put troops into the coal mines to resist agitation from that source. There is a strong section of so-called industrial militants within the trade unions in this State, and also in other States, whose main objective seems to be the destruction of the arbitration system, particularly where it has had a long and glorious history under Labour Governments. Do not take my word for what I am saying. After all, we have a great union like the Australian Workers' Union which has branded these same people for having those same objectives. It is not a case of my raising my individual voice, as a political nonentity as some might say. There is a strong opinion in the worthwhile section of the industrial movement that a lot of people are up to no good.

On the other hand, no Government can justify adopting an attitude that rejects the just claims of the trade-union movement. That has happened under previous Governments. I recall one silly strike in 1948 that I did not think should ever have happened. I was not a member of Parliament at the time, but I did my best to stop it from getting as far as it did. There are union officials who know that, too. However the strike continued for nine weeks and was followed by a settlement on the very terms for which the strikers went out.

The Government should adopt a somewhat stronger attitude towards some of the things happening in this State. It is no credit to any Government that one can pick up a newspaper and read of 167 rail stoppages in three weeks. Even though this action may not be to the credit of the unions concerned, it is certainly no credit to the Government. My attitude as Minister for Transport was that, if I felt the railway unions had a just claim, there was no way in the world I would allow them to go on strike. Apart from the small strike at Ipswich over the washing of hands, there was no strike of any magnitude during the three most difficult years in which I held that portfolio.

I appreciate the courage of trade-unionists who, having decided that their claims are just, and irrespective of which Government is in office, say, "Let's have a fight" and go on strike. If their claims are thoroughly justified, they can expect to receive the support of the public. Immediately the Government loses that support, the unions must win.

The manner in which this Government has been handling the industrial situation brings no credit to it. Let me say in passing that much attention has been given to the amendment of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. I shall pass over some of these matters quickly, because I have a few poison baits still to lay. The hon. member for Baroona has hammered away at this amendment on many occasions, and he did so again in his recent speech. I do not think that the Government can claim any credit for that amendment. On the one hand, it allows

the Commission to decrease bonuses that may be payable by a company and, on the other, takes from the Commission the power to increase them. After all, the Commission—or Court, as it then was—had that power before, and I am not aware of any cases in which it operated to the detriment of the industry. That amendment, I would say, was loaded against the trade unions and the workers generally. The sooner the Government examines this question the better.

Everyone in the sugar industry knows what is happening there. Under an agreement, a prosperity loading of £2 a week has been paid to workers for 12 months or two years. This is in addition to the ordinary award rates and is a common-sense arrangement between representatives of the industry and the unions. I have not the slightest doubt that, when the present arrangement terminates, a tolerant attitude will be adopted by employers and employees, through their organisations and unions, and the allowance will continue as long as the industry can afford to pay it. What is wrong with that? Where is the need to protect oil companies and Mount Isa Mines Ltd., who are making such tremendous profits, and to load legislation against the workers?

As the Treasurer has frequently gone out of his way to establish how beneficent the Commonwealth Government has been to him in recent years, I do not think it would be a bad idea for me to make a few comparisons and show that he has not really done as well as he claims to have done, taking the position overall. The Commonwealth Government may have thrown him a scrap here and there, but the South Australian Government has not done too badly in some instances, particularly in the field of housing.

We know that no longer are there tax reimbursements as we understood them from 1942-43 to 1958-59. They now come under the heading of financial assistance grants, which brings them specifically within the terms of Section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution. No doubt one day Sir Robert Menzies or the Federal Treasurer will be telling the Queensland Government, as the Federal authorities are now telling the State Governments in relation to intrastate airline operations, the conditions under which that money may be spent, because Section 96 says—

"... the Parliament may grant financial assistance to any State on such terms and conditions as the Parliament thinks fit."

**Mr. O'Donnell:** They are doing it with the brigalow lands development and the Mount Isa line.

**Mr. WALSH:** They are doing it with education, tobacco, and many other things. They have now formed a Federal Roads Bureau. Even when Ben Chifley was in office and the Federal authorities tried to reach agreement with the State Governments, the formation of such a bureau was resisted

by the Queensland Labour Government in the knowledge that eventually it would be the Federal authorities who would determine road policy in the State. The Treasurer and the Minister for Mines and Main Roads can protest as much as they like about that.

**Mr. Evans:** We did not agree to it. It was done.

**Mr. WALSH:** If the Government has not agreed to it, I do not know how it can be done.

Let us take the Queensland allocation for 1956-57, known as tax reimbursement. It was £27,261,000. For 1964-65, it was set down in the documents presented in the Federal Parliament as an amount of £50,534,000, or an increase of £23,273,000. The mere quoting of figures is not worth much in itself, but I make that comparison to show that the Treasurer and Government of Queensland have received £23,273,000 more this year than the Government of Queensland received in 1956-57. The South Australian figure for the same year, 1956-57, was £15,717,000, and that State's allocation has been increased to £39,000,000, an increase of £23,283,000. That is not a bad effort for South Australia, with its concentration of population within 250 miles of the General Post Office at Adelaide and with its very poor land resources generally. Then let us turn to Western Australia. In the same period, its allocation has been increased from £13,706,000 to £35,282,000, or by £21,576,000. To that must be added another £8,560,000 recommended as a special grant, bringing the total to £43,842,000. Other interesting figures show Queensland's allocation for housing in 1956-57 as £2,750,000, as against £3,300,000 for the current year, while South Australia's allocation in 1956-57 was £3,600,000 as against £10,250,000 this year.

It is no good the Treasurer coming back and saying that that is due to the failure of previous Governments. This Government has been in office for seven years, during which South Australia's allocation for housing has gone from £3,300,000 to £10,250,000, whereas Queensland's figure has increased from £2,750,000 to £3,300,000.

Let me deal now with borrowings. I like to study these documents and not to get into a general discussion on these matters. Borrowings approved by the Loan Council for semi-governmental and local authority purposes, per head of population, are shown for Queensland as £11 5s. 6d. in 1956-57 and £20 3s. 9d. in 1963-64, an increase of £9 a head. The comparable figure for New South Wales was £6 6s. 4d. for 1956-57 and, in 1963-64, which is the last figure available, as the Treasurer knows, it increased £4 a head over the 1956-57 figure. For Victoria the figure for 1956-57 was £13 6s. 8d. per head and for 1963-64 £15 17s. 6d., an increase of approximately £2 10s. The combined borrowings for State

works and housing purposes, semi-governmental and local authorities, for the years quoted show an increase in Queensland of £16 per head, in New South Wales of £9 per head, and in Victoria of £6 10s. per head.

Years and years ago, when the Labour Party was in power in Queensland, there was often voiced the catch-cry, "Is it a question of borrow, boom and bust?" I will let the Treasurer answer that to justify what is shown by those official figures tendered in the Parliament of the Commonwealth—and they show that the borrowings under both heads increased by £16 in Queensland, £9 in New South Wales and £6-odd in Victoria.

My time is passing and I wish to deal with a few matters on the political scene, particularly with that section of the trade-union movement which seems to have as its objective the destruction of our way of government and, in particular, the arbitration system in this State. I have before me a newspaper report of a speech by Mr. F. G. Nolan, who is Queensland branch secretary of the Australian Railways Union. Everyone knows Frank Nolan. I know him very well personally and I have found him to be a very decent fellow. I have always conceded his right to be a Communist.

**Mr. Thackeray:** You don't know whether he is a Communist or not. He is a member of the Australian Labour Party.

**Mr. WALSH:** That does not mean anything to me. If the hon. member wants to get me into an argument on this, I will now give him some evidence.

**Mr. Thackeray:** He is not a Communist.

**Mr. WALSH:** If the hon. member will listen to my story he might have some justification for butting in, but there are other people around here I suspect even though they are members of the A.L.P. The hon. member for Rockhampton North is not going to teach me to suck eggs after my years of experience in the political arena.

Under the heading of "Rail unionist in praise of Russian ways" Mr. Nolan said, as reported in "The Courier-Mail" of 21 September 1964—

"The Soviet Union had reached the root of industrial and trade union disputes by eliminating classes from society, Mr. F. G. Nolan said yesterday.

"He described the Australian governmental system as a 'camouflaged dictatorship' and Australia's trade union organisation as 'most wasteful.'

"Russian people had no need to strike, but Australians did not have the right to strike.

" 'Without it, we are nothing better than slaves,' he said."

I do not know whether Mr. Nolan knows the history of the Labour movement. I should hate to think that we should ever

have to surrender our way of industrial life in this State for the system that operates in Russia. Mr. Nolan says that they do not strike in Russia. Of course they do not strike in Russia. There is only one weapon used to prevent them from striking or to prevent them from, say, engaging in tactics that disrupt the national economy. I am not complaining about that in Russia. If Russians want to do that in Russia, let them do it. But I do object to Nolan or anyone else trying to inflict that system on the Australian community.

The report continues—

"Mr. Nolan criticised the Australian trade union set-up as 'the most wasteful form of organisation that could possibly be conceived'.

"There were crafts unions, sectional unions and general unions (like the Australian Workers' Union), which cut across industries. For instance, there were 19 unions within the railways.

"Unionism was weakened because the smaller unions could not be used in the best interests of members."

After all the things that we have won in Australia, and in Queensland in particular, through the trade union movement and then channelled through the political Labour movement to this Parliament, I think it is a bit late in the day for Mr. Nolan to try to convince anybody that we are not enjoying a better system of trade-union organisation in this country. If he wants us to adopt a system under which there is only one union and it is conducted by the State, with the workers having to do what the State bosses say they must do, then let him say so. But the way he is arguing reminds me of Carl King, the well-known I.W.W.-ite who, in the early twenties when the Communist Party was first formed here went across to Russia and became one of the superintendents or foremen in one of their factories. His great boast when he came back on a visit to Australia was how the production had increased under their system. No doubt it did, because, as long as he was occupying that position as superintendent or foreman, a norm of production was laid down and every worker was expected to produce that amount, and from then on he got his bonus of so much. It was King's job as a Communist to see that every worker under his control was pulling his weight; otherwise he lost his job and all the perks that went with it. This "Courier-Mail" article continues—

"Russian trade unions were not dominated by the Communist Party. The Communist Party was the only party, and the unions co-operated with the party in the same way that unions in capitalist countries aligned themselves with a political party."

No intelligent member of this Assembly believes that the unionist or the worker in

Russia has any alternative to the trade-union system there. As I have forecast previously, Russia will one day be merged as part of the western capitalist system and, as I have said before in this Chamber, I am wondering what attitude those who seek to justify the Russian system of government will adopt then. Lest I need any justification, and in case the hon. member for Rockhampton North has any doubts about the position, I shall quote a member of the Federal Parliament who is regarded as being very Leftist in his attitude—Dr. Cairns. I do not know whether he is Leftist or not, but when I have listened to him he has shown that he has some capacity and some intelligence and that he can handle his subject in quite a capable way. Many do that, whether they hold Communist or other political beliefs. Let me contrast what Dr. Cairns said with what Mr. Nolan said. This article appeared in the "Telegraph" as recently as last Thursday, 15 October, Dr. Cairns said—

"... the A.L.P. must make it clear that the forces which stood for individual freedom in Australia were to be found in the Labour Party and the Labour movement."

I ask hon. members to note that he did not say, "in the Communist Party". For the benefit of those supporting Mr. Nolan in his comparison of Australian conditions with Russian conditions, let me again emphasise that Dr. Cairns said that the forces which stood for individual freedom in Australia were to be found in the Labour Party and the Labour movement. He then said—

"... the advantage of the individual in Australia had not come about because he was free to make profits but rather from the work of those people who had sought to increase wages and conditions, provide more for education and get rid of slum housing."

So much for the taunt from Mr. Nolan that the Australian system of trade-unionism was wasteful. Here we have a prominent member of the Federal A.L.P. giving views exactly opposite to Mr. Nolan's.

I come to another phase of this picture, and refer to a report that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" on 14 September this year. The article is headed, "A.L.P. is looking at itself." It has an Adelaide date line, and it reads—

"For the first time since Federation the Labour Party is seriously discussing at all levels the basis of its organisation.

The Opposition Deputy Leader, (Mr. Whitlam) said this yesterday. He said this was the most serious review of its organisation that the A.L.P. had done."

I ask hon. members not to say that I am making these statements because I am no longer a member of the A.L.P. I am quoting statements by men who are still part and parcel of the A.L.P., as it is called, and I think everyone agrees that Mr. Whitlam

is not lacking in some ability and some capacity and, I might say, personality. If they intend to have a look at themselves, I wonder what type of examination they will embark upon. I could suggest quite a few, one concerning Queensland. I would suggest that they have a look at the Q.C.E. in this State, and take a census of the individuals who constitute that body today, to see how many of them were members of the A.L.P. before 1955. I say 1955 advisedly. How many of these people were members of the A.L.P. before 1955? I could nominate quite a few who had no apparent sympathy with Labour Governments in those days. Do not ask me to go into names at the moment. I have mentioned some of them before. I could mention Vickers and Waters, for example.

Any rehabilitation that takes place in the Labour movement in Australia must start in Victoria where the dirty mess started in 1954. As I proceed I wonder whether these people are taking their consciences seriously within the Labour movement.

Mr. Wyndham, the Federal Secretary, was a particularly lucky man. He came all the way from England and within a few years, after being secretary of the State Executive of the A.L.P. in Victoria, he got the top position governing the Labour movement in Australia, that of Federal Secretary. Whether his name is Wyndham or not does not matter to me. After all, Sir Isaac Isaacs was a famous statesman and jurist, and a very popular Governor-General of this country. I do not think that he was ever ashamed of his name, and I would not suggest that he should have changed it when he became Governor-General.

Mr. W. H. Hartley, less than nine years ago, was a member of the Young Liberals in Western Australia. He was president of the City Club Branch of the Young Liberal Movement. He was supported by no less a person than Fred Chamberlain. A member of the Liberal Party less than nine years ago was appointed to the secretaryship of the State Executive of the A.L.P. in Victoria.

Is it not time that some of these people looked at the past loyalties of those they are appointing to these positions? Surely nobody will deny that. Anyone who looks up the Melbourne "Age" can find his photograph and description. He is 33 years of age. On the recommendation of Fred Chamberlain, the Western Australian A.L.P. Secretary, he has been appointed secretary of the A.L.P. in Victoria. I will not bore hon. members by reading copies of two letters I have here.

I had better deal with the territory of the hon. member for Maryborough. He would be disappointed if I did not take an interest in what is happening here. I regret that I have lost the particular authority I wished to quote, but I will name the source. It was a report in the "South Coast News" in 1950 to the effect that a person by the name of W. Elson Green—although he did not have three years' membership he was put against me as

a real, bona-fide, strong A.L.P. man in 1957—stood in 1950 as an Independent candidate against the endorsed Labour candidate.

He gave as one of his promises that one of his first endeavours if elected to this Parliament would be to bring about the formation of a Liberal Government. I do not know whether the Treasurer was in league with him at that time, but he did go on to say that he thought that the most sensible policy put forward in the 1950 campaign was that put forward by the leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. T. A. Hiley. Apart from what has happened to Hartley, who was appointed as secretary of the Victorian A.L.P. executive after being a member of the Young Liberals in Western Australia, it appears to me that even in this State the Liberal Party has its own method of indoctrinating these people who eventually find their way into the Australian Labour Party. There is that sort of mixed breed in the A.L.P. today. One does not know whether they are Communists, Fascists, Liberals, or Labour men.

When I see reports in the Press that some parliamentarians are fighting their way back against Trades Hall domination, I am reminded of the old days. All I hope is that they keep it up and take the initiative from the elements that seek to dominate the structure of the Labour movement in this State. I say that members of the Labour Party have no chance of becoming the Government whilst they allow themselves to be pushed around by the likes of Egerton, Nolan, and a few others up there.

In digging out a lot of my dunnage I discovered a few interesting letters among my files. Here is one that involves Mr. Chamberlain. It is a pity I did not know of it some years ago. It is dated 10 May, 1943, and bears the address 20 Harvey Street, Collie, Western Australia. It reads—

"D. W. Davis, Esq.,  
Room 26 Trades Hall,  
Perth, W.A.

"Dear Comrade,

"With reference to your telegram of even date, concerning F. E. Chamberlain and his endorsement as the selected Labour candidate to contest the Sussex seat in the Legislative Assembly in 1932, I desire to advise you as follows:—

"In this Council's minutes dated 6th March, 1932, Mr. Chamberlain was elected unopposed to contest the Sussex seat as the endorsed Labour candidate.

"Contained in the Council's minutes dated 4th September, 1932, is a complaint by delegate Courtney from the Rosa Brook A.L.P. against Chamberlain, but the minute does not give any specific details of such complaint. A further minute shows where Chamberlain stoutly denies the statements of Mr. Courtney.

"Later at the same meeting Mr. Chamberlain resigns as the selected candidate and the same is accepted on the

motion of Messrs. Lowry and Hawke. Nominations were again called for and Mr. H. S. Swinbourne was elected to contest the seat in the place of Chamberlain. This latter information is contained in the minutes of a special meeting of the Council held at Bunbury 30th October, 1932.

"Trusting this will prove to be the information you are seeking.

Yours fraternally,  
H. MAY,  
Secretary."

Here is another letter dated 18 May, 1943, addressed from Swanbourne to Mr. D. W. Davis, Secretary, Tramway Union. It reads—

"Dear Sir,

"In reply to your query re the notice of complaint made by Delegate Courtney of Rosa Brook Branch A.L.P. at a meeting of the S.W. District Council A.L.P. held in R.S.L. Hall, Busselton, on 4th September, 1932. I have to advise that Mr. Courtney moved and Mr. H. Williams seconded a motion for the expulsion of Mr. F. E. Chamberlain from the A.L.P. on the ground that his actions in connection with the co-operative dairy movement were such that they were not in the interests of the workers engaged on that industry and that in effect he endeavoured to strengthen his position with employers opposed to labour principles at the expense of the workers. These delegates considered that his candidature for the Sussex seat would not be in the best interests of the movement.

"After lengthy discussions the motion was withdrawn after Mr. Chamberlain had been given the opportunity to resign from the position of endorsed Labour candidate, which he did.

"Fresh nominations were called, Mr. E. D. Davies, Sec. S.W. District Council A.L.P., Mr. Chamberlain and myself were the candidates. I won the selection ballot by an absolute majority and my selection was endorsed at the special meeting of the Council in Bunbury on 30th October, 1932.

"Mr. Chamberlain failed in his duty as a defeated candidate and member of the Party in that he did not assist me in any campaign in 1933.

"I have no knowledge of his activities, if any, in the movement since that time.

Yours faithfully,  
(Sgd.) H. SWINBOURNE."

I am glad to have those items recorded, but I am sorry that I have lost the references relating to Mr. Green. The hon. member for Maryborough might want them, because, if I know this man as well as I think I do, he will be looking to the future. He has put a team up to oppose Horrie Davies in the plebiscite on this occasion, and, as the time suits him, we will find Green out in front trying to dislodge the man who has represented Maryborough in this Assembly

since 1955. However, that is a problem that the hon. member for Maryborough has to face. He can deal with it, but I should like the people of Maryborough to know the type of person who is inflicting himself on them now.

As I say, there is a great deal of evidence of this within the Labour Party at present. There are many genuine men within the organisation, and within the Q.C.E. itself, who still want to do the right thing and rid themselves of the monstrous growth that has developed, particularly since 1957. It comes back to what the Leader of the Opposition said. A report in "The Courier-Mail" of Friday, 13 October, 1961, describing what the paper called a clash between Mr. Duggan, Leader of the Opposition, and Mr. J. Egerton, President of the Trades and Labour Council, attributed this statement to Mr. Duggan—

"Mr. Duggan deplored that Australia did not have a Labour Government and said that the fact was that Labour had been unable to sell the people the assurance that it could be trusted. There must be some stocktaking of the position politically and industrially. There was as much apathy in the industrial movement as the political."

I do not blame the Leader of the Opposition for having said that in 1961, because two people who are saying similar things today are the Deputy Leader of the Federal Parliamentary Labour Party, Mr. Gough Whitlam, and Dr. Cairns. In the "Telegraph" of 15 October, 1964, under the heading "Presentation, not change, A.L.P. need", this report appeared—

"Canberra: The fundamental characteristics and ideals of the Australian Labour Party needed clearer presentation to the public rather than alteration, said Dr. Cairns (Lab., Yarra).

"Dr. Cairns was speaking on The Way to Office at a meeting of the Australian National University Labor Club.

"He said change in the party leadership, the Federal conference, and relations between the trade unions and the A.L.P. were the matters with which the party was primarily concerned.

"'In a number of respects some worthwhile improvements can be made,' he said.

"'I don't think the majority of people are very interested, concerned or knowledgeable about the alternatives offered by the parties at election time.

"'They have a feeling for the situation that goes deeper than that.'"

I could not agree more. One of my own complaints, even when Labour was in government, was that there seemed to be many weaknesses in the structure of the party in presenting Labour policy. There we have three men, the Leader of the Australian Labour Party in Queensland, the Federal Deputy Leader (Mr. Gough

Whitlam), and Dr. Cairns, an ambitious young man who might one day be either Deputy Leader or Leader of the Federal Australian Labour Party, all expressing themselves in a similar way in relation to the difficulties within the Labour Party.

I say this: until they clear out many of the brumbies and mixed breeds who have come into the party since 1957 and who in Labour campaigns or industrial unrest had shown no evidence of their desire to assist Labour Governments of the day, the problem will not be solved. That is the trouble within the Labour organisation, and I only wish I could live long enough to see the Labour Party organised in such a way that it would return a Labour Government to the benches in this Chamber.

Mr. LEE (Yeronga) (4.10 p.m.): I join with other hon. members on this side of the Chamber in congratulating the Treasurer on his eighth Budget. It is the first Budget that I have had the privilege of hearing as a member of this Parliament, and I know that it is a progressive one for this wonderful State of ours. It will give further impetus to the prosperity and economic growth that have been injected into the State during the past seven years.

Hon. members from the Country-Liberal Party benches have criticised the Opposition for not speaking at any length on the Budget. I thought maybe this was a little unjust; but how could even the Opposition attack a Budget as good as this one, when in their hearts they know it evidences the progress of Queensland? One cannot blame members of the Opposition for getting off the subject of the Budget as soon as possible, because I believe even they have some conscience and find difficulty in condemning it.

I take this opportunity of congratulating the Minister for Mines and Main Roads and the Treasurer on their foresight in the projected installation of electronic computers in the Treasury and the Department of Main Roads. The Treasury Department's computer will be the first of its kind to be installed in Australia, and I can only say that it is another step by our progressive Treasurer in keeping this State up with the latest scientific developments.

As to the computer for the Department of Main Roads, I can speak with first-hand knowledge. In a short period of time this machine will more than save its cost in the design section alone. The hon. member for Kurilpa has just said that it must be costing the State money. It has been costing the Department of Main Roads many thousands of pounds over the past few years because they have not been able manually to keep up with the design of roads and bridges. When the Department of Main Roads calls tenders for the construction of a section of road in the Far West or Far North-west, often up to 1,000 miles from Brisbane, the cost of setting up a construction camp and workshop and of transporting heavy machinery from Brisbane can be as much as £5,000

It should be remembered that the larger contractors are based in Brisbane. The job is usually one of two or three sections of road for which the department intends to call tenders. It often happens that because of a shortage of design engineers the contractor has finished the first section before the design of the other sections is ready for tender. He has to move his plant back to Brisbane at a cost of another £5,000, and then, some time later, tenders are called for a further section of the same road. If he is successful in winning the contract for the next section, he has to repeat the process of moving his plant. If any other contractor wins the contract, it still costs money that it would not cost if designs were prepared in time and the plant was already on the job. The new computer will save this additional expense because it will prepare the designs within minutes after the data have been fed into it.

Under the present system roads are costing more than they should because the contractor has to meet the cost of duplicating the shifting of his plant, and his problems of non-continuity of labour. He has to meet the problem of obtaining new competent labour, such as foremen and engineers for the job, as the men who were previously employed have been engaged on other construction work.

New men have to become familiar with local conditions. Local labour is very seldom available in remote areas where contract jobs are let. This is one of the very reasons why the contractor's price is sometimes above the department's estimate. He cannot gamble that further sections will come out for tender before he is finished the first section; his price must allow for a return of his plant, which is a direct charge of up to £10,000 against the job. It could be even 10 or 20 per cent. of the total contract price. If we multiply that figure by the number of contract jobs that are let we will soon realise the enormous sum of money that will be saved by the computer. This applies also to some of the day-labour jobs, but as they are not in the remote areas the establishment cost would not be so high. Nevertheless, it does apply on a lesser scale.

I am certain that the Minister, and the Commissioner of Main Roads, Mr. Barton, for whom I have the greatest respect and who has done more for the Department of Main Roads than any other previous Commissioner, know that this costly situation exists, and that the computer will save many thousands of pounds which can well go into the construction of roadworks urgently needed in this State.

I am sure that if contractors had no need to load establishment and return-to-base costs onto tenders, it would bring them below the department's estimates. At present tenders are often called a second time because of this factor. Again, on the lodging of tenders contractors must enclose a substantial deposit. This is held by the department, and even on the calling of a second tender a further

deposit must be lodged—sometimes before the return of the first deposit. It is all an additional burden to the contractor which must be costed to a job.

I do not wish on this occasion to go into the subject of re-calling of tenders, as I should like to say a few words on the study of Brisbane's urban traffic problem that is being carried out at present by the Government and the council. The Government is paying 80 per cent. and the council only 20 per cent. of the estimated cost of £142,750. This amount includes a £39,000 fee to world consultants, Wilbur Smith and Associates. This firm has carried out similar surveys in many of the major cities of the world, and I think that when it is completed next April we will have the information that will put us where we should be in relation to the future planning of Brisbane traffic.

Transportation studies follow a somewhat usual pattern of surveys on various factors to give material to feed to electronic computers. Ultimately we have a picture of travel characteristics and pertinent statistics. The future transportation system thus developed is based on the adequacy of the existing facilities and future travel desires. The latter are predicted on the probable distribution of people, jobs and facilities anticipated for 20 years hence.

The future travel desires are assigned to alternate plans in sufficient detail to allow an analysis of the benefits to be derived from each plan. The evaluation of these plans based on service, community benefits, and economic feasibility, enables the selection of the most desirable future transportation plan for the area of Brisbane. The plan itself is designed to serve as a guide for logical orderly development, and to provide a high-quality traffic service for anticipated traffic demands. It also makes possible the most economical and logical expenditure of public funds for improvements consistent with long-range needs.

A stage construction programme can be set up in various yearly increments to include the development programmes of both the Brisbane City Council and the State Government. It is recognised that a study of this type, even though it is the best known method of approaching the problem, can serve only as a guide for programming improvements which will require the revaluation of the future transportation plan. Realising this fact, a continuing-study staff has been established. It is being trained for the Brisbane study and will be available for periodic evaluation of the recommended plan.

The techniques employed in this study and the establishment of a continuing-study programme permit the ultimate in transportation planning and programming to be achieved, and the future travel desires of the residents of Brisbane will be both conveniently and economically served. This survey will be completed by about next April, but it will

not solve one of the major traffic problems in Brisbane at the present time, that is, Fairfield Road.

In my maiden speech in the House I expressed concern that a serious problem at that time could be accentuated with the opening of the new markets. It is even worse than I thought it would be, and Fairfield Road is now a nightmare drive for most hours of the day.

**Mr. Hughes:** The city council should do something about that.

**Mr. LEE:** That is correct. I will discuss that point later. Successive councils have had a realignment notice on most of the property from Sherwood Road to Venner Road for the past 20 years, and there is plenty of vacant land from Sherwood Road to Yeronga that could be resumed to make a much wider road to handle this increased traffic. As usual, the council is waiting for the shops and houses that are affected at Yeronga to fall down around the owners' ears so that it can resume "on the cheap." I can assure hon. members that this old realignment notice has had the effect of stopping progress in Yeronga.

This is a main arterial road out of Brisbane to the Darling Downs and to Sydney, and it is becoming more loaded with traffic every day. It is obvious that it cannot continue to carry the traffic that is using it now, so it is equally obvious that something has to be done. It is not much good my asking the council to do something on this road unless I also get on the "back" of the Main Roads Department about the problem of the intersection of Sherwood, Fairfield, and Ipswich Roads. This is another city traffic problem that has been shelved too long; it has its complications, but it is an area that is fast reaching saturation point.

I am fully aware that the intersection poses a problem that is complicated by the proximity of the railway, by heavy traffic on Ipswich, Fairfield, and Sherwood Roads, and by the necessity to provide additional road capacity between Rocklea and Oxley.

The Main Roads Department has had a report on the intersection from a firm of consulting engineers, and has made investigations on its own behalf. I am happy to say that plans are almost complete for a fly-over in this area, as well as improved road facilities between Rocklea and Oxley.

The probable plan for this work will be in two stages. I express the hope that we will get past the consideration stage quickly, and will get down to construction of at least one stage of the work. I know that it is an expensive project overall, and will probably cost more than £500,000. But it is a very urgent and very necessary project. I hate to think of the traffic chaos on this road when we get the usual summer rains and Ipswich Road is cut by flooding, and more traffic than ever is diverted to Fairfield Road. The widening of Fairfield Road and work on the intersection are complementary to each other.

Another problem that is still worrying about 6,000 people of the Yeronga electorate is the Tennyson power house.

**Mr. Hughes:** The shower-house.

**Mr. LEE:** I always refer to it as the shower-house. I have learnt to refer to it by that term during the last six months since I have become the local member for the area.

These people will be pleased to know that after much representation the Commissioner for Electricity Supply, Mr. Neil Smith, has written to inform me that he expects to have the soot problem in hand by the end of this year. I hope that that means that we will soon see an end to the extreme discomfort that has been with the people of Yeronga for so long.

Following an approach that I made to the Minister for Education, Mr. Pizzey, I am very happy to say that some Commonwealth funds have been made available for the construction of a senior science laboratory at the Yeronga High School. This school has grown to be one of the largest in the State, and the science building will have up-to-date equipment for study in chemistry, physics, and biology.

There will be also subject masters appointed in English, mathematics, science, geography, commercial subjects, home craft, and manual training. Previously there have been only subject masters at the 11 largest State high schools in Queensland. However, Yeronga, as with other high schools having enrolments in excess of 1,000, will now have these subject masters. Yeronga already has a senior mistress to look after the welfare of the girls.

**Mr. THACKERAY** (Rockhampton North) (4.30 p.m.): It has been an enlightening day to many of us in this Chamber. This afternoon we heard the hon. member for Mackenzie attack the Minister for Mines and Main Roads concerning roads in his area. I congratulate him on his action because I have had the unfortunate experience of travelling on those roads on numerous occasions and can assure hon. members that everything that he said is quite correct. Recently 40 homes were built at Biloela. I know that extensive damage was done to vehicles belonging to West Rockhampton Building Co., which was the constructing authority, that were used to transport building materials. Similar damage has been sustained by cars carrying workers to the site and home again at week-ends. I congratulate the hon. member for Mackenzie, and sincerely hope that this road will be bituminised in the near future. Rockhampton has always relied on the Dawson Valley trade.

**Mr. Hewitt:** The Dawson Valley trade has always gone to Rockhampton.

**Mr. THACKERAY:** That is true, and we in Rockhampton do not want to lose it. For that reason I support the remarks of the hon. member for Mackenzie.

The hon. member for Bundaberg made several attacks, one of them on Mr. Egerton, president of the Trades and Labour Council.

He referred to what Mr. Egerton said at a trade-union congress. Let me say that it is for the Government, not us, to answer that charge. It is directed to Government members, and answering it is solely their responsibility.

Concerning the hon. member's reference to Mr. Nolan, let me say that he is no more a Communist or Communist sympathiser than is anyone here. No member of this Assembly is a member of the Communist Party, nor is Mr. Frank Nolan. He was quite open in what he said when addressing the meeting referred to. He was giving a factual account of trade unionism in various countries, one of which was Russia. He knows, as does everyone else, that Russia is a dictatorial country, and he does not in any way subscribe to that ideology. He has never believed in dictatorship. I shall leave it at that so far as Mr. Nolan is concerned. It is up to the Premier to make a statement on Mr. Egerton. It is the Government's prerogative, not the Opposition's, to have anyone appear at the Bar of the House.

Much has been said in the last week or two about industrial unrest. The Treasurer made a statement concerning the trade-union movement. He referred to claims not being granted by the Commission and said that there should be a change of advocates. Mr. Egerton said other things. He said that members of the Industrial Commission had told the unions from time to time that there should be round-table conferences—in effect, conciliation—before approaches are made to the Commission.

We then find the Government refusing to meet unions, particularly the Combined Railways Union and the Sheet Metal Working Union, to discuss award conditions. The hon. member for Bundaberg raised a great hue and cry about the railway stoppages that have taken place in the last three weeks. I wholeheartedly agree with them because if unionists are refused the right to meet their employers, their only alternative is to stop work. Railwaymen are seething with discontent over working conditions, long-service leave, penal clauses, and industry allowances, and they wish to discuss these things with the Minister. In my opinion, if the Minister for Transport had met the unions three weeks ago instead of meeting them this week, as I believe he is going to, many of the stoppages would not have taken place. The Treasurer has made the statement that Queensland is bursting at the seams, and I wonder why the Government has not met the railwaymen and tried to reach an understanding with them on their claims.

It seems to me that the Government is dictating to the Industrial Commission on wages, and that is why Queensland is a low-wage State. One has only to compare wages paid in Queensland with those paid in other States to see that they are the

lowest in Australia, and that is taking into consideration Federal and State awards. If we take the Monthly Review of Business Statistics, No. 322, issued by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, and go to the Consumer Price Index, we find that from the March quarter of 1957-58, shortly before this Government came to office, till the June quarter of 1963-64 the increase in the cost of living in Queensland is higher than that in any other Australian State. The increase in the Consumer Price Index was 15.2 in Brisbane, compared with 14.1 in Melbourne, 12.1 in Perth, 13 in Hobart, and 10.8 in Sydney. Although the increase in the cost of living has been greatest in Queensland, we have the lowest basic wage in the Commonwealth, and I believe that the Government is definitely interfering in the conciliation and arbitration system of the State and deliberately keeping Queensland a low-wage State.

I should like to move now to my home territory, Rockhampton, and deal with several matters. I often wonder when the hon. member for Rockhampton South will realise that he is a member of the Government and also Mayor of Rockhampton. As Mayor of Rockhampton, he has made some outlandish statements to the people of Rockhampton about the Livingstone Shire Council. I ask hon. members to bear in mind that there is no opposition party in the Rockhampton City Council, which is composed entirely of Mr. Pilbeam's team. In the past year he has been making overtures for the transfer of certain portions of the area under the control of the Livingstone Shire Council, principally in divisions 1 and 4. Some time ago he made a statement at a meeting at Parkhurst that if the Livingstone Shire Council would agree to the Rockhampton City Council's taking over a certain portion of No. 4 division, he would promise the land-owners involved that they would be free of rates for 10 years. Under the Local Authorities Act—I have checked on this—that is a deliberate untruth or lie.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member knows that he cannot use the term "lie" in respect of a statement by another member.

**Mr. THACKERAY:** I will withdraw the term and say "untrue", Mr. Hooper. I said "untrue" to start with, anyhow. The hon. member knows that he cannot give them a remission of rates. The only organisations that can be released from an obligation to pay rates are churches and bodies of that type. That is in indication of the way in which he tries to hoodwink the people of Rockhampton.

In "The Morning Bulletin" of 13 October, 1964, an article appeared under the heading "Mayor charges Livingstone with being unfriendly." He was reported to have

said a number of things about the Livingstone Shire Council, and the article continued—

"The Mayor said that Livingstone could not provide the amenities such as water, bitumen roads and sewerage that industry was seeking."

First of all, he wanted portion of the No. 4 division to take in the industrial area around Parkhurst. Now he also wants a portion of No. 1 division, which takes in the area where T. A. Field Pty Ltd. is constructing its works. I know—and so do other members of this Chamber—what happened on the South Coast when the late Lloyd Roberts was Minister for Local Government. There was trouble between the Gold Coast City Council and the Albert Shire Council over the supply of water. The Rockhampton City Council could provide water to the Livingstone Shire Council on the same basis as the Gold Coast City Council was forced to provide it to the Albert Shire Council. The Gold Coast City Council placed a prohibitive charge on the Albert Shire Council and the then Minister for Local Government, the late Lloyd Roberts, told the Gold Coast City Council that the rate was exorbitant and would have to be reduced. The same thing should be done in Rockhampton.

The Rockhampton City Council should be instructed to supply water to the Livingstone Shire Council without the blackmail that the Mayor of Rockhampton is at present resorting to. This would enable industrial development to proceed in the Livingstone Shire. If this land is taken from the Livingstone Shire Council let us be fair and, instead of taking only the plum industrial areas, take portion of division 4 also portion of division 2, which includes Yeppoon, and the whole of division 1, which includes Keppel Sands, Emu Park and the area where T. A. Field Pty. Ltd. is building as well as where industrial expansion is going on at Parkhurst, and make the Livingstone Shire an area subject to rural rating only instead of the four different rates to which it is subject at the present time.

I say quite openly that the Livingstone Shire Council has nothing to gain in giving away land, because in 10 or 15 years' time the council will be able to reduce the overall rates in its four divisions. Although I may be treading on some people's toes in saying it, I think the division of this shire into four differently rated areas is fantastic. On one occasion Mr. McNamara suggested that the four divisions should be done away with and that the shire be divided into two rateable areas, namely, rural and residential, but that suggestion was rejected by the present Livingstone Shire Council. I think eventually that must happen as a result of industrial development that will take place there.

This area is adjacent to my electorate. The Livingstone Shire Council has built bitumen roads and I think the Rockhampton City Council should supply water to the

various industries that are coming in. I should like the Mayor of Rockhampton to explain why he thinks big industries will stop going into the Livingstone Shire if he does not get his own way. He even went so far as to say, "We will not continue to subsidise the provision of amenities at the seaside resorts." He said his council would not continue to contribute the amount of money they had been giving for amenities at the seaside resorts after a certain time.

There have been differences of opinion among members of the Livingstone Shire Council and recently one point was decided on the casting vote of the chairman, to whom I pay a compliment. I say quite frankly to the Livingstone Shire Council that I would not give any land to the Rockhampton City Council. It is not going to hurt the Rockhampton people, and giving land to Rockhampton will not be of any assistance to the Livingstone Shire Council.

I wish to deal briefly with police stations in the Rockhampton area. At the present time seven traffic officers are required to man 24-hour shifts seven days a week. They patrol the beaches and control the traffic problem in the shires of Fitzroy and Livingstone. In addition they have all their office work to carry out. We have 2,000 new licences a year with 4,000 renewals. The policemen must have four days off a week. It is shocking that we have not sufficient police in Rockhampton for patrol duty. At least another five men are required to give an adequate service.

It is rumoured that the Yaamba police station is to be closed. This will mean that the road between Rockhampton and Marlborough, a distance of about 80 miles, will not be patrolled very much. In the event of a serious accident or other emergency there will be no officer to call out from Yaamba. It must be remembered, too, that there is a hotel at Yaamba. Most likely two other police stations—at Lake's Creek and Alma Street—will be closed. The sergeant and the two senior constables at the Alma Street police station do a very good job. They make about 250 arrests a year. The Lake's Creek police officer controls the whole of the traffic coming from the meatworks, where about 1,200 people are employed when the season is in full swing. He also looks after the children going to and from school. It would be a retrograde step to close down either of these two police stations.

I pay tribute to the police in Rockhampton, and also to Mr. Gillie Smith, for what happened at a recent drowning accident. In the past two months there have been two drownings in Rockhampton. On both occasions the police have had to enlist the aid of civilians who provided them with a motor-boat and the equipment required for the recovery of the bodies. Recently an accident happened on a Friday after-

noon but the body was not recovered until 10.40 a.m. the next day. The police have already congratulated Mr. Gillie Smith for the magnificent job he did. I take the opportunity to place what happened on record and suggest that there should be some recognition of his efforts on that occasion. I place on record the statement of Senior Constable Murdoch which appeared in "The Morning Bulletin" of 28 September. The Rockhampton Press report states—

"Senior Constable Murdoch said that Gillie Smith had 'done a colossal job.'

"He had been alone in the water from 9 p.m. on Friday to 11.45 p.m. and again on Saturday throughout the search operations.

"Police paid tribute to the efforts of the skin divers who had assisted them in two drowning tragedies in the river."

This drowning occurred at The Rocks, opposite St. John's Hospital in Rockhampton. The boy was wedged in the rocks about 15 feet down. Gillie Smith told police that he estimated the speed of the current at about 15 knots. He told them also that it took him four minutes to crawl across one rock in his search for the body under the ledge of rocks. If Gillie Smith had not been available there was no person in Rockhampton with an aqualung to aid in the search for the body, and no boat was available. An outboard motor was borrowed from a friend of one of the police officers. It was only a small one and, with the run of the current and big tide, it would not hold the boat in position. It was a difficult operation. The boat was going backwards and the police officers were trying to stand up in it and, with the aid of torches, watch the bubbles from Gillie Smith to see where he was going.

As I say, two accidents have happened in Rockhampton in the past two months. I believe it is the Government's responsibility to make equipment available for the police. A similar accident may not occur in Rockhampton again for years—and I hope it never does—but they could happen at Townsville or Cairns, or any other seaside resort along the coast. The police have no decent equipment. There is an old clinker boat at Rockhampton which, I guarantee has not been in the water for 10 years. The Treasurer should know all about old clinker boats. He could put his fist through it because of the dry rot in it. The police could never use it, it would go to the bottom.

The Government should seriously consider getting equipment for the police at Rockhampton instead of their having to go around begging and borrowing, and relying on the citizens. They should be provided with an aluminium boat on a trailer, with a good outboard motor so that they can go straight to tragedies. They should get all the

equipment that is necessary. I am sure there are police officers at Rockhampton who would be only too willing to learn skin-diving techniques, so that they may be available in an emergency. I sincerely hope that the Government has a close look at this matter. It is above politics; anyone can be involved. I think we should see what we can do to give the police officers the necessary equipment to handle emergencies that arise from time to time. We never know when there may be a flood, and the police officers do not even have a boat to cope with it.

I come now to the housing position in Rockhampton. Several months ago I asked the Minister for Housing about the homes to be built in Rockhampton and he told me that 12 would be built. That was two or three months ago, but so far no tenders have been called for the erection of Housing Commission homes in Rockhampton. There is plenty of development taking place in the town: the second stage of the cement works is coming into operation; T. A. Field Pty. Ltd. start operations next year and other developments are taking place. There are about 20 people in Rockhampton waiting to buy a home immediately one becomes available from the Housing Commission, and there are 30 people with top priority, waiting for a home. No Housing Commission homes have been built in Rockhampton for two years, and in the seven years that this Government has been in office only 12 have been built for rental. The Government will do nothing about building homes in Rockhampton. I have been making representations for the last two years about the Housing Commission buying land in the North Rockhampton area. Every time I ask a question about it I am told, "It is still under negotiation." I often wonder how long it takes the Government to negotiate with some people.

There is another matter I should like to refer to. Under the Government's new plan employees in certain industries get priority for homes because the rental is guaranteed. Five weeks ago three homes were completed at Bajool for employees in the salt works but they are still unoccupied. They have been completed for five weeks and there are employees of the salt works waiting to go into them, but the management of the salt works will not allow them to occupy them. These homes are Housing Commission homes, built at great cost, with septic and many other modern amenities. However, because there is a difference of opinion between the management of the salt works and the Housing Commission in Brisbane, they are unoccupied. Surely to God something can be done to iron out the trouble so that the people may get into the houses. There are vandals around and a washing machine will be "going off", or something else will be "knocked off".

I now get back to the subject of the Rockhampton railway station. This has been

a great old political bugbear for many years. An article appeared in "The Morning Bulletin" on Friday, 18 September, 1964, as follows—

"New Railway Station for City by 1967,  
says Minister

"Plans Released

"A new £350,000 railway station for Rockhampton, to be completed by 1967, was announced by the Minister for Transport (Mr. Chalk) yesterday."

They go on patting each other on the back. Chalk pats Pilbeam on the back, and Pilbeam says, "What a good politician you are, Gordon." They say that plans have been completed, and that certain resumptions have to take place. That is the claptrap they go on with. I asked a question on 16 October about the new station. The answer commences—

"The construction of this new Station involves considerable rearrangement of the existing Station Yard, and until all plans are completed, the actual number of properties which will require to be resumed cannot be finally determined."

One week the Minister comes out with claptrap about a new station in 1967, and the following week he says in answer to my question that plans are not completed. Last week the Executive Council allocated a paltry £50,000—probably to pull out a couple of gum trees. That is what has happened so far as the railway station is concerned.

I am worried about where the homes of the people in the area bounded by Murray and South Streets are to be moved to. Most of them are old people who have lived there all their lives. They do not want to move very far from that area. The Central Boys' School is being sold next week for removal. If this Government has any guts, it should make that land available as an area to which they can move their homes. It is a big block of land bounded by Kent Street, George Street, William Street, and Denham Street, and will take all the homes which have to be moved from the South Street and Murray Street area. The homes would have to be moved only three blocks, and the old people would still be right in the heart of the city. If they have to go to an outer area, they will not have buses and it will cost them more to live.

This land could be transferred from the Department of Education to the Railway Department, and there would be less cost to the Government for resumption. The homes could be moved to this new area at small cost to the Government. If the Government did this, it would be a move in the right direction and would be welcomed by these people.

I now deal with the Rockhampton abattoir. I often wonder exactly how much dead money is involved here. In regard to the Mackay,

Rockhampton, and Gympie Abattoir Boards, the Annual Report of the Auditor-General reads—

“It is now proposed that an abattoir will not be constructed by the Rockhampton Board and negotiations are proceeding with two local companies with a view to entering into an arrangement whereby slaughtering in the district of Rockhampton will be carried out by these companies on behalf of the Board.”

This has been going on for the last two years. I asked a series of questions in the House, and was told that arrangements were being entered into between the Central Queensland Meat Export Company Pty. Ltd. and T. A. Field Pty. Ltd. for 20 per cent. killing facilities there, and for space to be made available for outside operators. That is what we were told approximately two years ago. Recently I asked another question, and was told that negotiations are still under way. I wonder who is pulling the tail of this Government—the grazing empire or some of the people the hon. member for Gregory spoke about. Look at the cost to the people of Rockhampton. The table reads—

	£
State Treasury Loans .. .. .	3,611
Other Loans .. .. .	4,809
Sundry Deposits .. .. .	10
	£8,430

Of that amount, £1,933 is cash at bank. This means that over £6,000 has been spent on the Abattoir Board in Rockhampton and no construction has yet taken place.

The hon. member for Mackenzie referred to the fact that two-fifths of the cattle in Queensland were within 300 miles of Rockhampton. A perusal of the results of the operations of all the abattoir boards in Queensland shows that only the Townsville Abattoir Board did not make a profit; it showed a net loss of £2,412. The Bundaberg Abattoir Board showed a profit of £966. The Ipswich Abattoir Board showed a profit of £1,042, and the Toowoomba Abattoir Board a profit of £11,348. There must be very fine administration there. As yet the Gympie Abattoir Board has not come into operation.

A comparison with the 1961-62 and 1962-63 figures shows that in every case there has been an increase in killing facilities. In Rockhampton, we have been denied an abattoir because of political skulduggery by the Government. It cannot be described in any other way. It is about time that the Rockhampton Abattoir Board was wound up, because it is not worth the cost of its members coming in, doing nothing but collecting their fees, and returning home. I say that it should be wound up till the return to power of a Labour Government, when an abattoir board and an abattoir will be established at Rockhampton.

Let me say in conclusion that I have not finished with the rackets and rorts in the recent ballot to elect members of the board of the Q.A.T.B. at Rockhampton. The Minister sent officers to Rockhampton to investigate the ballot but has refused to tell me or this Assembly the results of their inquiries. The chairman of the Q.A.T.B. board said that the matter was sub judice because it was being investigated by officers from Brisbane, and he could not discuss it. That is all political hooey, because it was not that way at all. I referred the matter to the Minister but he is still avoiding the question. He says that any action would involve legal processes. He cannot interpret his own Act. When he was a back-bencher, he, with the hon. member for Bundaberg, was the greatest screamer about Reds. Every morning when he awoke he thought that he had Reds under his bed. Here is an example of rorts and rackets in a ballot, yet he will do nothing about it. He sits with a smirk on his face, probably still worrying about some of the things that are happening in Brisbane. I am going to raise this matter at executive level of the Q.A.T.B. on 10 November. I know that there will be some movement then because they are not going to “cop” it down there.

**Mr. HERBERT** (Sherwood) (5.4 p.m.): I should like at the outset to express my sympathy with the family of the late Mr. “Watty” Wallace on his recent tragic death. I entered this Parliament with him in 1956, and of those who entered then there are left only the hon. member for Mackenzie and me.

Mr. Wallace was a member who took an intense interest in his area. I should like to pay a tribute to him for the way in which he treated me during my first trip to Cairns after my election. He devoted three days of his time and the use of his car to taking me round North Queensland and showing me many things I would not have seen in any other way. That is a tribute to a man who sat on the opposite side of the Chamber. We are all very much the poorer for his passing.

In this debate I should like to make a few comments relating to the Department of Health and deal with matters that I shall not be able to refer to later when the Committee is dealing with the various departmental estimates. First, I wish to discuss the possibility of establishing an after-care hostel for patients released from the Brisbane Special Hospital, Goodna. A number of patients in this hospital at the moment possibly could be released if they had suitable accommodation to go to. Many mental patients have difficulty in re-establishing themselves in life outside after leaving the hospital, and in many instances patients cannot be released unless there is someone to look after them during this difficult settling-in period. For some time an organisation called the Queensland Mental Welfare Association has been endeavouring to establish a fund for the provision of an after-care

hostel. It was functioning under the chairmanship of Mrs. Griffiths for many years, and the chairmanship has recently been taken over by Mrs. Douglas, the wife of an Ipswich clergyman. It is now in a position to open negotiations for the acquisition of a property for hostel purposes.

The Mental Health Federation has taken the Queensland Mental Welfare Association under its wing and hopes to support the provision of an after-care hostel. Many hon. members have some knowledge of the Mental Health Federation. I started it some years ago after a meeting in the Legislative Council Chamber, and it comprises representatives of all the organisations doing welfare work in the mental hospital. A couple of weeks ago it held a Poinciana Festival at the Special Hospital at Goodna, and proceeds from the festival were in excess of £1,000. That money will be used for the welfare of mental patients, and it is possible that some of it may be diverted to this after-care hostel.

A property is available somewhere in the Ipswich area for about £7,000. The Mental Welfare Association has not quite that much money in "kitty" yet, but it is reaching the stage where it can acquire a property with some governmental assistance. Approaches have been made to the Minister, but unfortunately not enough money is available this year. I hope that at a later date finance will be available to provide this facility, because an after-care hostel can repay many times over the money invested in it. It will take people from the mental hospital who now are entirely under the care of the State and re-establish them as useful members of society.

When a person has been in a mental hospital for some time and is released, he or she has to face a number of problems—things such as handling money, using public transport, getting to and from work—and they all present some difficulty to people who have been in a mental hospital for any length of time. People who are bad nervous cases but who are well enough to be released quite often have relapses under the stress of having to care for themselves immediately after leaving a custodial institution. If an after-care hostel could be established with Government subsidy, a considerable saving could be effected, because even if some of the operating expenses had to be met by the Government, the cost of keeping people in a hostel and having them contribute to their own board from their earnings would be infinitely less than the cost of keeping a person in a ward in a special hospital.

I hope, therefore, that the Minister for Health will be able to find from within his budgetary allowance sufficient money to support the Queensland Mental Welfare Association in its endeavour to provide the first after-care hostel in Queensland. If this one is successful, there could be openings for several more—certainly one to take people

from Charters Towers, possibly another one in the Toowoomba area, and one in Brisbane to take people who come from the psychiatric wards attached to the hospitals in the Brisbane metropolitan area. Quite a number of people who are released from the psychiatric wards for a short period return to them for the very good reason that they have no-one to look after them in the period during which they leave the care of the hospital.

The next subject I should like to discuss is the remarkable response that we have received in Queensland to the sex education programme sponsored by the Father and Son Welfare Association. I have the honour to be State president of this organisation and for the last two years we have been operating extensively with the use of a full-time field officer, namely, Lieutenant-Colonel Garlick, who was head of the Salvation Army in Queensland for many years. The response from schools in particular has been somewhat staggering. In the 1963 school year he delivered a total of 200 lectures and had an attendance of over 15,000 people. This particular service was taken as far north as Cairns and to many places in between, so we gave a good Queensland coverage.

So far in 1964, in the first six months of the school year, Colonel Garlick has given more than 100 lectures which have been attended by over 11,000 people. That is a considerable amount of work when we consider that only one man is doing it. We have only one man on the staff and he has been able to make direct personal contact with 11,000 people in six months.

**Mr. Bromley:** His wife is very helpful, too.

**Mr. HERBERT:** Mrs. Garlick, who helps at no cost to the Association, is responsible for a great deal of the work. The point is that we are always in difficulties with finance. We are fortunate in having a subsidy of £1,000 a year from the Department of Health and we also get assistance from the Queensland Health Education Council. We are exceptionally grateful for this assistance but the demand has reached the stage where we can do with further staff. It is impossible for one man to arrange lectures and also deliver them every night and do all the incidental bookwork that is involved.

To give hon. members some idea of just how much work is involved, first of all he has to approach the school principal and the parents and citizens' association. Generally that is done through a high school. After obtaining the co-operation of the principal and his committee, Mr. Garlick then has to prepare a letter which is given to every youngster in the school to take home to his or her parents inviting them to a subsequent series of lectures. That may mean anything up to 1,500 or 1,600 letters in the one school and then, of course, there is the lecture series.

The first lecture is one for parents so that they can have some idea of what the programme involves. The second night is generally a father-and-son programme, to which fathers are encouraged to bring their sons. They are divided into two sections, one for the younger boys and the other the older boys, 10 to 12, and 14 to 16 being the rough breakdown in ages. The next night mothers and daughters in the same age groups attend, and, on the final night teen-agers.

On the night for the mothers and daughters, or the fathers and sons, a film is shown and a lecture is given, followed by questions. We do not attempt to give the youngsters in one short evening's lecture a complete sex knowledge or anything like that. What we do attempt to do is to break the ice so that the position is established where the mother and daughter or the father and son can discuss the matter further without undue embarrassment.

We have received hundreds of letters over this period from people who have been almost pathetically grateful for the help that has been given in a problem that they are absolutely unable to cope with. Many parents, of course, have had inadequate sexual instruction themselves and they are not in a position to pass on the proper information to their children. Consequently, this organisation is filling a gap in our present programme. The important thing is that it is voluntary. It is not an attempt to shove sex education down the throats of children who are forced to go to school.

I would not for one moment suggest that sex education should become part of the school curriculum. There are some parents who are fortunate enough to be able to give sex education to their children in a fully competent manner, but there are many more who, for various reasons, do not want their children to receive any sex instruction. Whether they are right or wrong their wishes should be respected. More parents would like to have some sort of assistance in this direction, and it is available through this organisation.

I should like to thank hon. members who have chaired these meetings all over Queensland. We appreciate the help that various State members have given. A programme of sex education is not easy to launch. We have the support of most churches—most of them have a representative on our council—but it is necessary to be extremely careful with such a subject. It is felt that if the State member introduces the field officer it is an indication to the parents that the organisation is worth supporting, and one to which they can trust the care of their children. The problem is to obtain the services of competent field officers. This is a real difficulty because mothers and daughters particularly will not listen to lectures on sex education by untrained people. As a matter of fact we find that they will listen only to a cleric or a

doctor. Obviously we cannot afford to pay the sort of fees that one would have to pay a doctor for this type of work. Lieutenant Colonel Garlick has stepped into the breach, and he does this work particularly well. His wife handles the book sales and quite a deal of the work associated with the mother-and-daughter section.

The books that are sold are printed by the movement in Sydney. They are graded according to age. They are available for youngsters who are not able to attend the lectures and for subsequent reading by those who do attend. There has been a tremendous demand for these books throughout Australia. On 9 November the 1,000,000th copy to be printed in Australia will be handed over by the Governor of New South Wales to the director of the movement at a function in Sydney. The fact that 1,000,000 books on sex education have been sold since the Father and Son Welfare Movement started its operations in Australia gives some idea of the response throughout the country to this Movement's programme of sex education. At one school in Brisbane only a few months ago 800 people attended one of the lectures. Among the audience were many professional men, including doctors and others who, one would imagine, would have been competent to deal with the sex education of their children. They all expressed great appreciation for the work that is being done.

I suggest at this stage that possibly the work of the field officer could be lightened if we had a system of rostering the high schools in turn so that each high school would know the dates on which the field officer would be available to them for the three or four nights required in that particular area. It would save him the trouble of having to contact the high school principal and the school committee. Some school committees do not know anything about the work of this organisation, and there are one or two principals who have not read the letter from the Director-General of Education. For this reason we have had some misunderstandings with these people about the work we do. The Director-General, Sir Herbert Watkin, was guest speaker at our last annual meeting. He has written to all his principals, telling them that the work of the movement is Government-subsidised, and that it is accepted by his department as an organisation well worthy of consideration, so that there is no doubt about the official reaction to these programmes. If we could have dates set down for visiting the various high schools in turn it would save us a considerable amount of work in arranging the programmes at the various schools. We now have return requests from schools that we visited last year and that were in some doubt about the value of our work. There is no doubt this year; we have requests for returns and the schools are most enthusiastic in the reception of our field officer.

However, we have some difficulty in obtaining suitable films. The Health Educational Council has been particularly helpful in lending us films from its library, but some of them are getting old and worn out and need replacement. Unfortunately, sex instruction films are not easily obtained. We are now negotiating for another film from America in an attempt to replace the films that are causing us some difficulty in our evening programmes. I ask that consideration be given to the granting of additional assistance to the Father and Son Movement to enable some office work to be done so that the field officer may be more fully engaged in producing programmes. I point out that in the South the office staff does all the book work and the field officers simply present the lectures. We are fortunate here in that we have a man who is prepared to do the whole job. However, as he has retired from the Salvation Army we cannot expect that he will continue forever and, when the time comes for his replacement, we will not get another person with a wife who is prepared to do so much work, and to be so enthusiastic in carrying out this particularly difficult task. Our field officer has just returned from a trip to Mt. Isa in response to an invitation to visit that town. As we received a donation from the Mrs. Nicklin Welfare Committee we sent him to Mt. Isa for a series sponsored jointly by the school and by church organisations. It was very successful and we hope that every two years he may be able to go to parts of the State well removed from the metropolitan area.

If we merit Government support we can extend our services throughout Queensland. However, we are straining our financial resources in covering the area we do, because we do not receive large donations from the general public. A Government subsidy of £1,000 a year, and door takings—we have to charge people who attend a few shilling admission—are our sole means of finance. If we do not receive some additional assistance we cannot extend our work to meet the demand, and we do not wish to institute a system of rostering for schools.

My next point concerns the possibility of establishing a general hospital in the south-western suburbs area, roughly along the Ipswich line, from Chelmer out. Officially we are south of the Brisbane River, and because we are in that position sick people from Chelmer are taken to the Princess Alexandra Hospital. To get to that hospital by public transport one has to go to town by train and then by tram to South Brisbane. Travelling by public transport it is impossible for a man finishing work at 5 o'clock in Brisbane to get from town to his home, pick up his children, return to the Princess Alexandra Hospital, and get there in visiting hours—without allowing any time for a meal. It just cannot be done. People have to miss out on visiting the sick in hospital or pay high taxi fares.

One can get to the Brisbane General Hospital much quicker. The train goes right through to Fortitude Valley, and it is a comparatively short trip. Because of this problem, a maternity hospital was established at Corinda. It is working to full capacity and is very much appreciated. I suggest that a general hospital should be established in this area. There is land available at Oxley, Darra, and Wacol. I name those three points because they are on the railway line and are within easy reach of the two satellite towns of Inala and Centenary Estates. They will in the future be almost big enough to support their own hospitals. If it is not established on the railway line, people living on the railway line will have to travel by train and bus in order to visit the hospital, whereas from Inala and Centenary Estates a straight bus run to the railway line would enable them to visit a hospital established near the railway line.

A number of sites have been suggested. One of the suggestions is the possibility of converting part of the Mounted Police Depot at Oxley for hospital purposes. I do not think that that is as suitable as some of the other sites, because it is on a main arterial road and is not close to direct through transport. A special bus service would have to be established to cater for a hospital situated there, and that might not appeal to the present operator of the buses in that area. It would mean a break in transport for people who live in the major centres of population right through from Chelmer to Booval.

A hospital established anywhere in that area would cater for people living in the outskirts of Ipswich, or on the Brisbane side of Ipswich, and the people of Centenary Estates, an area which will grow as fast as Inala has and which will be looking for some suitable hospital accommodation. Because they are technically on the south side of Brisbane residents of that area will be expected to go to the Princess Alexandra Hospital, but getting from that suburb to the Princess Alexandra Hospital would create quite a number of difficulties. It would be easier for them to go to the Brisbane General Hospital.

For financial reasons, I suggest a convalescent hospital able to handle routine minor operations, but not major surgical operations or operations requiring specialist attention. They could still be handled by the bigger hospitals. This hospital could handle convalescent cases and the routine ailments. At Oxley, Darra, and Wacol, there is land available within easy walking distance of the railway station and bus routes. Sites available in those areas are in places where a large number of cars could be accommodated. Anyone who visited either of the major hospitals in visiting hours knows the chaotic parking conditions that exist there. One often has to walk a mile from one's car to the hospital.

If we could establish a hospital on the outer fringe of Brisbane where these new growing suburbs are established, it could be used to the full and would take a considerable amount of pressure from Princess Alexandra Hospital. Both general hospitals at the moment are used to their fullest capacity, and additional hospitals will have to be established in the near future. I suggest that this is the logical place to put one.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Don't you think that population would warrant a hospital in both places?

**Mr. HERBERT:** I do not think that at this stage we should have so many suburban hospitals. We should establish them along the railway line so that people from suburbs on the railway line can go to them. A hospital can be established at Wacol where there is a great deal of Government land. We already have a special hospital there and its laundry and other facilities could be used by a smaller general hospital. It would be within walking distance of the Wacol railway station, and Progress Road brings Inala within a mile or so of it. The Centenary Estate is not very much farther away on the other side. Anyone living near the railway line from Chelmer to Booval would be within easy reach of the area by train. The existence of an institution of that type would possibly induce the Railway Department to run a few more trains on this line.

In the Wacol area there are ample facilities for the parking of cars. This aspect of any large public utility must always be considered. Approximately 95 per cent. of people visiting such an institution would travel in their own cars, and parking space for them must be given consideration. The present major hospitals were established before cars became the popular means of private transport, and no consideration was given to the parking of vehicles. At Oxley there is a belt of land not being used at the moment between the site being acquired for the Oxley High School and Canossa House, which is an institution for the sick aged run by the Roman Catholic Church. This is within a quarter of a mile of the Oxley railway station, and could be served by buses that travel to the Oxley railway station from Inala and Centenary Estate.

Possibly such a hospital could have part of its services devoted to the care of the sick aged, because in my area almost every church has a home for aged people. The final hospitalisation of people from those homes does create a difficulty. The Methodist Church has established "Bethesda" at Corinda. These two homes for the sick aged are the only two that take bed-ridden patients. The Presbyterian Home at Corinda has many inmates. A hospital, with an annexe for senile patients, in the area would be used to the full and would take some of the weight off the two hospitals that are at present doing the job for the whole of Brisbane.

We appreciate the maternity hospital at Corinda and the facilities that have been given to the area, but we would like to see a general hospital in the same locality.

**Mr. BYRNE (Mourilyan) (5.33 p.m.):** I have read with interest the Treasurer's Financial Statement, together with the associated tables, and I think it only fair to say that it sets out very well indeed the financial affairs of the State. Many, or at least some, may find difficulty in absorbing all the information that it contains. I certainly find some difficulty because, unless one goes through it quite intensively, one is inclined to miss many of the points in it.

The Financial Statement merely shows receipts and payments, and does not take into account moneys that may be owing to the Government for various services. I listened to a speech made here some time ago by a member who referred to the fact that some graziers in the West owed considerable sums of money in transport fees. If these had been paid, I suppose the amount involved would have been included in the Financial Statement and the bulging figures presented would have been further increased considerably. The Minister for Transport referred to the fact that £250,000 was owing. It is difficult to say how much money would be owing for transport fees in other areas in Queensland, but if all that money were taken into account, what a wonderful Financial Statement would be presented to us. I understand, too, that fairly heavy penalties are imposed, and I think it is only fair that we should be told what they amount to, how much has been paid, and the balance remaining unpaid. I have no doubt that that will be taken care of at a later date, but I think I should mention it now.

We know that the Treasurer is a very accomplished accountant, and we know that moneys coming into his hands are husbanded very carefully and invested to the best advantage. Let us take the Parliamentary Contributory Superannuation Fund as an example. He has invested all the moneys available to him from that fund at a very satisfactory rate of interest and the fund is in a very healthy state. I think we should at least give him credit for that.

In the Financial Statement the Treasurer had this to say about the revenue from the sale of Crown land—

"With land prices once more recovering to higher levels, an acceleration in sales of Crown lands, which included a number of valuable sites . . ."

and so on, and he went on to give certain figures. I wondered what the position would have been if Crown lands whose opening for the production of sugar cane I advocated had been made available for sale prior to the granting of cane assignments. I think it would be safe to say that if the Government had opened that land for sale it would have received a return of up to £1,000,000, and

individual applicants would not have had to acquire land privately at a cost of up to £100 an acre.

The two points that I have mentioned would have resulted in a considerable increase in revenue, if the Government had taken advantage of them.

The Treasurer's Financial Statement also refers to the effective sugar storage capacity in all ports, and I notice that the capacity of each terminal other than Mourilyan has been doubled or more than doubled. The capacity of the terminal at Bundaberg has increased from 47,500 tons to 195,000 tons, Lucinda from 75,000 tons to 150,000 tons, Mackay from 140,000 tons to 420,000 tons, and Townsville from 140,000 tons to 280,000 tons. On the other hand, Mourilyan remains at 140,000 tons. I am not suggesting for one moment that there may not be a good reason why Mourilyan's capacity has not been doubled, but I believe that the port has not been developed as quickly as it should have been, and there is a good deal of local support for that opinion. The Treasurer also said that a contract has been let to deepen the harbour at a cost of £360,000, and this will be of great advantage to the port. We hope to see ships loaded fully at Mourilyan instead of being loaded only partly and then being sent to other ports to be topped up.

I think the time has come to speak of the sugar industry and I propose to do so this afternoon. I should have liked the Minister for Primary Industries to be present. I am concerned about the economic position of the sugar industry; I know it is good, but changing circumstances entitle one to ask numerous questions as to the likely eventual position, as to whether we are entitled to be over-enthusiastic as many of us are at the present time, and as to whether we have not already achieved our objective in the light of changed circumstances.

I do not pose as an authority on the sugar industry; I am merely one of those who have been associated with it for a number of years. I know that a great many experts are associated with the industry, but its ramifications are such that we must be exceedingly careful about how we are to progress. My humble opinion is that the time is opportune to sound a warning note to those who are inclined to be over-enthusiastic. I notice in this afternoon's paper a report that we are able to sell to America for 1965 only the quota of 172,000 tons whereas previously it was 215,366 tons. That is a drop of 40,000-odd tons. It is not very promising.

As I have moved about, I have often been asked the question, "Mr. Byrne, do you think it is right for me to invest my money in the sugar industry by acquiring land for future production?" That is a question often asked of members who represent sugar areas. Usually the land that is offered for sale is offered at an excessive price of £100 or more an acre. That is why I am so annoyed and

angered at this Government's failure to make Crown land available at a considerably lower price per acre than is being asked by individual landholders. The Government did not take that opportunity although plenty of Crown land is available for the purpose. There is some suggestion that we should not interfere with private enterprise and that land privately owned must first be sold to prospective buyers even though they bankrupt themselves by buying it at an excessive figure.

The land that has been sold by these private individuals has been lying idle for a great many years, harbouring pests of all descriptions, and often it is land that has been leased from the Crown without any provision whatsoever for improvements. Then, some of the land that has been offered and sold at an excessive figure had been acquired for next to nothing in the first place. Naturally, if you buy something for very little you do not lose much by holding it over the years. That being so, it is frequently held pending the possibility of something turning up rather than, by the exertion of some effort, being put into a productive state. I do not want to delay the Committee by going over the several North Queensland examples I could give, but something has to be done in the future. If our Crown land becomes available to the public for production, at least there should be some conditions as to settlement and improvement. It should not be merely handed out to them saying, "There it is. If you are successful in the ballot go ahead. There is no obligation on you to improve it." There have been several cases where land obtained for almost nothing has been sold for a fortune. I can prove that.

As to whether prospective growers should invest, I think it is purely and simply a gamble on whether the land will be assigned in future, whether the applicant will be accepted, and whether he can comply with other conditions which probably the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board will require.

At this stage I would give it as my opinion that the acquirement of land at an excessively high price in anticipation of a future cane assignment is simply madness. My inquiries lead me to believe that the Gibbs report with its anticipations has already been superseded because the then existing circumstances have changed, and this has materially altered the sugar outlook. At the time when the report was being prepared the world consumption aspect seems to have appealed to the committee of inquiry, and possibly they did not make a sufficient survey of the prospective production of the world sugar countries, both beet and cane. Production of beet sugar, particularly in the Communist-bloc countries, and in Europe generally, has revived considerably after a very serious winter. I am not critical; my interests lie with the progress and development of the sugar industry and of the growers and workers in

that industry. The urge for expansion in the sugar-producing countries of the world has been strong—perhaps even stronger than in our own country. My information leads me to make that statement. In South Africa the Government declared that any individual or company would be permitted to bring 250 acres into cane production. If more than 250 acres were required all that it was necessary to do was to apply for and obtain a permit.

The expansion of sugar production has been world wide for a long time. We are coming in at this late stage to try to catch up. It is this situation which has brought about a sharp decline in both world sugar prices and what is known as world sugar “futures”. I understand “futures” means that you buy against later deliveries. The position has changed so rapidly and so acutely that thought might well be given to the setting up of a supplementary committee to assess the whole position. I do not mean to say that what has been done should be capsized, but I think it is of sufficient importance that the authorities and those well versed in the industry, particularly the Minister for Primary Industries, should make a re-examination of the sugar industry as we see it today. If any further expansion does take place—we know it is anticipated—I think that the greater share of the assignment should go to the new grower. We hear statements made today—I think this has been substantially proved—that in certain areas cane will not be harvested this year. We are told that some of it will be left in the paddocks. Certain growers will harvest in excess of their peak while others will not harvest their peak. We also hear that expansion programmes in certain mills are not ready to cope with the terrific tonnage of cane available.

The other day, an hon. member said that a cane farmer owning cane land in proximity to a town should have the right to dispose of it, or part of it, as town allotments and that the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board should give him an equivalent area. I do not think that should be permitted. The trend seems to be developing that if a man has something to dispose of at a high price he sells it and then asks the Government to give him something in exchange. That is altogether wrong.

If a cane farmer had 100 acres, and subdivided it into five allotments to the acre, the average price would be £250 an allotment. For the 100 acres he would get £125,000. His return may be in excess of that figure. I do not think that £250 is too much to allow, because if one wants an allotment close to any of the sugar towns one pays more than that. Hon. members can see that a cane farmer would be advantaged by subdividing his cane farm for house allotments and, at the same time, applying for an equivalent area to be re-assigned to him. That, too, would be wrong.

I have another matter concerning land policy. I have come to the conclusion that each member of the Government has his own ideas about what should be done about land, and who should be entitled—

**Mr. Camm:** That is correct. We all have our own ideas; there is no mass direction over here.

**Mr. BYRNE:** That is what I said. I said that it seems to me that members of the Government have individual ideas on land tenure.

I have quoted the hon. member for Gregory before and perhaps I may be allowed to quote him again. I direct the attention of hon. members to this statement of his—

“ . . . whereas the big companies can renew their leases virtually without so much as an inquiry every known reason is found why the areas of small men . . . should not be increased.”

I am not in a position to say whether that is factual or not. The statements made by the hon. member from time to time are indeed very alarming. On one occasion he referred to the Government of the day as trafficking in land matters. Here is another pearl of wisdom that does not do much credit to the Government.

“ . . . why should he be penalised while others are being granted tremendous areas—people who will muddle on in the same delightful way and do precisely nothing about bringing the land into production but nevertheless get this wonderful recognition from the Government through a renewal of lease?”

That is a terrible thing and it should not be tolerated. I contend that the hon. member's speech is an indictment of the Government on its land policy.

The hon. member for Whitsunday dealt with the sugar industry, and made suggestions about the aggregation of land. He said that he did not believe in the aggregation of land, but that he did not discourage anyone from making money out of subdivision and sale. His idea is to get as much land as possible from the Government, subdivide it, and make as much money as possible out of it.

**Mr. Camm:** I did not say that.

**Mr. BYRNE:** It is recorded in “Hansard”.

**Mr. Camm:** I do not think so.

**Mr. BYRNE:** The hon. member did say that money would be made out of the young men desirous of settling and farming in a country area.

**Mr. Camm:** They cut it up and, when a young person wants to settle on the land, they make money out of it. That is why I object to aggregation.

**Mr. BYRNE:** I am only trying to quote the hon. member correctly, and I am trying to contrast the positions of various members.

We have one member believing in straightout freeholding and aggregating as much as possible and saying that other provisions in the Act control the matter. Another hon. member said that freeholding should be restricted to an area not much in excess of a living area. But what is a living area, and what is "not much in excess of a living area"?

Members of the Government believe in getting what land they can from the Government and disposing of it, when the opportunity arises, at the highest possible price to young men who thus enter the industry at a price which they cannot really afford to pay. That is happening in the sugar industry and it will extend to areas in the West.

**Mr. Ewan:** Not unless you alter the rainfall.

**Mr. BYRNE:** I have often heard the hon. member for Roma's opinion on freehold land. If I remember correctly, he had a perpetual lease at one time and made a good thing out of it.

**Mr. Ewan:** I have never held a perpetual lease.

**Mr. BYRNE:** He said that what he disposed of was the improvements on the property, and that the land was not worth anything. He cannot tell me that, and I do not think he could tell the hon. member for Bundaberg that. He has been happy with perpetual leasehold, and would be happy to get a perpetual lease.

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

**Mr. BYRNE:** I have been dealing with the land and pointing out the different viewpoints of various members of the Government. I desire to make the point that if the Government continues to alienate our land from the Crown, it will soon be realised that a great mistake has been made. I do not wish to cast any aspersions on those directing the operations of King Ranch under the franchise given to them. They are certainly doing a good job, although doing it slowly. My main objection to the granting of the franchise was that our own people could develop the land just as well as could this foreign company, of which the hon. member for Clayfield complained. He said that he would have preferred to see the privilege of developing this area given to the Hooker company. I understand that this company would have very much liked to get this land on the same terms and conditions as those applied to King Ranch Development Company Pty. Ltd.

My complaint is that we are not entitled to give away for a mere song great tracts of our most fertile country whilst so many of our young people are clamouring to go on the land. I could deal with this subject at great length, but I do not desire to do so tonight.

Reports reaching me indicate that it is proposed to close the police station at Chillagoe. Although this is not in my area, I spent much of my boyhood years in the

district and I know it very well. Although the district surrounding Chillagoe is no longer the hive of activity that it once was, I think it would be a calamity if the police station were closed.

**Mr. Dewar:** It has been all right since you left.

**Mr. BYRNE:** That may be so. It may have improved when I left.

When I go to the little towns in the Peninsula that once gave employment to 5,000 or 6,000 people, and to places such as Croydon and Burketown that in the early days provided work for 20,000 to 30,000 people, and meet people who have remained, I feel very sad. I ask the Minister in charge of police to take into consideration the area of the Gulf country. If it is in his mind to close the police station because of the present depressed state of the district, I ask him to give it further consideration and realise what his action might possibly bring about. I suggest that the Minister might call together members representing northern electorates for a discussion on the whole matter. We may be able to give him some information that at the moment is not in his possession. I very strongly urge him to confer with us and, if it is possible for him to do so, give an assurance that he will not close the Chillagoe police station or any police station in the Gulf country and the Peninsula. I realise that the Minister has a fairly big job to do in police administration, and I can speak of members of the Police Force only in the highest terms. Again I put it to the Minister seriously; do not close back-country police stations, particularly those serving huge areas in the northern parts of Queensland, the Gulf country, and the Peninsula.

**Hon. A. T. DEWAR** (Wavell—Minister for Labour and Industry) (7.21 p.m.): I have sought to enter this debate only because of the comments that have been made by hon. members opposite, in particular their comments relating to the closing of some of the police stations in the Brisbane metropolitan area, and I have here a map showing the new police divisions in that area.

In introducing his contribution to the debate, the Leader of the Opposition made some comments along these lines: that the closure of police stations was hastily conceived, that the scheme was increasing the trend towards centralisation, and a few other comments that are not particularly relevant to what I have to say. I wish to make it abundantly clear at the outset that the decision to close various stations in the Brisbane metropolitan area and to make a survey of the entire State was most certainly not hastily conceived. It was made in the light of the amount of money that is made available for this particular governmental service and to make the best use of the personnel we have.

**Mr. Hanson:** There should be more.

**Mr. DEWAR:** The hon. member for Port Curtis says that there should be more. I propose to deal with the outlook today in respect of this particular department and the outlook that prevailed when his political party shamed the Government benches of this State.

**Mr. Tucker:** Are you going to get on your hobby-horse?

**Mr. DEWAR:** When you are on a good thing, stick to it! This debate has had two aspects: firstly, there has been an attempt to vilify the Government on the basis of lack of knowledge; secondly, there has been an attempt to vilify the Police Force of this State. I propose to deal with those two aspects of the matter.

There was only one design, and there is only one design continuing, in respect of the stations in other parts of Queensland—that is, to improve the police services in the interests of the people of this State. We believe—I have every reason to conclude that the people who advise me have a great deal more knowledge of these matters than have members of the Opposition—that by making police personnel more mobile through the provision of more vehicles, we shall be able to give the public better coverage, with more road patrols and more men on traffic duties to take care of the problems of traffic and the mounting toll of the road. We believe that it will give longer hours for the manning of stations. We believe that, as a result of this deployment of personnel into specialised fields, we shall be able to increase the number of persons concerned with criminal investigation work, particularly stock squad investigations, because figures that I shall give later will show that there is a need for greater activities in this field. Because of the deployment of personnel as it exists today, it is impossible to devote men to what are highly technical modern problems in the field of crime detection. Also, we will be able to place more men on motor-cycles on traffic patrol. Rather than being ill-conceived, this step has been designed for that purpose.

As I said earlier, the Treasurer and the Government make available to each Minister a certain amount of money to run each department. Those who have read the Estimates of expenditure will have seen that the Police Department requires £5,869,382 for the present 12 months plus in excess of £500,000 for the superannuation scheme. Within the field of that amount of money made available to the department we are approaching the matter of adequate public protection in the best possible way. In other words, when you cannot get more money to govern a specific matter you look to your plant to see if you can get better usage of the plant that you have. That is precisely what has been done. It most certainly is not ill-conceived and it most certainly will be successful.

As I said earlier, the main aspects of the comments of members of the Opposition have been related to an attack on the Government.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** That is what we are here for.

**Mr. DEWAR:** Sometimes I wonder what they are here for.

I should like to give some indication of the approach of this Government, as opposed to that of the Australian Labour Party in Government, in this particular field. In 1950-51 there was an approved total of 2,076 personnel for the Police Force. It went to 2,277 the following year. The year following that the approved number was 2,362 but the actual number sworn in was 2,306—in other words, 56 fewer than were budgeted for. The following year there was no greater allocation of personnel and 70 fewer were sworn in. The year after that there was no greater allocation of personnel and 100 fewer were sworn in. The following year there was again the same allocation and 77 fewer were sworn in, and again in the following year there was the same allocation and 18 fewer were sworn in.

So that from 1952-53 to 1956-57 not one officer was added to the budgeted number of police personnel in this State. During that time 172 men was the maximum number allocated to traffic duties. I shall deal with cars and other aspects later.

In our first year as the Government only 10 months were available to us but my colleagues went into Cabinet in sufficient time to rehash the budgets in that first year. Certainly the amount they had to work on was that which had been made available as the result of the damning attitude of Labour in the previous year. They immediately allocated 101 more personnel to the Police Force of this State in that first year, and actually two more were sworn in than those budgeted for. So that in the very first year in office of this Government, 121 more personnel were sworn into the Queensland Police Force.

This figure of approved personnel rose steadily to 2,543, and two years later to 2,563, then to 2,630, 2,695, and 2,701 last year, and again this year we have budgeted for 2,701 personnel. So that during the 6½ to 7 years that this Government has been in power no fewer than 339 more police personnel have been made available as a result of our financial approach to this most important facet of public life.

At the time this Government came into power there were only 65 civilian personnel engaged in the Police Force. By the end of the last financial year there were 138 civilian personnel engaged, and an examination of the Estimates will show that this year we have budgeted for 193 civilian personnel. That means 73 more civilian personnel between the last year of Labour and the last financial year of this Government. Added to the 339 additional

police officers, it means a total active increased strength of 412 police officers in the Police Force of this State.

When we became the Government there were seven sets of traffic lights in the city of Brisbane. As I recall it, there were seven sets before the war. I do not recall one set of traffic lights being installed after the pre-war days until Labour was thrown out of office in 1957. This displays in ample fashion the attitude of the Labour Government towards the safety of the people. Because of the proper approach we made to this all-important matter of traffic, by the end of the last financial year there were no fewer than 96 sets of traffic lights in the city of Brisbane—89 more, or an increase of something like 1,200 per cent. I am reminded by the Premier that there are now many sets of traffic lights in the country as well. I think every fair-minded person will recognise that although a set of traffic lights cannot entirely remove the need for a traffic officer for eight hours of the day, at least at schools they relieve traffic officers for some 1½ hours a day, and that would work up in intensity in some of the city streets to at least eight or 10 hours per day. Even half the traffic lights put into operation by this Government would mean the relief of 44 police personnel from these duties to go on to other activities. Add them to the 412 active personnel and you get a figure of 456 additional personnel engaged in police work compared with the position when Labour was thrown out of office.

Another facet which indicates very clearly the attitude of this Government in contrast with that of the Labour Government towards police work in this State and the safety of the people is to be found in a comparison of the number of police vehicles. In 1950-51 there were 123 cars in the Police Force, and by 1965-57 there were 229. At the end of the last financial year there were 388 cars in the Police Force and the number of motor-cycles had grown from 63 in 1956-57 to 117. There had been a decrease in the number of motor-cycle outfits because it is the policy of this Government to do away with motor-cycle outfits and to equip personnel in the Police Force with cars—either the Falcon for pursuit purposes or the Mini Minor or a similar small type of car for local work. This all highlights the difference in approach of the two Governments.

Let us have a look at the amount of money spent on police buildings by the two Governments. Here we see a really sorry case. Is it any wonder that when the hon. member for Cooroola visited a country police station and stepped onto the veranda he went right through the floor because the white-ants had eaten it out—the same white-ants that ate out the Labour Party were eating out the buildings it built?

In 1950, the grand sum of £27,743 was spent on police buildings. In 1951 the amount was £19,000; in 1952 it was £11,000; in 1953 it jumped to £55,000 and in 1954 it was the same. In 1956 the figure dropped to £40,000, and in 1957 it was down again, to £35,000. Let me remind the Committee that £35,000 would build about three decent police stations, despite the white-ant-ridden hovels that our police personnel were serving in.

In our first year we did not do so well. The sum spent was only £14,900. In the next year—our first full year as a Government—we spent £78,900. Then in 1960, we spent £237,000; in 1961 the expenditure was £381,000, and the same amount was spent in the following year. In 1963 the amount spent dropped to £200,000, but it rose in 1964 to £240,000. For 1965 it is to be £240,000 again. These figures highlight the different approach to this important facet of protection for the public. I remember taking out figures when I opened the Stanthorpe police station. For the six years prior to our assuming office I think Labour spent about £215,000 on police activities and buildings, while in a six-year period we spent £1,500,000.

**Mr. Houston:** What does that prove?

**Mr. DEWAR:** It proves that we are interested in improving the Police Force of this State, despite the unenlightened comments that come from the other side of the Chamber.

**Mr. Duggan:** Is there anything about the increase in crime?

**Mr. DEWAR:** I will deal with that later. The more hon. members opposite come in, the harder they fall.

It is all very well to give credit to the Labour Party for having 123 cars in 1950, and for the fact that that number jumped to 229 in 1956-57, but what was the programme under Labour? It was to run the cars into the ground. Many of them could not have caught the hon. member for Townsville South on his pushbike, because they were absolutely worn out. In 1950-51 the maximum mileage for a Chevrolet at Roma Street before it was sold was 345,064, and the minimum mileage was 59,000. For the next year the mileages were a little better. The maximum mileage was 182,000—

**Mr. Houston:** What does that prove?

**Mr. DEWAR:** It proves that the equipment supplied by Labour was worn out.

**Mr. Houston:** Don't talk rubbish!

**Mr. DEWAR:** Just like the Government, it was worn out.

For the following year the maximum mileage was 206,000 miles; for the next year, 1955, the maximum was 196,000 miles; for the following year it dropped to 171,000 miles, and then, for 1957, the maximum was

117,000 miles. It took us a few years to get our enlightened approach into full swing. In our first few years we did not do very well. For 1958 the maximum mileage was 112,000; for 1959 it was 130,000; for 1960 and 1961 it was 138,000. I ask hon. members to bear in mind that not only did we inherit the broken-down buildings, but we also inherited a lot of crocks in motor-cars.

By 1961-62 the effect of our policy of building up an adequate, properly equipped Police Force came into effect, and the maximum mileage in that year was 59,101. For 1963, the maximum was 54,000 miles, and for last year there was an odd case of a vehicle which had done 68,000 miles. Today, the moment a vehicle registers 40,000 miles it is rostered for approval to sell. It may do 2,000 or 3,000 miles before the paper work catches up with it, but in general terms all vehicles are sold at between 40,000 and 45,000 miles. As to the minimum mileages in the last three years, some vehicles were sold at 11,000 miles, 13,000 and 26,000 miles.

It is important that our policy be realised by the Committee, because it highlights the whole difference in approach of the Labour Party in Government and this Government, which believes that an adequate Police Force, properly equipped, is required in the interests of this State. That is precisely what the Government is providing. I think I have spent enough time in showing that the spurious and ridiculous attacks on this Government's police policy are just so much hot air, which, after all, is what we expect from members of the Opposition.

**Mr. Davies:** What was the increase in population from 1957 to now?

**Mr. DEWAR:** I would say it was much less than the percentage indicated by the increase from 2,362 police personnel to nearly 3,000.

The Leader of the Opposition asked about the increase in crime. The "hanging" member for Nudgee, who was going to hang me the other day in a burst of hysteria following my reply to a question he asked, tried to build up in the public mind an image that crime was on the skids, and that people could commit crimes willy-nilly. The suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition was along the same lines. I intend to quote figures in relation to the clean-up of crime in this State, and in other parts of the world.

This matter was ignored by the Press, and in that regard I think it was treated well because it should have been ignored. The hon. member for Nudgee endeavoured to build up the idea that crime had got out of control, that the Police Force was inept, and that people could not walk out of their houses at night for fear that their throats would be cut. That was the atmosphere he tried to create.

It is essential for those who apply themselves in a normal fashion to these matters to consider two types of crime, firstly, crime against the person, and secondly, the small and petty type of crime against property. The record of the Queensland Police Force is second to none in the world in the solution of crimes against the person. The question asked by the hon. member for Nudgee dealt with the last three years, so I quote the following figures: in regard to murder, of the 17 cases in 1962, 100 per cent. were cleared up; of the 21 cases in 1963, 100 per cent. were cleared up; and of the 17 cases in 1964, 94.1 per cent. were cleared up. The case of the old man who was murdered in a park at East Brisbane has not been solved yet.

**Mr. Houston:** He was murdered in Hawthorne, and that is one of the stations that has been closed down.

**Mr. DEWAR:** If the hon. member knows so much about it, he should give his information to the police.

I quote the following figures:—

	Percentage Solved		
	1962	1963	1964
Attempted murder .. .. .	100	100	95
Manslaughter (including motor-vehicle cases) .. .. .	94.7	100	100
Rape and attempted rape .. .. .	90.6	94.5	100
Carnal knowledge .. .. .	96.5	96	100
Indecent assault (on males) .. .. .	86.4	87.5	80
Incest .. .. .	100	100	100
Abduction .. .. .	100	100	83.3

In regard to crimes against the person the record of the Queensland Police Force is, without doubt, second to none in the world. The hon. member for Nudgee, in his hysteria, endeavoured to build up the image in the public mind that this type of crime had got out of control.

For crimes against property the record is not so good, but this is in keeping with what has happened in other parts of the world. I ask the Committee to visualise a situation where a woman leaves her purse in a phone booth. She goes home and suddenly remembers that she left her purse in the telephone booth. She rushes back and finds that the purse is gone. She reports her loss. Although there may have been only a few shillings in the purse, that is regarded as a theft. There is not one chance in a million of detecting the person responsible, and there are thousands of cases of that nature. There was a case quoted the other day of a child's tricycle being lifted out of a yard when the people were away for the day. There is no way in the world in which the persons responsible can be apprehended in these cases. Nevertheless, they are listed.

One State of Australia shows a very high percentage of crime cleared up. I shall tell hon. members how this is achieved, as it

is freely admitted by the Commissioner of Police concerned. The other day there was highlighted on the front page of "The Courier-Mail" the apprehension on the south side of a man suspected of committing 100 burglaries. Most likely he will admit to five, six, 10, or 12 offences. He will go to court for trial, and then be sent to prison. If he admits 12 offences, the other 88, which the Police Department reasonably suspects he has also committed, stand as unsolved crimes, despite the fact that the person who has in all probability committed them is in gaol.

In a similar situation, the Police Department in the other State to which I refer will wipe off all those not admitted by the person but which are reasonably suspected of having been committed by him. Consequently the percentage of solved crime in that State is much higher than in the other States. Only one State in Australia follows that method.

**Mr. Hanlon:** That fact has been common to our statistics all the time, hasn't it?

**Mr. DEWAR:** Quite so. I am merely quoting the record of our Police Department compared with the records of those in other States. The overall percentage of crime solved for all offences in Queensland in 1962 was 54·6, in 1963 it was 59·06, and in 1964 it was 58·06. The percentage of solved cases of crimes against the person is well over 85 to 90, and in most cases between 95 and 100. The record in the solving of crimes against property is low, in the case of stock stealing being as low as 14 per cent. The average for all crime over the last three years is between 54 per cent. and 59 per cent. The figures for one other State of Australia, the name of which I shall not mention, are for the five years to 1962, 57·9 per cent., 62·6 per cent., 56·2 per cent., 49·7 per cent., and 52·05 per cent. These are about the same as our figures, or perhaps a little lower.

The average figures of crimes solved in another State, including offences of homicide, breakings, assault, grievous bodily harm, robbery, sex offences, larceny of motor vehicles, larceny generally, and false pretences, are 46·06 per cent., 43·49 per cent., and 46·44 per cent. Our figures are equal to those of any other State of Australia, and better than those of the State that I have quoted.

Even those who do not watch television have heard of such well-known places as Scotland Yard, where the Metropolitan Police Force of London enjoys a reputation probably second to no other Force in the world. I was able to get some figures in relation to the activities of the Police Forces in London and Glasgow. The London figures of crimes solved, including those for offences against the person, against property, and other indictable offences, for the six years from 1958, are 27·5 per cent., 26·1

per cent., 25·1 per cent., 25·3 per cent., 24·6 per cent., and 24·2 per cent. In other words, they are less than half the percentages shown by the Queensland Police Force.

**Mr. Houston:** Things will improve in England under a Labour Government.

**Mr. DEWAR:** If anything improves in England today it will be the poverty of the people. They will get poorer and poorer and poorer. We know what happened there under a Labour Government after the last war, and it will happen again. It is the best thing that could happen for this country because more and more people will want to come to Australia.

In the six years from 1958 to 1963 the picture is the same in the city of Glasgow—29 per cent., 27·4 per cent., 28·1 per cent., 31·9 per cent., 30·6 per cent., and 29·9 per cent. It is slightly better than London, but only half as good as the record of crime solution of the Police Force of Queensland.

I point the bone at those "knockers" of the Queensland Police Force who endeavoured in this Chamber last week to create an attitude in the minds of the public that the Police Force of this State is inefficient.

**Mr. Mann:** We do not admit that.

**Mr. DEWAR:** I was speaking to one member of this Assembly today who was involved in a matter last Thursday night and he was very complimentary to me about the way in which the Police Force treated him. He said, "In the old days they 'bunged' you into a Black Maria. Now they take you away in a Ford car." He was very happy about that.

**Mr. Mann:** We did not say they are inefficient.

**Mr. DEWAR:** The hon. member for South Brisbane made a contribution of his usual type to this debate, and he expressed some surprise that £205,000 had been set aside for the replacement of existing police vehicles for one year. He said—

"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 hon. member has the audacity to get up and take part in the debate on the Treasurer's Financial Statement when he does not understand the basic principles of Government finance. He does not understand that the Treasurer allocates gross amounts of money for departments to spend and that any money that comes back by way of revenue goes into the Treasury to provide the money to come back to the department.

The hon. member for South Brisbane, in reply to an interjection, said that he looks after the interests of the people of West End,

that he usually spends most of his time with them, and that he does not laze around the South Coast beaches with girls in bikinis, as the Minister for Labour and Industry does.

**Mr. Duggan:** Is that "laze" or "lays"?

**Mr. DEWAR:** "Laze".

**Mr. Aikens:** Have you ever seen Johnno Mann in a bikini?

**Mr. DEWAR:** I have seen everything else.

During the past 12 years I have spent three holidays on the South Coast—in 1952, 1956, and 1957—and on each occasion I was accompanied by my wife and two children. It is true that I have lazed on the beach with a girl in a bikini—my small daughter, when she was aged 1, 6 and 7. As a matter of fact, I saw someone sneaking behind a pandanus tree. No doubt it was the hon. member for South Brisbane.

**Mr. Aikens:** "I spy" Colin.

**Mr. DEWAR:** "I spy" Bennett. As Walt Disney said, "Fantasyland is the happiest kingdom of them all." On that basis, the hon. member for South Brisbane must be eternally happy because he is always in the land of fantasy.

In conclusion, I should like to make some comment on the hysterical attacks of the hon. member for Nudgee, who was going to hang me. He painted a picture of crime unlimited. He painted the picture that because police stations were closing young girls would be afraid to go out.

**Mr. Houston:** They are.

**Mr. DEWAR:** Only when the hon. member is about.

The following day we saw reported in "The Courier-Mail" the fact that a man had attacked a young girl in Albert Park, which is only 250 yards from the biggest police station in Queensland.

**Mr. Mann:** What was she doing in Albert Park?

**Mr. DEWAR:** I would not know. That is probably in the hon. member's electorate. He might know.

The hon. member for Nudgee also made the comment that instead of doing what we have done we should be getting men out into the outer suburbs. How little he understands. That is precisely what is being done. We have closed the Teneriffe station, which is in the centre of the city; we have closed Rosalie; we have closed Kelvin Grove.

**Mr. Melloy:** Are they in the centre of the city?

**Mr. DEWAR:** They are only about one mile away. This is a fairly big city of 379 square miles, and when it gets that close to the centre it would be virtually in the centre of the city. Every one of these stations that have been closed, with the

exception of Pinkenba and Virginia, is within two miles of the centre of the city. What have we done with the personnel from them? Generally, the very thing the hon. member for Nudgee suggests we should be doing. We have moved men to Chermside, to Newmarket, to Moorooka, to Upper Mt. Gravatt, and to Inala. That is where they have gone. Where the people have gone we have taken the police officers, as the "hon. member for hysteria" has suggested we should be doing.

**Mr. Duggan:** Why does the Police Union criticise the proposals if they are so meritorious?

**Mr. DEWAR:** I would not know. I can only assume that they do not know as much about the Police Force as they should.

I do not propose to spend any more time on this subject. I think I have indicated clearly that, with the outstanding record in crime detection of the Queensland Police Force and the attitude of this Government and its allocation of funds to provide the necessary services, there is not one scintilla of truth in any of the spurious attacks made by the Opposition.

**Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) (7.58 p.m.):** I have listened to the rather hysterical outburst from the Minister and perhaps it might be advisable to give him some advice as to what he should do in the future about these outbursts, because I could see him getting rather red in the face. I do not know whether he was embarrassed by the accusations from this side of the Chamber, but certainly our accusations were justified.

I did not rise to speak on the closing down of police stations in my electorate although I have received many complaints from the people concerned. The East Brisbane Police Station was closed down, and they were doing a mighty job. Right outside of that police station there is a park known as Mowbray Park which is bordered by the river, and on the river banks certain things happen at various times. I have received numerous complaints in the past and I have only had to ring the police concerned, whether at East Brisbane or Woolloongabba, to find them right on their toes. They have always done the correct thing and attended to the complaint. For that I am very grateful. Nevertheless, I do protest strongly at the closing down of the East Brisbane Police Station. I do not intend to deal with it except to say that nobody on this side of the Chamber has ever criticised the efficiency of the Police Force.

**Mr. Dewar:** The hon. member for South Brisbane never stops.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** Nobody has ever criticised the efficiency of the Police Force as such. We may have claimed that the number should be increased in order that people might get better protection. I do not want to go on in that strain.

I feel at the outset I should pay a tribute to a departed friend of the people. It is with a heavy heart that I offer my condolences to his relatives. I am speaking of a great and fearless fighter for the worker—"Watty" Wallace. I affectionately refer to him as "Watty" because he was well known by that name. By losing "Watty" we have lost a great friend and a champion of the working-class people.

I notice in today's "Telegraph" the headlines "M.L.A. attacks bridge step." I do not know what we are going to do. We already have members of the Country Party and the Liberal Party fighting. Now it seems to be a matter of the bridge versus the tunnel. It suggests a rhyme to me—

"Which shall it be, which shall it be?

Sam looked at Ray, and Ray looked at me.

'I go for the bridge, Ray, old boy!'

Sam said 'Pick up thy musket and shovel, The bridge is only a toy.'

That appears to be how it is going, backwards and forwards. I still go for the bridge.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Do you know "Little Jack Horner"?

**Mr. BROMLEY:** Yes, and I know little Vic. Sullivan who sat in the corner.

We on this side of the Chamber are very pleased to see in fact—not only recorded in the Financial Statement—full employment in Australia today, particularly in Queensland. We are very grateful for it. I hope that that position will remain static for many years. We read in the Press that some "G. G."—Government galah or whatever you like—says that full employment is not a good thing for the economy of the State. What a shocking statement for anybody to make! It is all very well for a person to speak in that strain when he is receiving anything from £3,000 to £5,000 a year. Of course it would not matter to him that his next-door neighbour was out of work. I will not accept for one moment the suggestion that there must be a pool of unemployed in order to have a stable economy. No right-thinking person could make such a statement or think that way.

It is rather disquieting to read in the Treasurer's Financial Statement that certain primary industries have slipped. I am particularly concerned about this. I believe that those engaged in primary production are the backbone of the country, particularly the dairy farmers. The Government should do something to assist financially those people who are endeavouring to populate the country and produce our primary products.

**Mr. Sullivan:** What do you suggest?

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I sincerely believe that those people should be helped. When we see the dairy farmers' butter production drop we should do something to assist them.

I know that in this instance the drought had a great deal to do with it. In previous years the Treasurer said that we had had droughts and rainy seasons, and I remarked by way of interjection that apparently in preparing the Financial Statement the Treasurer could not handle the heavy going; he just was not any good on the track. I believe that statement to be true. I sincerely hope that the Treasurer and the Government will do something to help the dairy farmers. There is no doubt that they work hard for their living. Anyone who has been on the land knows that they work from early morning until late at night. They are entitled to everything they can get in recompense for their labours.

On page 8 of the Financial Statement the Treasurer said—

"Queensland is and, I believe, always will be a State dependent predominantly upon primary industries, including mining."

I do not wholly agree with that. That may have been true in the past but now we have discovered so many natural resources that, without any doubt, under a Labour Government we could become a great industrial State—a State with industries—which could produce its own industrial needs and export more and more. I congratulate those who are responsible for the short series on the national television station titled "Export Action". I believe that Queensland can become a great industrial State with its natural resources.

The Government must agree to a certain extent that, in the past, it has failed to ensure that the required number of apprentices have been trained. Unfortunately, since 1957 the numbers of apprentices in Government and private employment have slipped alarmingly—so badly that the number of tradesmen has greatly declined. Instead of the Government ensuring that more apprentices are taken on, it is talking about importing fully trained tradesmen. That may be good with full employment, or if full employment could be guaranteed, but the young people of Queensland should have their future entry to the trades assured. It is their birthright, their future, if they are to be successful citizens and to help establish the economy of our great State.

I will turn now to page 5 of the Financial Statement where the Treasurer said that the public debt had been increased by almost £26,000,000 during the year. That is a colossal sum, particularly as the Treasurer blandly stated that we are in an era of prosperity. If we turn to Table F we see that the advances made for Queensland are £69,000,000. That is a further public debt for Queensland yet, last Sunday week, on television, Mr. Holt said that it did not matter if there was an increase in the public Debt, and to let posterity pay for it. I do not believe that is right. To a certain extent we have to go into debt to expand, but not, in an era of prosperity, to increase the

public debt by £26,000,000, plus another £70,000,000 by way of advances from the Commonwealth Government. I was very disappointed to read that.

I was pleased to see the Treasurer refer to finance for matters affecting aboriginals. I shall not speak long about aboriginals, but it is high time that the proposed legislation was introduced. It appears obvious that some pressure, possibly from the U.G.A. and others, has forced the Government to delay it because of the economic cheap-labour angle involved. I publicly thank the Minister for Education, who made possible for members of all parties the visit to aboriginal missions and settlements. For many years I have been speaking on this subject in Parliament. It was as a direct result of a question I asked of the Minister that he agreed to this all-party trip, from which members on both sides of the Chamber gained knowledge and became better acquainted with the subject. At times we had fun too. I believe there should be more of these trips, although I do not think they should be all paid for out of the public purse. It is better to see these places than to read of them. By visiting them we can learn more and be better representatives of the people. I am grateful to the Minister for extending that opportunity and I am sure other members are, too. Through my stubbornness in insisting that we continue with that trip, I am still suffering from an injury I sustained; nevertheless, it was well worth while because I learnt so much.

The Treasurer referred to the Workers' Compensation Act. He said that he intends to bring down legislation to alter that Act in the near future. I have advance information on legislation that will be introduced possibly this month in the New South Wales Parliament in relation to the Workers' Compensation Act. I advise the Treasurer to study that legislation. From what I have seen of it, it will put the New South Wales Act far above the Queensland Act. A study of the amendments to be introduced in New South Wales will satisfy the Treasurer that it is taking a substantial step forward to improve the conditions of workers who may be injured in the course of employment.

We all know that New South Wales is not only the spearhead of industrial reform in the Commonwealth, but also the State that makes most progress. Of course, it has a Labour Government. One has only to visit New South Wales to see the expansion that is taking place there. It is not due to poker machines. At the same time, it will be noted that New South Wales is spending vast sums of money. I have a copy of the New South Wales Budget, but unfortunately I did not have sufficient time to compare that State's expenditure with what is to be spent in Queensland. However, I can assure hon. members that the percentage is much higher than ours.

Tremendous expansion is going on in New South Wales, where the Government is spearheading industrial reforms such as improvements in the Workers' Compensation Act, the granting of equal pay for women for equal work, and various leave provisions. New South Wales is the key State and we should take a leaf out of its book.

I should like to mention in passing the Treasurer's reference in the Financial Statement to the provision of daytime training for apprentices. I suggested this, if I remember correctly, many years ago in my maiden speech, and we on this side of the Chamber have constantly requested its implementation. I sincerely hope that it will not be long before it becomes a reality. I believe that having to go to college at night-time after performing a day's work takes too much out of a young lad. Unfortunately, because of the times involved, many have to go without a meal, particularly if they are working well out in the suburbs. The sooner daytime training for apprentices is introduced, the better it will be. In these days of rapid technical advances, these lads should be given every opportunity to assimilate the knowledge imparted to them by their very efficient instructors at the training colleges. I am very happy to see this subject mentioned in the Financial Statement, and the sooner daytime training is introduced the better it will be.

I wish to deal briefly now with the iniquitous penal clauses existing in both the State and the Commonwealth arbitration Acts. I have here a list of the various fines that have been imposed on unions in the last 14 years, and the amounts are absolutely disgusting. It is difficult to imagine why any Government would fine unions so heavily as to break the morale of their members and deprive them of finance so as to make them tame-cat organisations. I believe the Government will suffer from its strong enforcement of those penal provisions. The Australian worker has the guts to stand up for himself and he can take only a certain amount of this treatment.

Hon. members opposite constantly claim that union leaders are bringing these things about. I can tell them that union officials are not inciting men to go on strike. I repeat that I know what I am saying is correct because on many occasions I have been present when union officials have gone to jobs and said to the men, "You are not to go on strike." The men have said, "You are here to do as we tell you; you are not here to tell us what to do." The men are becoming dissatisfied with this Tory Government, which is Fascist in many ways. The heavy fines imposed on unions are absolutely shocking. In 1954, for example, the unions paid £3,350 in fines, and in addition they had to pay costs of court.

**Mr. Hiley:** Are they State or Federal fines?

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I am speaking of fines imposed by the Commonwealth court.

**Mr. Hiley:** They would be fines paid under the Chifley Act, because he brought them in.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** In reply to the Treasurer, let me say that I intend to use that as an example. Admittedly there were penal provisions then, but they have been strengthened so much now that it is almost impossible for a worker to use what is, in my opinion, his inherent right—the right to strike. The penal provisions under the Commonwealth and State Acts are taking from the workers their right to strike, and I believe that is a shocking indictment of any Government. Hon. members on both sides of the Chamber have, at some time or other, been members of industrial unions and I think that they believe in the right to strike and that such a right should not be taken from the workers.

In 1960 fines totalling £3,405 were imposed on the unions, but in that year, in addition, costs granted to the employers that had to be paid by the unions amounted to £9,504 19s. 10d. If that is not one way of breaking down the strength of the working class, I do not know what is.

I do not want to delay too long on this, but, in 1962, because the Menzies Government viciously applied the penal provisions of the Act through the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, fines imposed totalled £9,050 and costs awarded to the employers, which the unions had to pay, amounted to £12,166.

**Mr. Ewan** interjected.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** The hon. member for Roma is happy out on his prickly pear selection. He takes money from the workers by selling his beef, and he could not care less what unions and unionists were suffering.

**Mr. Ramsden:** Will you answer one question?

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I will answer any question the hon. member likes to ask.

**Mr. Ramsden:** In the year in which the unions were fined £9,050, how much did the unionists about whom you are complaining lose in wages because of strike action?

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I think I can reply to that very effectively. If the hon. member had anything to do with unions, or even knew what a trade union is or where the Trades Hall is—

**Mr. Ramsden:** I know where that is.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** . . . he would know that trade union officials work seven days a week, sometimes seven nights a week, and are on the job all the time in the interests of their members. I have been a trade union official; as a matter of fact I have been to an executive meeting of my union tonight. Ballots are held regularly and if the members are not satisfied with their

officials, they can get rid of them. That is the answer to the poor old tunnel-maker, the mule from Merthyr.

These fines mounted progressively, until in 1963 they reached £12,800, and there have been many more fines since these figures were compiled. The grand total of fines paid by the unions is £43,200, and they have paid £33,023 to the employers in costs of court. It is absolutely shocking.

**Mr. Smith** interjected.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** They still have to pay it because costs were granted in all those cases. I know the hon. member is broken down but how would he like his law practice to be broken down by legislation introduced by any particular Government? He would not like it at all, and, as I say, there have been many more fines since. I repeat, it is a shocking indictment on any person who calls himself an Australian to be connected with a Government that viciously levies such fines on any body of people. I honestly believe that it will be the downfall of not only the Tory Government in the Federal sphere but this Government as well if its Ministers do not take heed.

Some Ministers are quite willing to meet deputations from unions and union officials, and on behalf of the unions I am grateful for this. On the other hand we see the arrogant attitude of certain Ministers who say, "Why should I meet the unions? After all, they are nothing. They are only unions. They are only workers, whilst I am a member of a Liberal Government, a Tory Government."

**Mr. Pilbeam:** We are workers, too.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** Certainly. I think everybody in Parliament, irrespective of his political colour, must be a tremendous worker because we have so many bosses in our electorates—by that I mean our electors—that we are obliged to work. I think most of us work because we feel it is our duty to give certain services.

**Mr. Ramsden:** You are like me; you like working.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I like doing things for people. As a matter of fact the hon. member knows that I get a kick out of accomplishing things for people. At the same time, there are many frustrations in this game when we cannot accomplish what we set out to do. I think that cognisance should be taken of my remarks in this regard. A better understanding would be brought about by Government members and the Premier meeting deputations representing the working class. In that way we will accomplish much more than is accomplished by continually ignoring them.

I believe to a certain extent in arbitration but much more in conciliation. In my time I have been a court advocate and have

also conciliated with employers, and I think we have accomplished more in that way. I certainly have, anyway.

In perusing the Estimates, I notice on page 24 that an increased amount is to be spent on hospital administration and, just as importantly, there is to be an increase of 161 in staff. For that I am grateful and I think that everybody who has the welfare of the health services at heart will be grateful also. I am very pleased to see that additional amount of approximately £1,000,000. With that amount we can do much in the coming year. It is very good to see it there and, in my view it probably justifies what I and other members have said in the past about hospital administration. Last year approximately £500,000 less was spent than budgeted for. If this amount had been spent, there may not have been so many complaints. It is very pleasing to see that an additional £1,037,560 will be required for 1964-65. Perhaps the Minister has taken cognisance of our remarks about the health administration. I do not want to make comparisons, because sometimes they are odious, but in New South Wales at least £45,000,000 is being spent on health plus an additional £5,600,000 as a direct contribution from the tax on poker machines—a total of £51,600,000 on health, which is a great thing to see. I am fair enough to admit that when we see an increase of £1,037,560 in the allocation to the Department of Health for administration it is a very good thing. I am the first to admit it, and it makes me very happy to do so. Perhaps we can look forward to improvements in the Department of Health.

I now turn briefly to the Estimates of the Department of Justice. Time does not permit me to deal with them fully. Under the heading of "Probation and Parole System" there is no increase in staff. This is a most important section. If a person has been unfortunate enough to commit a crime, he should be given a chance to rehabilitate himself after he has paid his penalty for it. I am glad to see that the Minister for Justice is in the Chamber. Not merely because it is his job but by nature he is particularly interested in the probation and parole system. I appeal to him to increase the number of probation and parole officers. If an unfortunate person has committed a crime, perhaps not meaning to, it is a wonderful system if we can help to rehabilitate him.

Perhaps the Treasurer can explain to me why, although there is an increase of 36 in the staff of the Immigration Department, the allocation for this financial year is only £5,500 greater. I cannot reconcile 36 additional staff with an increase of only £5,500. If he does not explain that to me now, perhaps he will at a later stage.

I turn now to another aspect of safety. This may be connected with the Police Department, but it is certainly of interest

to, and connected with, everyone in Queensland whether he be a pedestrian, a motorist, a child in a pram or an invalid in a wheelchair. Today's paper published figures of the toll of the road and they are shocking. This year in Queensland, 374 people died in accidents in 293 days. Much more money should be spent in trying to reduce the road toll to a minimum. I am not particularly in favour of Q-cars although I believe there is some merit in them. I have said dozens of times—and I repeat tonight—that I believe there is only one solution to the problem, namely, more motor-cycle patrols or more patrol cars on the road. The sight of a police uniform is a deterrent. At some stage, I should imagine, every one of us has been a motorist. At times we may drive along at the correct speed, doing everything properly, but if we see a police uniform, whether the officer is on a motor-cycle or in a motor-car, we immediately check to ensure that we are doing everything right. If we come to an intersection we immediately stop even though the police officer may be out of sight. We take all safety precautions immediately we sight a police uniform. I therefore believe that with more police officers we could considerably reduce the number of road accidents.

Australia's average death rate in road accidents in proportion to the population is the highest in the world. In America, which has the highest proportion of motor-cars to population, the rate is the lowest; I do not know the exact percentage, but I think it is as low as 2.2. America has high speed-safety limits, wide open roadways, and plenty of safety patrol officers on the roads. Those are the reasons for the low accident rate. I cannot reconcile myself to the statement of the Minister for Labour and Industry a short while ago that we had sufficient members in the Force because, looking back over the years, I do not think the number of police officers has increased at all. It may be that the main reason is lack of finance. However, if we have to spend money to save lives let us spend it, because that is the best thing to do. We may be here today and gone tomorrow—and tomorrow it will not make any difference—so let us do something while we are here to try to save lives.

I give credit to the magazine report published by the Australian Road Safety Council because this body does a very good job in trying to reduce the number of road accidents and deaths. Some very good advice is contained in the magazine and I urge all hon. members to spare the time to read it. I note that it says, "Pedestrian crossings can be a traffic hazard." I suggest that we should have better lighting at pedestrian crossings to decrease the accident rate. One has only to drive at night to realise that it is very hard to see pedestrians because car lights are not sufficiently bright to illuminate

pedestrians at any distance. If we concentrate on having more lighting over pedestrian crossings we will reduce the accident rate.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Every time I have advocated it, the Government has turned it down.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** On many occasions the hon. member for Salisbury has advocated better lighting. It is a good idea.

**Mr. Pilbeam:** Couldn't the council put lights across?

**Mr. BROMLEY:** Anybody who goes around the suburban streets will see an increased number of lights. Pedestrian crossing lights do not always operate at night. It is a responsibility of the Government to provide better lighting. The present Brisbane City Council is installing an enormous number of extra lights and is doing a good job in this respect.

The article by the Australian Road Safety Council says that publicity is not enough to reduce the accident rate. It is my opinion that enlarged photographs of bad accidents, erected where the public could see the colossal damage caused by these accidents—even if we photographed people lying dead on the road—would act as a deterrent. The immediate reaction would be one of horror; but unfortunately it soon passes.

Excessive speed is another cause of accidents. The report reads—

“Commonwealth statistics for 1962-63 show that 556 persons were killed and 7,712 injured in road accidents attributed to ‘excessive speed’. Total casualties for the year from all causes was 2,575 killed and 66,287 injured.”

That is more than we lose in a war within a certain time.

**Mr. Dean:** Do they mention alcohol?

**Mr. BROMLEY:** Yes. The article refers to “Alcohol suicides.” It reads—

“Our Score

“Recent Australian figures show that the ‘gallon of alcohol to a tankful of petrol’ ratio quoted in California applies here to an even greater extent.

“In 1961-62 petrol consumption in Australia amounted to 1,331,085,000 gallons, while consumption of beer, wine and spirits amounted to 283.8 million gallons, a ratio of about 4 gallons of petrol to 1 gallon of alcoholic beverage.”

That shows how far you can run on a gallon of beer, or how far you cannot, depending on whether something gets in your way. At a recent meeting I delivered an address on road safety. At the conclusion I asked, “Are there any questions?” One man said, “Yes. What if you come out of a hotel and get in your car and go up the road and some sober idiot bashes into you? What will happen then?” Obviously, he was under the influence of alcohol, and that is typical of the people who drink to excess while driving.

I am now going to make one final appeal for the use of seat belts in motor cars. I have asked various Ministers in the past, including the now Senator Morris, to make their installation compulsory in Government vehicles. I do not ask for them to be made compulsory in private cars, although I think it should be compulsory for manufacturers to provide the necessary fittings on vehicles.

I believe that the wearing of safety belts is something that should be given close attention. I read that in the operations of the Snowy Mountains Authority the fitting of safety belts had not only prevented injuries and fatalities to the occupants of cars but had produced a significant decrease in the number of accidents. A study made at the Brisbane General Hospital has shown that, of 200 who died in 1,000 road accidents studied, not one was wearing a safety belt. The Australian Road Safety Council estimates that if this equipment were in general use at least 12,000 drivers and passengers would avoid death or serious injury in the next 12 months. That is a very significant figure. I compliment the Brisbane General Hospital on the undertaking of this study.

In the brief time that I have available I intend to deal with education, which is another important phase of this State's activities. I believe, as I have said before, that there is an urgent need for a review of teacher training. I believe the Minister to be a person who will take cognisance of things said in Parliament. I know that he is absent from Brisbane tonight; nevertheless I think that what I have to say will be brought to his attention.

I believe he realises that plans for improvements in education can never be successful till there are sufficient adequately trained teachers. In the past the hon. member for Barcoo, the hon. member for Maryborough, and I have often debated this matter and suggested that changes in our system of education should not be implemented till sufficient trained teachers are available. I do not believe that they are now, nor do I believe that anything is being done to overcome this lag.

At the secondary education level, there are insufficient recruits of graduate standard. I asked the Minister a question on this subject only a couple of weeks ago. He quoted figures that I do not intend to quote again. I have ascertained from inquiries that I have made that this year the number of students to complete the Diploma in Education will be fewer than 50. This is not enough to make up losses of staff in the teaching service. Teachers are leaving day after day. In addition to those who leave because they are disgusted with the treatment that they have received, there are retirements on the ground of age. The present administration of the education system in Queensland does not appear to be making any headway in its attempts to meet the increased demand for teachers of all types. In my opinion, one of the reasons for this is that the change of syllabus in secondary education was

implemented by the Government at least 12 months too soon. It acted hastily in this respect and did not think of the future.

I know of several State primary and high schools at which the principal has to take classes. How can a principal take classes and run the school satisfactorily when from 800 to 1,500 or 1,600 children attend the school? It is absolutely impossible for him to do it. If two teachers are away because of illness, one class does not have any teacher for the day, or days, as the case may be, that the teachers are away. The principal can take only one class; the other class does not receive any teaching. There is no pool of teachers to enable transfers to be made from one school to another.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** Big schools should carry internal relieving teachers.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I have suggested that, too. The Minister may be able to explain this state of affairs, but I do not see how he can. I have discussed the matter fairly thoroughly with people from the university and others interested in education and they are dissatisfied with the way in which things are proceeding.

**Mr. Sherrington** interjected.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I would not go as far as suggesting that the Minister for Education should resign. I believe that he is doing the best he can in the circumstances and with the money that he is receiving for education.

The Treasurer said that it is an education Budget. It might be an education for some people. It is certainly an eye-opener to hon. members on this side of the House who have studied the Financial Statement thoroughly. I do not think it contains anything that will improve the economy of Queensland, and it certainly will not mean an increase in the number of teachers, the subject with which I wish to continue dealing.

Over 2,000 primary and secondary teachers are now taking university courses as external students. This means that they attend university at their own expense and in their own time, and I congratulate them upon that because I believe that they are conscientious and wish to learn more so that they can impart that knowledge to their pupils, thus making them better pupils. Many hundreds of teachers also are attending evening classes—the hon. member for Barcoo will bear out what I am saying—and they should be commended very highly, too.

It is very strange, but several people who have attended coaching colleges have approached me and told me that they have seen school teachers in the same class as they are in at those colleges, learning at night what they have to teach their pupils next day. I think that is rather a shocking state of affairs and it proves that the Government is not encouraging more to take up

the teaching profession. I believe that, because of the importance of education in these days of technological advances, a greater proportion of young people should be trained in this profession. We could easily get them; they are there to be trained. The Government is providing a number of scholarships but I think we should provide more and more of them. In that way we will have, perhaps, a pool of teachers who can be transferred here and there, overcoming the hurly-burly that exists at present.

At schools in my electorate, as I said before, if there happens to be a teacher short the principal has to teach his class. It is wrong that that should happen because he has other work to do. He has people to interview, parents who want to complain about this, that or the other, or to ask about little Johnny's progress. The Principal has to leave the classroom to interview these people because they are entitled to discuss the progress or non-progress, as the case may be, of their children. If a school is going to be short one or two teachers today or tomorrow, the principal should be able to ring up the department and say, "I am down a teacher today. Can you arrange to send one out?" I know the Government does it in other branches. I know certain people are on call for switch duties. It is simply a case of ringing up and saying, "Look, we are down a switch girl today. What about sending one in to take over the duties?" If it can be done in one case, it can be done in others.

When I suggest a pool of teachers I do not wish them to remain idle. There are plenty of things they could be doing either at the Technical College or assisting at the University. There is plenty of scope for a pool of teachers to replace those who are absent.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. RAMSDEN** (Merthyr) (8.58 p.m.): I should like to take this opportunity of congratulating the Treasurer on yet another very successful presentation of a State Budget. In spite of the knockers on the Opposition benches and in the Opposition ranks, I believe that the Treasurer's prophecy in the closing remarks of his Budget speech are a challenge to us all. In the last two paragraphs of that speech he prophesied that 1964-65 will be an outstanding year for added development—a development not confined to the capital city or a few provincial cities, but a State-wide development with full employment, and our greatest trial of strength being to hold prices and costs at a reasonable level.

**Mr. Duggan:** It failed miserably on the figures published tonight of the increase over the past three months.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** That again is a typical remark from the knockers on my right. The Treasurer prophesied that funds for capital

expansion will be readily available with no limit on the private sector but with a degree of restraint in public borrowing. I liked his vibrant conclusion—

“The value of the development will endure. Great new industries and additions to existing activity will shortly be adding their throbbing output to the economic lifeblood of the community. The years of waiting and planning are ending. The years of dramatic growth and expansion are now with us. They will present their peculiar problems, but Queensland will enjoy their infinite rewards.”

It is because I believe, most sincerely, with the Treasurer that the years of dramatic growth and expansion are now with us, that I renew my plea, in the interests of that growth and expansion, for the urgent need for the Government to expedite the letting of a contract for the feasibility study that I have been speaking about and that I believe must be undertaken before a new cross-river facility can be decided upon.

A few weeks ago I went to Sydney where, among other things, I conferred for some hours with a consortium of Dutch companies called together by Mr. J. A. Zwartveen, Director of the Netherlands-Australia Trade and Industrial Development Council—a semi-governmental instrumentality. That consortium was comprised of the following companies: Westminster Dredging Australia Ltd. (represented by Mr. C. H. van Brink, Director, and Mr. Kalis, Chief Engineer), Lend Lease Corporation Ltd. (Mr. W. M. Leavey, Joint Managing Director), Eastern Dredging and General Works Pty. Ltd. (Mr. H. Ferwerda, Managing Director), The Amsterdam Ballast Co. (Mr. A. de Wit, Australian Director) and Hollandsche Aanneming Maatschappij N. V. (Mr. P. Th. Eckenhausen, Project Manager).

I was asked by these gentlemen to bring them up to date on the thinking of the State Government in connection with the proposed Brisbane River tunnel, a project they have been watching and waiting for for some time since I first made the proposal and as it has gradually gained public acceptance. I had forwarded a comprehensive folder giving the progressive story up to and including the Treasurer's statement in this Chamber on 28 August last, when he said that the Government was now prepared to give sympathetic consideration to any proposals received from competent and experienced companies, either at home or abroad.

I pointed out that the present thinking of the Government, as expressed by the Treasurer, was that any company that was interested in constructing the proposed tunnel would be prepared to carry out its own feasibility study at its own expense. I was assured by all present that in their view this was an unrealistic approach which was quite impracticable, and that if such was to be the condition upon which tenders would be called, then it would be most unlikely that

any company in the world would lodge a tender. I am not being critical in the sense of being destructive; I am trying to be critical in the sense of being constructive. I point out what the thinking behind this subject was.

In the first place, a feasibility study would have to determine for all time the question of tunnel or bridge, particularly as the latter alternative has been suggested rather dogmatically by my colleague, the hon. member for Windsor, whose views I quite frankly put before the consortium, which, after quite a lot of thought and discussion, came to the conclusion that the tunnel proposal was the most appropriate for the location I had advocated. I will say here and now—because I have been asked by many people, including pressmen, what is my reaction to the bridge proposal of the hon. member for Windsor—that although the hon. member forcibly puts the contrary view to my own in his belated entry into the study of this cross-river facility, I am delighted—I say this sincerely—to see him enter the lists. For over 3½ years I have been advocating a new cross-river facility in the lower reaches of the river in the Gibson Island area, but it has been a completely unsupported advocacy. Now even at this late stage, when obviously my colleague the hon. member for Windsor is flying a kite for the proponents of a bridge, even though this suggestion comes after 28 August when the Government accepted the principle of a tunnel, I say that his suggestion is a good thing because I think there has been some thinking in the Co-ordinator-General's Department about a radical form of bridge for that area instead of a tunnel, and doubtless my colleague has been advised by interested persons there.

Be that as it may, let me say that in spite of his contrary views, and the general confusion caused by the expression of those views, I repeat that I am glad of his contribution. In the first place, after 3½ years of being the voice of one crying in the wilderness, as it were, I am joined by the hon. member for Windsor in a plea for a cross-river facility. The fact that he prefers a bridge to a tunnel does not affect my delight at his entering the field. His advocacy of a bridge instead of a tunnel, and the reasons he advanced in support of his belief, only highlight the urgent need for the Government to let a contract to experienced consulting engineers qualified to do the fullest possible feasibility study. The result of that study, *inter alia*, will show which is the preferred method of river crossing at that point. Neither the hon. member for Windsor nor I is qualified in his own right to advocate any particular type of crossing.

**Mr. Duggan:** Why waste £100,000 of the public's money to see whether you or the hon. member for Windsor is right?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I am very sorry that the Leader of the Opposition has missed his opportunity to make a speech on this subject.

**Mr. Duggan:** I should like to follow you.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I ask the hon. gentleman to listen, because he will learn something.

If, in my 3½ years' study of the subject, after much discussion and many letters and inquiries, those who have advised me have convinced me that a tunnel is the right facility in that particular location, and if the hon. member for Windsor in the period he has been studying this problem has been convinced by those advising him that a bridge is preferable, then quite obviously one of us has come to the correct conclusion. A feasibility study will show which one has. No man, in all sincerity, could ask for more.

For that reason, let me develop further reasons why the Treasurer and the Government should agree to an independent feasibility study at Government expense. A feasibility study, *inter alia*, must determine traffic usage on a scientific basis, not only as it exists now but, also as it would exist after the creation of a cross-river facility, be it tunnel or bridge, and such traffic usage would have to be scientifically projected into the future. In addition, the study would determine the work force that would be available to industry in that area of the river and the degree of commuting that would be undertaken daily both now and, again, projected into the future.

As well, a feasibility study would cover the engineering and geophysical aspects which would determine the exact location for the facility in relating to siting. Furthermore, such a study would have to cover the economic feasibility of the project, which would of course have a great bearing on the length of the franchise that would have to be granted in order to attract the necessary capital. It will be seen from this that a comprehensive feasibility study covers traffic surveys, geophysical surveys, engineering surveys, and economic surveys.

Consequently, any company interested in doing the construction work would have to employ experts in these separate fields to determine the overall results upon which the company would have to make its decision. It is an unreasonable requirement to expect every company interested in constructing a tunnel or a bridge, on a franchise basis, to undertake such a series of surveys and thus in reality be duplicating the tests being conducted by its competitors. Let us be realists in this; we get nothing for nothing; everything must be paid for! Whether or not the Government pays for this feasibility study now is beside the point. One representative told me that his company would consider doing its own feasibility study if that were the inflexible view of the Government, but he also said, "That doesn't mean we would pay for it. The cost of the study and the interest would be added to the contract price. In other words, the Government would still be paying for it, and possibly at a much dearer rate than if it did the study that you have suggested." I suggest to the Treasurer

that there is food for thought there, and I ask the Government to consider that point.

Yet another objection to the companies themselves doing their own feasibility study is that most companies favour, and are especially skilled in, certain forms of engineering construction. Until such time as it is decided finally whether the correct answer is a bridge or a tunnel, it would be unreasonable to expect a company favouring, and skilled in, bridge construction, or a company favouring, and skilled in, tunnel construction, to conduct a survey, one of the tasks of which would be to determine which kind of facility was the better under the circumstances, and to have a completely unbiased viewpoint which might lead it to lose the contract. Not unnaturally, any such survey conducted by it would have a bias towards the particular form of construction work in which it specialised.

I instance the new harbour works in Suva, where the supervising engineers had ordered reinforced concrete piers. The constructing engineers, one of the most reputable and one of the biggest engineering companies in the world, went to the designers and said, "We are far more skilled in handling prestressed concrete. Is it possible to do away with the reinforced concrete piers and use prestressed piers?" As it happened, the designers were able to meet them by re-designing certain sections to allow them to do it. That illustrates the natural tendency that exists even with a highly ethical company in doing work in which it is highly skilled.

The next objection is that a feasibility study properly conducted by a firm of consultants not interested in the actual construction or franchise might well come up with the answer that, in general, I have been correct in my submissions for a tunnel, but that such a tunnel may not be economically possible for, say, five years. Let us assume that this is so, and let us assume further that one of the constructing companies has carried out its own feasibility study at a cost of between £80,000 and £110,000. What then is the position? We have a company which has expended a vast amount of money, and, as a result, finds that it will be five years before it can economically tender for the project. Is the Government then to expect such a company to deprive itself of the use of the money so expended, and the interest on it, for that period of five years? In any case, is the Government then going to write a blank cheque for the company and say, "Well, now that you have done the study at your expense, whatever else happens in the next five years, however much costs may rise, and whatever new engineering processes are developed, you can have the job when the time is ripe," or is it to say to that company, "Thank you very much for spending your money in order to tell us what is possible. As soon as the time has arrived we will let you run

the gauntlet of tendering on a competitive basis with other companies, which of course will be tendering against you on the results made known from your feasibility study.”?

These in the main were the views advanced in order to show that in all fairness, both to interested constructing companies and to the Government itself, the Government should commission and pay an experienced firm of consultants to do the necessary comprehensive feasibility study so that open world tenders can be called for the design and construction of a bridge or a tunnel across the Brisbane River in the lower reaches near Gibson Island.

It was suggested that Professor Munro, Professor of Civil Engineering in the University of New South Wales, who is hailed by those who know as one of Australia's leading academic hydraulic engineers, might be able to advise me further. Accordingly I called on Professor Munro and discussed the whole problem with him, as I have discussed it in this speech. Professor Munro's advice was that the most satisfactory way of handling this proposed project was for the Government itself to employ consulting engineers experienced in this type of feasibility study, at least on the traffic, geophysical, and economic sides of the survey. He pointed out that Mr. John Shaw, Commissioner for Main Roads in New South Wales, who is Chairman of the New South Wales State Planning Committee, has employed such outside consultants to do feasibility studies on at least three projects at present being considered in New South Wales, namely, the North Sydney Expressway, a second harbour crossing, and the Eastern Suburbs railway. In those cases, the American firm of de Liew Cather, whose Australian associates are Rankine and Hill, are the consulting engineers, and the Eastern Suburbs railway feasibility study is being conducted at a cost of £69,000. Professor Munro pointed out that it must be remembered—and this is important—that, unless the consulting engineers were acceptable on a world-wide basis, experienced companies would still want to re-check certain facts arising out of such a study.

I conferred with Professor Munro to see whether he was prepared to suggest companies reputable enough and qualified enough to carry out such feasibility studies. Professor Munro was gracious enough to give me frank replies to these questions, which it would not be politic to list here. However, Mr. Campbell, I am prepared to give, in confidence, the advice that Professor Munro gave me in this regard to the Government for its assistance. Any of these companies would be acceptable to any major constructing engineers anywhere in the world. Let me make it quite clear to the Government, to Parliament, and to the people of Brisbane that, provided the Government takes not only my advice but the advice of those who know in these matters, there will be no dearth of tenderers. I can say now that

I know of at least three starters, namely, the Dutch consortium with whom I have conferred and which has the necessary finance arrayed if required; Costain Ltd., the English company which, incidentally, is interested in the cross-channel tunnel; John Holland & Co. of Melbourne; and others that I know are interested but whose names I do not have permission to use.

**Mr. Bennett:** Who wrote your speech for you?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** If the hon. member opposite who interjected were given a shilling for every kind thought that he had and lost six pence for every unkind one, he would still be bankrupt.

May I now pass on one pertinent point that Professor Munro made? It was his opinion that the Government should conduct the traffic, geophysical, and economic survey and then call tenders on a world-wide basis, based on the results of that survey, for the construction of a cross-river facility. Incidentally, he felt that I was right in advocating a tunnel rather than a bridge in that locality.

**Mr. Mann:** How much would the survey cost?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** If the hon. member for Brisbane had been here earlier, he would have heard.

Professor Munro said that by calling tenders in this fashion we would get the best and most economic offers available in the world, because each company was skilled in, and preferred, one particular method of tunnel construction as opposed to other methods. For example, one company would favour the prefabricated tunnel built on dry land and floated out and sunk into position. Another would favour the “dry pit” method, another the prefabricated steel tube method, yet another the hard rock drill type method, and so on. Consequently, by leaving it open to tenderers to design their own ideas for tunnelling the river, we would get for our decision an assortment of the most skilled types and the most economic methods of construction. This is what was done with the Sydney Harbour Bridge. The original intention of the Government was to erect a cantilever bridge across Sydney Harbour, but finally the Government was prevailed upon to call tenders merely “to bridge the harbour”—a design-and-construct tender. As a result, Dorman Long's construction of the arch-type bridge was accepted, and this was built.

I do hope, Mr. Campbell, that the lengthy observations I have made, backed by experienced engineers of world-wide reputation, will finally convince the Government that to call tenders successfully for the construction of a tunnel under, or even a bridge over, the Brisbane River on a franchise basis, it must be prepared to spend the necessary money on a feasibility study which, in actual fact, is but a quarter of

the money spent as the Government's share by way of subsidy on the Council's stopgap, which is the vehicular ferry the "Sir James Holt."

I have one final word of warning. If the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works is drawing up tender forms without a properly-conducted feasibility study being carried out on the lines that I have suggested, I can prophesy now that there will be no tenders submitted. I have another word of warning. When tenders are finally called, it must be remembered that most of them will come from overseas, and there must be more than a mere five or six weeks allowed from the calling to the closing of tenders. No less than three months will suffice to enable representatives in Australia of overseas companies to get the tenders considered by their head offices in their countries of origin. I plead with my Government, having regard to this year of expanding development that the Treasurer has prophesied, that it should heed my words and accept the advice I have given it, not of my own knowledge, but based on the best advice that some of the biggest constructing engineers in the world have seen fit to pass on to me for the Government's careful and sincere consideration.

Having said that, let me remind the Committee that I have also advocated, as complementary to my tunnel proposal, a scheme for the development of the Port of Brisbane, a port to be excised from the Greater Brisbane area and handed over to the administration of an independent Port of Brisbane Authority. I did suggest that such an authority should administer some 10,000 to 12,000 acres on both sides of the river, east of Hamilton wharves. It is in connection with this matter that I want now to talk of an allied matter, a matter that I realise is highly controversial and which, unfortunately, has been accepted—wrongly, I believe—by the Government.

Earlier I disagreed with the hon. member for Windsor on the question of bridging or tunnelling. On one other matter that my colleague mentioned I would give him whole-hearted support—that is, the expansion programme of Evans Deakin & Co. Pty. Ltd. at their shipyards at Kangaroo Point. I realise, with the hon. member for Windsor, that this programme has been approved on the Kangaroo Point site by the Government and, indeed, is well under way. I realise, too, that I am fighting an uphill battle on this, but I plead with the Government, even at this late stage, to heed my submission. I recall that I raised this matter in the party room when resumptions at Kangaroo Point were first brought up with a view to expanding the present shipyards. At that time it was difficult to argue successfully against the proposal, for we were still suffering from the stinging blows of the credit squeeze and we were wanting every ounce of heavy industry in order to absorb the wastage in employment. Conditions were so bad industrially at that particular time that we were

led to believe that unless Evans Deakin & Co. Pty. Ltd. were permitted to expand at Kangaroo Point, there was a strong possibility that they would have uprooted their shipyards and withdrawn them to some southern State. Whether there was any truth in that or not, I do not know. All I do know is that, in my humble opinion, the Government and Evans Deakin & Co. Pty. Ltd. should, even at this late stage, confer and negotiate with a view, in the interests of the people of Brisbane, to moving these industrial eyesores out of the inner suburbs to a more convenient place further downstream.

I know that it will be claimed that it is now too late to reconsider this decision. But is it? Let us look at the facts. Why do I, and others, think that the yards should go from their present site? In the first place, surely the area concerned, being across the river from the city proper, could better be utilised for high density flat dwelling. As it is now, we have a heavy industry, the ship-building industry, with its heavy build-up of noise, of hammering and rivetting, breaking the urban peace on many occasions all night long, in what is in fact one of the heaviest-rated parts of Brisbane—the waterfront of New Farm in my electorate directly opposite the shipyards. Whenever Evans Deakin & Co. Pty. Ltd. have a ship under construction I know about it, even though I never see the yards from where I live, and even if I never go over the Story Bridge. On such occasions I invariably get a spate of letters from both owners and tenants of properties viciously complaining about the disturbance of their peace and quiet. So it would certainly be to the advantage of the citizens of Kangaroo Point and New Farm to have this industry taken to an industrial area outside and away from the residential area. I believe that, even at this late stage, if the Government would make a sincere attempt, and make the proposal attractive enough, perhaps by allocating new land further downstream and paying adequate and fair compensation, Evans Deakin & Co. Pty. Ltd. would still find it an attractive proposition.

Let me develop this argument further and point out why the company might well be prepared to reconsider the location of its shipbuilding yards if sufficient encouragement were given. The company is in the first stage of a £1,000,000 expansion programme at Kangaroo Point. The shipyards are to be completely modernised by the introduction of the most up-to-date shipbuilding methods. As I have had it explained to me, the yards will be a giant assembly line. Construction and handling will be on a straight-line system moving progressively from the stock yard to the assembly skids for lifting to the main building dock.

So modern will the new yards be that one of the outstanding features, I understand, will be the 100-ton monotower travelling crane, the largest of its kind in Australia, which will be used for the lifting area and the dry dock building berths where ships

up to 50,000 deadweight tons will be built. An indication of the size of this monotower crane is given when I tell the Committee that it will be 300 feet high, a little taller than the Story Bridge.

I want it clearly understood that I am not deprecating the reconstruction programme of Evans Deakin & Co. Pty. Ltd. I am wholeheartedly for it because it should bring to Brisbane an increase in the local shipbuilding programme. But I do feel that their £1,000,000 expansion project, which is a major step forward in the Australian shipbuilding industry and which will be capable of more than doubling the previous annual output, would better serve both the company and the people of Brisbane—and indeed the State itself—if it were down in the area adjacent to Cairncross Dock. I say that because the general layout of the yard, with the installation of modern equipment has been designed to facilitate speedy economical construction. For instance, as I understand it, once the new yards are completed they will have a building berth in the nature of a shallow dry dock 115 feet wide with a capacity for ships up to 50,000 deadweight tons. Vessels will no longer be launched in the conventional manner but will be floated out of the building dock fully fitted out and ready for sea trials immediately they leave the dock. In addition, there is to be a sloping berth of the conventional type for construction jobs up to 3,000 deadweight tons should it be needed while the main building block is in use.

I have suggested that an area somewhere in the vicinity of Cairncross Dock could well be the answer to the problem of siting the new £1,000,000 shipbuilding yard. Cairncross Dock is capable of docking any vessel entering the port of Brisbane. 830 feet long and 110 feet wide at the blocks, with a depth of 30 feet over the sill at low water on spring tide, and only intermittently used now, owned and administered as it is by the Department of Harbours and Marine, it was built in 1940 by the Commonwealth as a defence project. If we turn to page 41 of the Auditor-General's report upon the Public Accounts for the year 1963-64, we see that the Auditor-General has this to say—

"The operations of the dock at Cairncross, Brisbane, resulted in a loss of £15,620 for the year compared with a loss of £15,979 for 1962-63. In addition, an amount of £1,898, being Dock Dues in respect of the year 1955-56, now regarded as irrecoverable, was written off in 1963-64 direct to the Accumulated Loss Account.

"The debit balance of the Treasury Trust Fund further increased during the year to £241,421 at 30th June, 1964, compared with £211,594 at the end of the previous financial year.

"The capital cost of the dock to 30th June, 1964, was £1,334,826 of which

£425,000 was provided by the Commonwealth and the balance of £909,826 by the State. However, interest and redemption, totalling £7,962, on an amount of £200,000 only, has been charged annually by the Treasury.

"Operations resulted in successive losses since the year 1946-47. Total losses to 30th June, 1964, amounted to £386,469 which were reduced to £311,469 by grants totalling £75,000 from the Brisbane Harbour Section of the Harbour Dues Trust Fund."

It is interesting to note the paragraph at the bottom of page 41, in which it is stated—

"The transactions of the South Brisbane Dry Dock showed an excess of £4,854 receipts over disbursements and the credit balance of this account increased to £55,898 at 30th June, 1964."

Again do not let me be misunderstood. What I am saying is not a criticism of the administration. What I am suggesting is that Cairncross Dock could well become the pivot point in any negotiations with Evans Deakin & Co. Pty. Ltd. I would suggest that Evans Deakin might well be asked to take over the management and maintenance of Cairncross in a way similar to the agreement with the administration of Cockatoo Dock and the Commonwealth Government. I suggest that the type of agreement operating there should be investigated with a view to a similar agreement between the State, the Commonwealth and Evans Deakin at Cairncross. Here is the starting point for constructive negotiations to move this company to a more suitable site downstream, which could be made attractive to the company as an incentive to move, and at the same time help rid the State of accumulated losses of £386,469 and relieve the Harbour Dues Fund of some £75,000 in grants.

Surely this must be an attractive proposition to the State as well as to the company. If it could be worked out similarly to the agreement between Metropolitan Vickers in Sydney and the Commonwealth for Cockatoo Dock, I am sure it would be a tremendous lift for Evans Deakin and a very attractive enticement to move downstream. Briefly, at Cockatoo Dock, Metropolitan Vickers are contractors and managers, and the machinery is installed by the Commonwealth, which charges a machine rental. If such were done here, it could be possible for Evans Deakin, co-operating with shipping companies and engine builders, to lay in stocks of major spares to cope with large-scale breakdowns—something which cannot be done at present on any full scale in the port of Brisbane. From the defence point of view the proposal I am making is sound. Evans Deakin, which is decentralised into four groups—the shipbuilding yards at Kangaroo Point, or Cairncross if my proposal succeeds; the heavy steel fabricating works and heavy machinery shop at Rocklea; the general engineering and

forging works at South Brisbane, and the light fabricating works at Geebung is fully equipped with modern machinery and the personnel qualified to carry out every requirement of marine engineering, and thus has the necessary equipment to undertake almost any ship repair. This organisation would be a better defence organisation than a single unit, as targets would be split. I think it is fair comment to say that as the years go by fewer and fewer big ships will come further upstream than Brett's Wharf at Hamilton, and eventually repair activities will be driven away from Kangaroo Point because of lack of water, whereas at all times Cairncross would be an ideal substitute, utilising the breasting wharf for emergency engine repairs of deep-laden ships of all sizes.

**Mr. Bennett:** What do you suggest should be done with the Kangaroo Point shipyards when that happens?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** If the hon. member had been in the Chamber when I began he would have known that I said it was ideally suited for high-density flat dwellings.

I believe that if we got Evans Deakin to take over Cairncross Dock as part of its removal downstream, with the company's management and its greater knowledge of competitive business the losses would be reduced and bigger ship-owners could be attracted to dock, service and repair their vessels regularly on a well-planned maintenance scheme. Many improvements would be made and the dock would be operated much more efficiently and economically by private enterprise than as a State instrumentality.

As a starting point for negotiations, with a view to making it attractive to the company to move downstream, I suggest that negotiations should begin immediately to let Evans Deakin & Co. Pty. Ltd. take over Cairncross Dock administratively, with the company undertaking to provide all management, operational and maintenance staff; a board consisting of representatives of the company, the Queensland Government and the Commonwealth Government and another engineering firm be appointed and the company be given the full responsibility of management of the dock on the basis of work performed plus a percentage or straight management fee. This could be decided only after a full survey of the Cockatoo Dock agreement. I am certain that an approach of this kind could well lead to an acceptance of the position by Evans Deakin & Co. Pty. Ltd., and I am sure the company would have fuller thoughts and proposals to submit.

We have been concerned for some years at the shipbuilding and repair position in the port of Brisbane. One of the major reasons for Brisbane's getting less and less work is that there is no repair organisation of a major nature associated directly with Cairncross Dock. Brisbane, in 1964, has no fitting out or repair berth facilities worth speaking about.

I believe that the Government should heed what I am saying because this country and the port of Brisbane are now being visited by larger vessels, with deeper draft, and in the foreseeable future the upper reaches of the Brisbane River will not be developed or deepened for shipping.

If time permitted I could demonstrate that Cairncross is very much out of date, and I could make suggestions about what should be done with it to bring it to a reasonable standard to encourage shipping interests to bring their repairs to the port of Brisbane. Suffice it to say that if Evans Deakin and Co. Pty. Ltd. could be enticed to enter into an agreement for the administration and control of Cairncross, as part of the downstream move, these improvements would rapidly follow. I know it will be argued that it is too late to suggest moving Evans Deakin downstream from Kangaroo Point.

It will be said that a large amount of work has already been done as part of the £1,000,000 expansion programme. In reply, let me say that the only work that has been done so far is of an earth-moving type, and any work so far done need not be wasted. It would still be valuable for the erection of Housing Commission flats and for high-density living, a facet of life quite in order for a part of the city so handy to the commercial centre of the city. As a matter of fact, I would say without fear of contradiction that the total expenditure to date on reconstruction, other than resumptions, would not exceed £50,000.

I make a plea to the Government to take this matter up with Evans Deakin in the interests of the State, the people of Brisbane generally, and last, but not least, the company itself. It will be a far-sighted measure and will do much to create the rapid development of the port of Brisbane. If I could offer a recipe to make the port of Brisbane the port of the future, I would say, "Take the port of Brisbane, insert a traffic tunnel to weld the industrial lands in the north with the south, add Evans Deakin's shipyards to Cairncross Dock, and slowly bring the whole to fruition under the administration of an independent port authority separated from the Greater Brisbane area."

Speaking about the Greater Brisbane area and the local authority that controls it, might I ask when the Government will take on the dictators of the City Hall? We have heard time and time again of acts of tyranny and doubtful morality carried out by the Brisbane City Council. Case after case has been cited to this Chamber by members such as the hon. member for Nundah and you, Mr. Campbell, to name but two, which demonstrate the point. But possibly one of the greatest injustices being done to the people of Brisbane and the commercial and industrial heart of the city by the civic fathers in power is the continued and flagrant prevention by the Brisbane City Council, the Lord Mayor and/or the Brisbane Town

Planning Committee, of the erection of a second city fire station by the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board.

As a member of the Board, I have till now kept a discreet silence in spite of the temptation to tell the city just what has been going on and how this city council, through its Lord Mayor and Town Planning Committee, has been forcing the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board to delay giving adequate fire protection to the city of Brisbane. Let me put the facts before the Chamber. Under the Board's plan—this was long before I became a member of the Board—which was approved by the then Minister for Health and Home Affairs, it was intended to erect a fire station in or adjacent to the Roma Street area to be a No. 2 city station, complementary to the proposed new headquarters in Kemp Place. As hon. members know, the station at Kemp Place is now completed and functioning, and whilst the Board has been endeavouring to procure what we call the Roma Street site for some years, every effort seems to have been frustrated by some means or other with the result that the moment has arrived—indeed it has passed—when the securing of a suitable site for this second city fire station is a matter of extreme urgency.

In June, 1958, the Board had discussions with the then Lord Mayor concerning a site bounded by Roma Street, Eagle Terrace, and Skew Street. Whilst the Board held every hope that it would secure this site, it was told in due course that because of council requirements it would not be possible. The council suggested other sites, all of which were investigated—one in Cribb Street, Milton, and another adjacent to the International Harvester Co's premises—but without any satisfactory result to the Board.

Again, in May, 1960, the Board had further talks with the Lord Mayor concerning a site, and as late as November of that year there was still no suitable site.

In December, 1960 the Brisbane City Council stated that consideration would be given by it to available sites when investigations were completed. At this stage, I say that the Board was given to understand by the Brisbane City Council that it would have a site available for it. But in this we were again doomed to failure.

In April, 1961 Messrs. Sharp & Musgrave Pty. Ltd. offered Carricks Ltd's property at Saul Street and North Quay. This was unsuitable for two reasons; firstly the extreme high cost, and secondly, the Town Plan ordinances rendered the property completely unsuitable for the Board's requirements.

In October, 1961 the Brisbane City Council was questioned on the possibility of a fire station on land at present occupied by the International Harvester Co., and adjacent land. The Board subsequently ascertained that after the council used up

land required by it at this location, there would not be enough left for the Board's purposes.

In December, 1961 the Brisbane City Council advised that it was giving close consideration to fixing a site and that this would be finalised when the council's new Town Plan was under consideration and after completion of new design work for the northern approach to the William Jolly Bridge.

In November, 1961 Queensland Trustees Ltd. offered a property in Herschell Street owned by Messrs. Littledike & Son, but at that time the Board was so certain of a site being made available to it by the Brisbane City Council that it did not avail itself of this site. In any case, at that time the chief officer considered this property was not suitable for fire station purposes.

On 22 May, 1962, the Brisbane City Council told the Board that there was no council-owned land in the Roma Street area that could be considered suitable for fire station purposes. This information gave the Board great concern, and efforts were then made to obtain sites from the Government. A deputation then visited the Minister for Transport concerning railway property, two sites in Countess Street and one at the corner of Countess and Roma Streets, but the Minister advised that the land was not available to us and suggested an area in the municipal markets site.

In September, 1962 the Board wrote to the Land Administration Commission requesting that portion of the markets area be made available for fire station purposes, and the matter was referred to the Brisbane City Council for its views. We as a Board subsequently saw the Lord Mayor and the Town Planning Committee relative to this site and we asked for 200' x 200' as the best area or, as a minimum, 200' x 150' in the old markets site where the weigh-bridge stands in the far corner nearest to Roma Street Railway Station.

**Mr. Sherrington:** How many more pages are there?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I know that members of the Opposition do not like my talking on this subject but I want to tell this story to the people of Brisbane. I do not care if I am here all night. I have a message to get across to the people of Brisbane about the shocking treatment they are getting from the Brisbane City Council in regard to fire protection.

The Lord Mayor told us he would not give us site approval in that area as it would spoil his city beautification plan to have a fire station there. This was in spite of the fact that on 8 October, 1962, the Land Administration Commission wrote advising that when the markets site was transferred to the council the matter of reservation of the area would be considered,

but the Brisbane City Council had plans to use some of the land as a pick-up centre for bus travellers and the remainder as a garden area. In other words, a fire station built as aesthetically as possible, which we promised, and "prettied up" to fit in with the council's architectural beautification requirements would spoil the city beautification plan, whereas a diesel bus pick-up centre would be a thing of beauty and undoubtedly a joy forever.

**Mr. Houghton:** In other words, they fiddle while Brisbane burns.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** Yes, just like Nero.

The Lord Mayor did suggest a property on the other side of Roma Street, closer to the City Hall, which was for sale and for which he was prepared to grant site approval and which, for some reason clear to only the Lord Mayor, would not interfere with his beautification plan although it was only on the other side of the same street! This property, consisting of two blocks, was found on inquiry to be for sale for a mere £300,000. It had on it a multi-storey building which would have to be razed to the ground at an additional cost merely to get sufficient land to erect a fire station to cost at the most £100,000! On 23 November, 1962, we were offered for purchase land at Mountjoy Street and Petrie Terrace. This was rejected as completely unsuitable by the Deputy Chairman, Chief Officer, and architects.

From that time onwards we have been investigating site after site and in every case—I repeat, in every case—the land investigated was either too uneconomic, too small, or unsuitable traffic-wise. We have been offered blocks for sale for £150,000, for only half of the required area; £150,000; £55,000, plus a further £10,000 to demolish the existing buildings; 81 perches for £150,000; another unsuitable property for £150,000; another at £129,000; Carricks' site at North Quay, a good site that we could have had cheap for a mere £200,000, plus demolition! There was another property at the corner of North Quay and Tank Street offered for £220,000.

Now comes the moment of triumph for the Board. After all these long months of complete frustration in its efforts to give adequate fire protection to the inner city area of Brisbane, on 17 December, 1963, the Board received a letter from the Minister for Lands asking it if a portion of railway land at the corner of Roma and Countess Streets would be suitable for its requirements. On 7 January, 1964, the Board wrote to the Minister advising that the area required was 250' x 200', and on the 14th of the same month the Railway Department advised that they were agreeable to the surrender of the land.

**Mr. Davies:** Why didn't you tell us that in the beginning?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I have not finished yet. I advise the hon. member not to open up too early.

On 29 January, 1964, following a meeting, the Board wrote to the Land Administration Commission requesting that the required land at Countess and Roma Streets be set aside as a reserve for fire-brigade purposes. On 6 April this year the "Telegraph" reported "From Government Roundsmen"—

"Approval of Major Fire Station Site

"Brisbane's second new major fire station will be built at the corner of Upper Roma Street and Countess Street, City. The site chosen by a Special Cabinet Sub-Committee has been approved for the project."

I understand that this reserve was set aside by an Order in Council.

I might say that the Board felt like singing that ancient hymn of triumph, "The fight is o'er, the battle won". Had it done so, it would have been premature, for on 1 May, nearly a month after the Government had approved the transfer of this site to the Board, the Board's architects were advised by letter from the Brisbane City Council that negotiations were now taking place between the Council and the Government and that design work for the new station should be deferred.

I subsequently asked, as hon. members know, by question of the Minister for Labour and Industry when site approval would be granted, and he replied that the City Council would grant it the following day. This appeared in the Press, and I acquainted the Board of this advice. Imagine the Board's surprise to find that the Minister had in fact been told a lie and that site approval was not to be granted.

**Mr. Low:** A shocking business!

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** It is shocking when a Minister of the Crown is told a deliberate lie by a responsible authority. This was not something cooked up in a day, but something that had been going on for some years. The excuse now given was that no decision could be made until the Transportation Study Committee survey at present in hand was finalised, or at least until the road needs of this particular area were known. This was in spite of the fact that the Transportation Study Committee survey will not be finished till about May, 1965, and the Deputy Main Roads Commissioner had said he was not interested in this particular area.

And so the struggle has gone on. In sheer desperation, the Board has now asked for a minimum of 40,000 square feet of Hardgrave Park on the corner of Countess and Secombe Streets and Petrie Terrace. This site was selected as long ago as 1962, but the Council would not make it available. If the Lord Mayor and Council are as co-operative in 1964 as they have been since 1962, then it still will not be available. That is why I ask the Government, when is it

going to take the gloves off to this dictatorial junta in the City Hall? I ask, has the Government no pride that it gives a reserve by Order in Council to the fire brigade and then stands idly by whilst the power drunk dictator of the City Hall says, in effect, "To hell with the Government! The Government can give you any land it wants to, but I'm damned if I'll let you use it!"? I warn both the Council and the Government that this is more than just irritation tactics. It is an act of sabotage by the Brisbane City Council that could, under extreme circumstances, prevent the Metropolitan Fire Brigade from putting out the greatest conflagration in the history of Brisbane. Every day the Board is denied the right to build its No. 2 City Station the city lacks maximum protection, and every day other suburban stations cannot be commenced because their erection depends so very much on when the Roma Street Station is completed. I sound the note of warning to the Brisbane City Council that they reject our site approval further at their own peril, and if a serious conflagration does break out, then every man Jack among them will be guilty of criminal negligence.

I trust that the public generally will recognise the seriousness of what I say and rise up in righteous indignation and demand of their civic fathers that they start and exercise some sense of responsibility in this grave matter of fire protection for the city of Brisbane.

Now, there is just one other matter that I want to raise in the debate tonight. I want to answer the Leader of the Opposition, who spoke on Tuesday, 6 October, and made a singularly vicious attack on my colleague the hon. member for Greenslopes, during his absence in hospital, following my colleague's criticism of Mr. J. W. Walters's statement that the Government was paying only lip service to the free hospital scheme.

Acting for Mr. Hooper in his absence, I took the trouble to seek an interview with Mrs. Deighton and get from her a statement concerning the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. A study of the position indicates that, in spite of the letter from Mr. Walters received by the hon. member for Toowoomba West, substantially the statements made by the hon. member for Greenslopes were in fact true. Mrs. Phyllis Deighton, who was Matron of the Lowood Private Hospital, assures me that she was forced to close that hospital because of the poor support from the people of the district. She said that in her opinion medical benefits partly contributed to the hospital's closure, and when an approach was made to the Government of the day for more land, it was pointed out that nearby country towns had public hospitals. She repeated to me the charge laid by the hon. member for Greenslopes that the people who owned the Lowood

Private Hospital were more interested in turning the hospital into flats than continuing it as a hospital and, in truth, did not have the welfare of the people at heart.

The Leader of the Opposition read a letter purporting to be from Mr. J. W. Walters, the person referred to by the hon. member for Greenslopes, in which he wrote, "I have never at any time held any financial interest in the Lowood Private Hospital. The hospital premises are owned by John Samuel Walters, Church Street, Lowood." If that is true, how is it that Sister Deighton recognised the photo of J. W. Walters in "The Courier-Mail" of 14 September, 1964, as her previous landlord? I have here the photo of the man whom she has marked with a cross over his head as her landlord, the man who closed the hospital. I am informed that this man who denies his association with the hospital was in partnership with his father and that the two of them jointly accepted the rent from Sister Deighton. The statement that Sister Deighton did a moonlight flit and owed them money is completely untrue. The truth is that everyone in town knew she was leaving. It was common knowledge. She had a lot of maternity bookings and she cancelled all of them as she was closing down. Her leaving was no secret to the townspeople. It is true that when she left she was in arrears with rent (due to non-support of the hospital) but when she left she more than covered her rental arrears by the value of equipment she left behind. For instance, the sterilising plant alone was worth £360. As a matter of fact, Mr. Walters, known locally as "Billy", saw Mrs. Deighton the morning she left and he did know she was going, not in a moonlight flit as is now alleged, but openly and with the knowledge of all concerned. As a matter of fact, her brother still lives in the district.

I want to point out that J. W. Walters condemns himself by his own pen in his letter to Mr. Duggan. The very knowledge he has of the intimate details he quotes regarding the business confirms Sister Deighton's statement. If he was in fact divorced from the hospital, if he was not a partner, then he just would not know. I am assured that the man stated to be the owner, namely John Samuel Walters, is the owner of the picture show, not the hospital—a different theatre, as it were.

Let me tell the Committee that not once did Walters patronise this local hospital. Even when his own wife had her child she came to Brisbane to have it, and the records show that never at any time were the Walters patients of Lowood private hospital in Sister Deighton's time. And this is the man who criticises this Government for not supporting local district hospitals!

As a matter of fact, the licence was not passed to Walters after Sister Deighton left, or to Dr. Boyd, because both Walters and Boyd asked the department to hold off. Mrs. Boyd was the then matron and Sister Deighton thought they were trying to squeeze

her out. A sister who was interested in taking over the hospital from Sister Deighton had an interview with the man responsible for letting it. If J. W. Walters had no interest, as claimed by Mr. Duggan, why did he and his father interview Sister Loneragan, the Sister concerned? Apparently things were not acceptable to her because she declined to go ahead, making the excuse that her mother's health was not good. The next step was that the licence was given by the Department of Health to Sister O'Connell, but she did not last long either, obviously because the locals did not patronise the hospital any better under Sister O'Connell than they did under Sister Deighton.

Finally, let me say that the cheap sneer of Mr. J. W. Walters in his letter to Mr. Duggan in which he refers to Mr. Hooper's, "lack of intelligence" in that he did not understand the difference between a cottage hospital and a community hospital, does not add to Mr. Walter's stature any more than it does when he attempts to demonstrate that Sister Deighton was a sister, not a matron, when in fact she was a triple-certificated sister acting as matron of the hospital. I trust that what I have said will vindicate the stand taken by my colleague, the member for Greenslopes, and put an end to this whole sorry incident.

**Mr. DAVIES** (Maryborough) (9.58 p.m.): At this hour of the night when we are possibly nearing the end of a Budget debate, one does not feel inclined to be too long. First of all, I should like to pay a brief but sincere tribute to the late "Watty" Wallace. He was a splendid Australian, a loyal mate, a good family man and a fearless fighter for the welfare of his fellow men in his electorate, his State, and our Commonwealth. I feel that he won the sincere respect of every member of this Parliament and I am sure we shall all cherish our memory of him.

Considering all the wrangling that is apparently going on in the Government's ranks, the bitter land dispute among the hon. member for Clayfield, the hon. member for Roma and the Minister for Lands, and the verbal wrangling going on between the hon. member for Windsor and the hon. member for Merthyr over the tunnel versus bridge question, I feel certain that the public generally must be very disturbed at the evident lack of stable government. The Premier would be better advised to concentrate upon restoring some discipline within his ranks than to engage in unwarranted and vicious attacks upon the trade-unionists in this State. We know that there are some trade union leaders who are Communists. We find that these men admit they are Communists. They tell the world that they are members of the Communist Party. But most trade union leaders are good, loyal Australians who support the A.L.P. Most of them are family men owning their own homes, with their own stake and interest in this country. It

ill becomes the Premier of this State to adopt the irresponsible tactics that were adopted away back in the 1890's and the early part of this century when the Labour Party was accused of being disloyal. I will not go through the long story of the malicious attacks made on Labour leaders. As I have said before, the only good Labour leaders, in the eyes of Government parties such as we have at the present time in Queensland, are men who have passed away. I express resentment on behalf of trade-unionists in Maryborough at the uncalled-for and unfair attack by the Premier. I can assure him that these men express very deep resentment. I have heard more forward talk and threats of direct action in the last few weeks from many good, solid, loyal Australian unionists than I have heard for many a long day.

I take the opportunity to express on behalf of the railway men in my electorate—in this regard I think I can speak on behalf of railway men generally—their resentment at the attack made by the Minister for Transport upon railway men in answer to a question I asked on 8 September in which he said—

"I would suggest to the hon. member that in future he be not quite so impetuous—it makes it so easy to trace his informant."

Evidently the Government has an espionage service to track down any member of the Public Service who dares to divulge any information to any member of Parliament. First of all I want to assure the Minister for Transport that my information was not obtained from any member of his department other than from union members or from trade union meetings. I hope that the Minister is not going to make any attempt in this State to endeavour to suppress trade-unionists to that degree. My information about the Baddow lights is also obtained from personal observation. In any case, if I were given the information, why should the Minister make such a statement—a veiled threat that something would happen to the future welfare of the individual in his department if information were given to a member of the Opposition? On behalf of members generally I express strong resentment at that threat. I assure him through you, Mr. Hooper, that information will continue to be made available to me, not only from my own observation of the position as it exists but from representatives of the men through their trade unions and through their trade union leaders.

Tonight for some half-hour we heard the ranting and roaring of a Cabinet Minister, who, in a blustering and bullying way, endeavoured to weave his way through a mass of figures but most certainly finished up only confusing all hon. members. Every member of the Opposition has a perfect right to present his case in connection with the closure of police stations. I had police stations closed in the Maryborough area some years ago, and discussions followed those closures. In our area we, too, thought it better to retain the police stations. Hon.

members have every right to put their case and the Minister has a responsibility to act in a role more fitting a member of the Cabinet and give reasons to hon. members. When such an important change was in the offing, the Minister should have brought the matter before the Chamber to let hon. members know about it. They should not have had to read about it first in the Press. They should have been told in this Chamber that it was the Government's intention to take such a drastic step. If the facts had been calmly placed before all hon. members, possibly some of the closures would have been justified. Many comments were made by my colleagues and I believe there are sound arguments against the closures. It ill becomes a member of the Ministry to act as the Minister did, and to indulge in such ravings and expressions of hatred against the A.L.P. It resounds of the days when he was in Opposition and when he, more than anyone else, made such vicious statements of hatred against union leaders at the Trades Hall. If I had known that he intended to speak as he did tonight I should have produced a clipping that I have containing statements made by him on previous occasions, to remind the Committee of what he said.

I point out to hon. members that every member of the Opposition has faith in the Queensland Police Force. I firmly believe, and I am sure I am supported in this statement by all Opposition members, that the Police Force is definitely understaffed. I will not name the stations in view of the Minister for Transport's statement about the ease of tracing an informant, because the Minister in charge of Police by his espionage service would try to track down the police officers who have given me the information. I know that there are important centres in the State dangerously understaffed not only in the regular section but also in the special traffic section. Is it any wonder that we have tragic mishaps on the road when there is an inadequate traffic force for the job? The men in the traffic force are doing a grand job, but with the limited numbers at their disposal, it is impossible for them to cover adequately the traffic on the roads. We have the greatest respect for the force. We do not doubt its ability to carry out its duties as efficiently as in the past, or more efficiently, because, with experience over the years, the members of the force must become more efficient.

The Minister has endeavoured to rubbish Labour administration, Labour Commissioners and Labour police administration in the past and, in general, the Police Force under Labour administration. For that reason I draw his attention to the police report for 1963 which states—

"The number of offences throughout the State recorded at the Modus Operandi Section, Criminal Investigation Branch, Brisbane, for the year 1962-63 once more

reached a new record, viz. 34,234; and the rate of increase, 7.67 per cent., is substantially more than that recorded for 1961-62, 4.55 per cent. The largest increase, 12.24 per cent., occurred in offences in which violence to property was used. Stock stealing offences showed a decrease of 3.24 per cent. on the previous year's figures."

The report then stated that total offences reported, in proportion to the number cleared up, compared more than favourably with the previous year's performance. We do not contend that the Force is inefficient, but this statement clearly proves our argument that it is understaffed and we hope that Cabinet as a whole will take some steps to curb the unwise statements of the Minister in charge.

I have some words of praise for the work of the Juvenile Aid Bureau, which was established during the year. From the information I have received, the Juvenile Aid Bureau is doing a good job. I also compliment the Police on the Police Youth Clubs. I appreciated the action of the Police Commissioner, and one of his senior officers, in showing me over the club a week ago. I appreciated this because, as chairman of one of the National Fitness centres, I am particularly interested in establishing a National Fitness headquarters in Maryborough. We have plans completed to the extent of £12,000 or £15,000. The Lions Club has come into it in response to our appeal, and will take over a section of that. I hope it will not be long before it is established. The State Council of the National Fitness Campaign examined the plans and, with a few alterations, expressed its approval. That brings me to the point that this Government and the Federal Government have fallen down on the job in regard to national fitness.

The Director of Education in charge of National Fitness, the National Fitness Campaign, the National Fitness State Council in general, and its State officer, Mr. Harris, have all been most helpful and considerate, and within the limits of the money available, they are doing everything possible to help the National Fitness centres in the State. National Fitness expenditure should be regarded as being as important as expenditure on defence, but a mere pittance is made available. In 1939 when the movement was inaugurated by the Commonwealth £100,000 was granted.

The men out in the field, the area officers, are imposed upon by the Government. There is no limit to the hours of overtime they are working. They do not spare themselves. They have to pay the expenses of running their motor cars. They get a certain allowance for petrol and oil, but it is not sufficient. They have to pay for breakdowns. They run their cars at their own expense. They are paid a miserable salary for men who have to establish good public

relations. The officer in my area, the one in Toowoomba, and some others I know of, are splendid types who know their job. They are doing a skilled job, and have had a lot of experience in service in all branches of national fitness work. They are inspiring leaders who are able to assist the chairman to establish good public relations. They have to maintain their families on a mere pittance of a salary.

I hope that members of the Cabinet will go into this matter. I feel certain that if some of the resources of the Government, particularly the money gained from Sunday liquor trading, or the T.A.B. operations were made available, and we were confident that the money was coming from those directions we would feel that at least there was some compensation for the means by which it was being raised. Out of the money that is made available, the council is doing everything possible. As chairman I fully appreciate the special allowance passed at the last council meeting towards the opening of this fund. I did protest strongly that the Commonwealth Government should be heartily ashamed of its attitude towards national fitness. It talks about defence and people being ready to go into the Forces, yet it turns back a high percentage and complains bitterly about people not being nationally fit.

One of the best ways to reduce juvenile delinquency is to encourage, not with talk and meetings, but by a practical demonstration, a practical interest in committees such as that of which I am in charge and all its branches, at Bundaberg, Gympie, Gayndah, Monto, Gin Gin, Kilkivan, and other centres. The Wide Bay officer has to cover all of this tremendous area. He goes away for two or three days in his car. He cannot do it by train.

The Government talks about being the working man's best friend, yet it is willing to exploit its employees. I hope that some action will be taken to assist the State Council to give justice to these men, and to assist them. I believe that the building we contemplate should not be a tax on the public purse. The Government should be in a position to make a big gesture and a big contribution towards the funds. I leave it at that. This National Fitness work is of tremendous importance. In my area there is a married women's club with a membership of 130. It has two meetings a week, and 130 youngsters get together every Monday evening. There are two classes covering all forms of activity. These young people meet in groups. But the Federal and State Governments are not sufficiently interested, and are making but a weak gesture towards national fitness. I did not mean to deal with that subject at length; activities of the Police Department and the Police Boys' Clubs led me to it.

Although I am endeavouring to reduce the length of my speech, adult education is a subject to which I must refer. I know that

the Estimates of the Department of Education are to be debated, but in the short time available it is difficult to cover much ground. Let me say at the outset that the Government is constantly endeavouring to "rubbish" Labour Governments. There should be such a thing as fairness in the arguments used by some irresponsible back benchers on the Government side in their efforts to discount the job done by previous Labour Governments. Their attitude is decidedly unfair.

I am not going to deal with this subject at length now, but say, however, that a Labour Government met the tremendous increase in the number of children attending primary schools in a magnificent way. I could make a few Ministers of today blush with shame by recalling their words of praise when attending openings of new school buildings. The book that I have here shows one magnificent school building after another constructed in the days of Labour administration. The schools feature painting in pastel tones and new architectural trends, as do schools being built today. The Labour Government faced up to the problem, and no child was ever refused admission to a school, or indeed to the university.

Concerning the school buses that are now running round the State transporting children to various schools, I remind the Government that it was only a few years ago that people, particularly those in areas such as the one represented by the Minister for Works and Housing, would not listen to suggestions of closing local schools. It took years and years to persuade them that it was wise to close them and take the children to central schools. All that preliminary work had to be done, and the work of planning of bus routes, with the help of committees, was undertaken during our time as the Government. The idea is not new. We studied the position in Tasmania, where the system was well advanced, and in other countries. In spite of that, this Government attempts to take all the credit for it.

Let me say that the stage has now been reached at which a committee should be appointed to investigate how far this method should go. I have no time to go deeply into the subject now. I feel, however, that the problem should be investigated to see whether it will be carried to an extreme stage in some centres. The many arguments that I should like to develop on this point will have to wait till a later stage.

There is little to be proud of in our approach to education in this country. Governments of the day must take the responsibility for the present position. The present Commonwealth Government has been in office since 1949, and this State Government has occupied the Treasury benches for seven years. A smaller percentage of the national income is spent on education in Australia than is spent in any other worthwhile country. That is not something to be proud of, and is one reason why the country is today short of apprentices and trained

technical men. It also explains why we are in the tragic position of not having sufficient tradesmen to develop the country at the speed at which it should be developed.

It cannot be stated too often that in this State less per head of population is spent on education. Some people may say that a still smaller amount was spent when the Labour Party was in office. The position, however, has now changed for the worse. The percentage difference is now greater than it was under Labour administration. Each year classes are growing larger. I am quite confident that investigation would show that classes have now more pupils than they did when the Labour Party was in office.

The Government makes a great clamour about high schools. We know that conditions are deplorable in many of them.

On the subject of police stations, let me say that I picked out at random a departmental report for 1956-57, the year before the Country-Liberal Government came into office, and what did I find? About £500,000 spent on courthouses and police stations. The Minister, in extravagant language ill-befitting a Cabinet Minister, talked about hovels. What kind of a statement is that to go out to the people of Queensland? Whether we are in Opposition or in Government, surely we must have some pride in and respect for our State, and it is not right that extravagant and untrue statements should go out to the public.

**Mr. Houston:** He said that only £35,000 had been spent.

**Mr. DAVIES:** £322,572 in this particular year, as well as £256,301 in the previous year. The Government is most unfair in this respect.

Labour Governments were in office in Queensland during both World Wars and they handled the affairs of the State magnificently. There was a shortage of men and materials for years after the war.

**Mr. Hanlon:** A shortage of motor vehicles, too.

**Mr. DAVIES:** Yes. No member of the Government can deny that. We all know that the railway system in Queensland, worn out as a result of the strain imposed by the war, had to be rehabilitated. Did not we have building regulations, and were not they justified? On the southern coast there were strict building restrictions and did not we have people living in housing camps in various areas? Was not that necessary? Of course it was necessary. It was a quick and immediate way out of the difficulty, but it was not the final solution. The Government had to face up to these problems with limited resources and with an anti-Labour Government in office in Canberra. The reports show that right up to 1955 there were shortages of iron. They say, "We will do this when we can get the iron and

various other materials." There was a terrific upsurge in the number of pupils attending primary and secondary schools, and the position was much more serious than it is now. The Labour Government handled the job very well, and I heard members compliment the then Secretary for Public Instruction on the magnificent job being done. Today we hear from back-bench members of the Country Party—I am shocked to see such viciousness developing in the Country Party with the Senate elections coming up—opinions that I thought we would hear only from the most bigoted Liberals.

The buildings in the year to which I referred earlier included 10 new police residences, three new police stations, and sewerage was connected to the courthouse and police buildings at Blackall. The hon. member for Gregory rises up in this Chamber and "rubbishes" Labour Governments, saying that they did not do anything in the West. If Labour did nothing more than provide electricity for these small places, it did a good job, and it did not rob any children in the West of a school, either. There were additions to the police station at Dajarra, and a new courthouse and public offices at Goondiwindi—a splendid building in brick of which any Government could be proud. At Richmond, which is also in the West, there was a new police residence, and at Windorah there were new quarters and office accommodation. The list is a long one, ranging from a £108,000 job at Bundaberg to a £26,000 job at Petrie Terrace. Surely that is not the one that has been closed down?

**Mr. Hanlon:** No.

**Mr. DAVIES:** £17,000 was spent at Redcliffe, £7,000 a Southport, and £5,000 at Blackall. The story is here in black and white, with illustrations that confound the arguments that the Minister for Labour and Industry has endeavoured to put forward.

The Government has tried to glamorise many industrial activities, for example, the export of coal to Japan. Japanese industrialists know where the coal is and they want coal. If the Minister for Mines had never gone to Japan, they would still have come here to get coal. The development of the bauxite field at Weipa was begun when a Labour Government was in office, and development will continue there if the international companies want it to continue. This Government did not find oil. As a matter of fact, if one studies the exploration that is going on all over the world it will be found that what is being done in this country pales into insignificance in comparison with what is being done in other countries in the search for oil.

Take away those features and the glamour associated with them and what do we find? We find Ministers talking about hovels. No doubt there were some buildings awaiting repair or replacement under Labour.

There must be, no matter what Government is in office. Roads that were put down then are now getting to the breaking-down stage, whereas several years ago they appeared sound for decades ahead. They have to be renewed. In the seven years we have been out of office, the railway accountant's office on the top floor of Central Station, has certainly become what the Minister would call a hovel. Nothing has been done about it because few people go there and it is not in the public eye.

Moving back to adult education, I want to make a point on a matter that affects the State. I am not going to dwell on the importance of adult education just now. We believe that it must be treated equally with primary education, secondary education, technical education and tertiary education—in fact all stages of education—because of the responsibilities and difficulties of modern life and modern citizenship, the increase in knowledge, and what we may regard as the pressing problem of our society, namely, the economic complexity of life generally. Because of those matters it is certainly necessary that we have more regard to adult educational activities that we have at the present time.

Other countries are doing much more than we are. Sweden is one country where a great deal more is being done and I can say that the amount of public money being spent here at the present time is quite infinitesimal in relation to the importance of adult education. If the Government—particularly the Commonwealth Government—could see the wisdom of doing more in this direction the uplift resulting from it would be tremendous.

I draw the Government's attention to a few factors that relate to the amount being done in the field of adult education. In 1959-60 the Government spent £58,500; in the next year £53,774, and in the following year £69,155. Those were the amounts budgeted for but the money was not all spent. The amount remaining unspent was handed back and was not added to the following year's allocation. Why that should be done when the amount allowed is so small, I do not know.

The people in charge of adult education centres throughout the State are not able to handle the work. More officers should be trained and appointed. There is not enough money for lectures that the people want or for the variety of classes that they need. That is a black mark on the record of this Government. Over all those years they have not increased the amount as it appears in the Estimates, as any increase shown is virtually taken up by increases in salaries. The amount for salaries jumped from £25,700 to £38,000, an increase of about £12,500, but the increased amount allotted for general work was only £700.

If hon. members would like to hear the figures, the amounts are £69,000 actually spent last year and £55,000 in 1959-60, a

difference of about £13,000. For library book purchases £1,508 was granted in 1959-60, I suppose in the Government's excitement at taking office.

Just to give hon. members some idea of the extravagant language used by Government officers—the officers are catching it now—just listen to this statement. I am not blaming the man who prepared the report for the Director of Industrial Development, but he says—

“1963-64 has been a year of great achievement—in fact one of the most exciting and memorable years in the industrial history of the State. Exciting as the past twelve months have been, the current year offers prospects even more thrilling and exhilarating.”

Have a look at what is being done in the education of the people of this State. Except for a miserable increase of £700, the Government has done no more than was done in 1959-60. The amount spent on the purchase of library books has dropped.

**Government Members interjected.**

**Mr. DAVIES:** I am giving facts and figures.

Book purchases dropped from £1,508 in 1959-60 to £450 in 1960-61, £252 in 1961-62, down to £123 in 1962-63. In 1960-61, £55 10s. was spent on the purchase of projectors; £274 10s. was spent in 1961-62; nothing was spent on projectors in 1962-63. Projectors in various parts of the State are in need of repair.

Each year organisers work hundreds of hours of unpaid overtime. They are expected to work far in excess of 36½ hours a week but they do not receive the equivalent holidays of teachers. Hours of additional work are required for lecture preparation as notes and illustrations are an important part of adult education work. In general, adult education in this State is just drifting along.

I want to put up to the Government the idea of establishing an education centre in Maryborough associated with the office of the Director of Education for the statistical area of which Maryborough is the centre. The taking over of the top floor of the Commonwealth Bank perhaps has relieved the situation, but a larger office is required. The building occupied by the adult education people has been rented for a few years. The School of Arts building was not adequate for this purpose; indeed, the accommodation was rather deplorable and new quarters had to be found. Though the Government may think the present accommodation is adequate, it is too cramped. It does not give the adult education people any opportunity to expand their activities. In the new office building I suggest that we could have the Director of Education, the adult education people, Junior Farmers, and other activities associated with the Department of Education. I think this is an idea that should be taken up by the Government and followed in other centres.

Apart from the glamour associated with the activities I have mentioned—coal, bauxite and oil—it must be pointed out that Queensland is a low-wage State and a high cost-of-living State. This is shown by the various tables that have been presented. Some of the figures may have been referred to during the debate but I remind the Committee that the basic wage in Brisbane, adjusted by parity throughout the State, has risen from £12 1s. in 1957 to £15 in 1964. That is not taken into account when Ministers make comparisons between the money spent in the various departments by this and previous Governments. It is most unfair for hon. members opposite to say, "You spent so much in 1957; we spent so much in 1963" without making allowance for these huge rises in costs.

Since 1957 average weekly earnings in New South Wales have risen from £19.95 to £25.17 in 1963, an increase of £5.22. In Victoria they have increased from £19.81 to £25.04, an increase of £5.23. In South Australia they have increased from £18.34 to £22.91, or £4.57. In Western Australia the average weekly earnings were £17.51 in 1957 and £22.14 in 1963, an increase of £4.63. In Tasmania the earnings were respectively £18.58 and £23.19, showing an increase of £3.34. The Australian average was £19.21 in 1957 and £24.22 in 1963, a difference of £5.01. New South Wales and Victoria are well up on the figures for the States, but Queensland has an increase of only £4.76. Since 1957 food and grocery prices have increased by 26.5 per cent., and from statements in the Chamber tonight there appear to be further increases although I have not had a chance to see them in the "Telegraph". Brisbane has a consumer price index 5 per cent. above that for any other capital city.

These matters seem often to be forgotten by hon. members opposite when they wrangle over such matters as the need for a bridge or a tunnel. It is a pity that the Government does not appoint the two hon. members concerned—who are lost in a maze of figures and authorities—to a special investigating committee. They seem to indulge in endless repetition. Their arguments seem to be put forward more from a personal angle than with the idea of satisfying the Chamber about what is best. I believe that a committee should be appointed to investigate the whole question.

I remind the members of the Committee that the Australian Labour Party established a Conservatorium of Music in this State. No serious effort has been devoted to giving the Conservatorium the necessary money to do what is proper in the interests of culture.

In addition, the Australian Labour Party established a Research and Guidance Section which is claimed to be the best department of its type in Australia. The research work carried out is as good as that done by any other similar department in Australia, and

the department publishes reports that are very valuable. However, its work cannot be extended because money is not available. The department says, "We cannot appoint men and we have not enough men." Why has the department not got the men? It is important for the future welfare of this country to appoint these officers. It is most important for the State to have men available to travel the length and breadth of Queensland giving advice, conducting tests, and carrying out the necessary research work in conjunction with the educational activities in Queensland.

The Government has done nothing but talk about matters relating to culture in the State. It endeavoured to win the election on a promise to establish an art gallery. A site was selected and the matter was debated in this Chamber. However, what has been done? So far as I am aware, the site has been scrapped. Some time ago I suggested that the Government should gradually take over all the land from Margaret Street to the Botanic Gardens and from George Street to Edward Street. If we gradually resumed all that and some of it could be used to establish an art gallery, museums and other amenities, and the Botanic Gardens could be enlarged. Brisbane is in great danger of growing into a very harsh industrial city that will be a disgrace to Australia. I come from outside the city, and I appreciate that something is being done to establish a city square. I only hope that more action along the same lines will be taken.

I come now to the railway centre in Maryborough. I will not speak at length about industrial unrest. I join with other members of the Committee in saying that the Premier should be prepared to confer on this national conflict. Eventually both sides will have to sit around the table. The statements we heard from the hon. member for Merthyr tonight are typical of those we have heard from one or two Ministers—"If you want to fight, we will fight." That is a provocative statement, and I cannot understand the Premier's action. What forces are behind it? Surely it is the coming Senate election. But he is not entitled at this stage to make rash and provocative statements such as he has made. What harm can be done by getting around a table and discussing these matters? At least the Government could then say, "We made the gesture." There is discontent, and what has the Government done?

So far as arbitration is concerned, we know the story of bonuses at Mt. Isa. The mine cannot ask for a reduction, and the miners cannot ask for an increase. When three weeks' leave was brought in, it was traditional that railwaymen should have an extra week's leave after 13 years' service. After eight years' service they got an extra day for each additional year, with a maximum of a week after 13 years. Why, at a time when three weeks' leave was introduced, should the Government wipe out that privilege? It is only a source of annoyance

and is an endeavour to disturb the minds of the men in the railways. It was wrong to do that. The men resented it very much. We have railway tradesmen in Maryborough—and there are some in other centres—who are doing the same work as that done at Walkers, and getting £2 a week less. Is it any wonder that the men are leaving the railway service and going to Walkers?

Speaking of efficiency in the Railway Department, the job cannot be done properly with the strength down 3,000 to 4,000. No person would voluntarily travel twice between Cairns and Townsville by rail. I have never been on such a shocking trip. Sufficient work is not being done there. I am not exaggerating when I say that it is dangerous for any aged or sick person to travel alone on the Sunlander between Townsville and Cairns. Money is being saved on the railways. It is said that the railways have not paid their way. That is another fallacy. Throughout the years we were in power our opponents always added interest charges on. Why shouldn't interest charges be added on? Is not interest an expense in the running of the railways? So the railways are being run at a profit of a couple of million pounds. If the job was done properly there would be a bigger deficit. There are not enough men in the service to do the job.

The men in the workshops in Maryborough are turning out work as good as that turned out by any other people in the State. There is a lack of tradesmen. There is supposed to be a certain number of tradesmen's assistants to every group of tradesmen, but often some are taken to do another job in the workshop where there is a shortage of labourers or assistants. The shortage is shocking. It has reached the stage where the department is finding it difficult to overcome the problem. That is the fault of the administration. For years it did not appoint apprentices. I realise that as a result of the examinations held for the first time for a few years there have been fewer apprentices.

I appreciate the fact that the Minister has given us the sheds for steel wagon repair work in Maryborough. We have recently been given six jacks and a mobile crane and these will be most welcome. There are 4,000 fewer men in the railway service, and that makes it impossible for the necessary work to be done. The Government will have to face up to the position sooner or later. There are 25 to 30 tradesmen short in some big centres, and I believe that the department is disturbed as to how it will fill those vacancies. If it pays the extra £2 that is being paid to tradesmen outside to compensate men and help them, the men can be expected to stay in the service.

I am not going to dwell upon this point; rather do I make an appeal to the Minister on it. A ruling has been given in the Railway Department that every man must return

to work on 11 January, 1965. I know of the case of a man who devotes all his leisure time to Scouting and wanted to attend a Scout jamboree in Melbourne. He had two weeks' holiday up his sleeve, as it were, and wanted to take one week off to go to Melbourne. His application for leave was refused. I appeal to the Minister to grant leave in such cases to people who, like this man, are rendering a service to the community. In many ways the Government is white-anting the working conditions of the workers.

In the time that remains to me I should like to give a summary of some of the achievements of the Australian Labour Party in association with agricultural activities in Queensland.

**Mr. Bromley:** That would take all night.

**Mr. DAVIES:** It would if I went into it in great detail. I have, however, a summary. Let me remind hon. members of a statement on gross production in this State ably summarised by the Leader of the Opposition in a recent address. Gross production valued at principal markets, when decreased by rising costs of marketing, rising costs of seeds, fodder, and other materials, depreciation and maintenance of plant and buildings, falls sharply in net value in comparison with the position that obtained in the years of Labour government.

In 1959-1960 gross primary production of £294,541,000 fell to a net value of £229,177,000. In 1960-61, gross primary production of £301,794,000 fell to £226,184,000 net value. The comparable figures for 1961-62 were £292,269,000 and £215,868,000. In 1957, the last year of Labour administration, gross primary production of £286,370,000 fell to £253,867,000 in the first year of the Country-Liberal Government.

That is linked with the position of primary producers. Hon. members opposite rave about bridges and tunnels, and make malicious charges against members of the Opposition. It is time they gave serious consideration to the problems confronting primary producers who have to meet increased costs all along the line. They have to cope with racketeering in spare parts, fertiliser, seeds, sprays, and all things necessary in agriculture. The primary producer is restricted in his opportunities to demand increased prices for what he produces. The marketing of primary products restricts any such activity, and no effort is made by the Government to assist these people.

When the Labour Party was in office, hon. members now on the Government side were always complaining about the drift of people from rural areas to the cities. What is happening now? People are moving to the cities. In 1957, 61.3 per cent. of the population resided outside the capital. In 1962 this figure had decreased to 59 per cent. More people were coming to the city. In 1963,

it was down to 58·4 per cent. Where is the cry now from representatives of the Country Party that people are not being kept on the land? The Government has been in office for seven years and the position is worse than it ever was, the percentage having decreased from 61·3 to 58·4.

In 1915, when a Labour Government came into office in this State, there was every excuse for it to spend the whole of the first session upon legislation to improve the general conditions of the workers in the community, but it spent a big portion of its time—I often wonder how it managed to do it—concentrating as much on farming legislation as it did on industrial legislation. A Labour Government established the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board in 1915—hon. members opposite cannot deny that—and the Sugar Acquisition Act was the foundation upon which this wonderful industry was based in this State. It would not have reached its present position of eminence had it not been for legislation passed by a Labour Government.

In 1920 the State Wheat Board was established, and in 1940 the Australian Wheat Board was set up. In 1922 a number of marketing Acts were passed, which Country Party representatives said were “socialising the farmer”. In 1926 the Primary Producers’ Organisation and Marketing Act was introduced. Over the years Labour Governments gave the farmers machinery to enable them to handle their own affairs and deliver themselves from the hands of the middle-man, who in those days was extortionate in his demands for a share of the price of the product. In 1926, also, the Cotton Board was established. In 1923 the Fruit Marketing Organisation Act was brought down, and under this legislation the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing was set up. Also in 1923 the Cheese Marketing Board was established, in 1924 the Peanut Marketing Board, and in 1925 the Butter Marketing Board.

In addition to these Acts, Labour Governments provided increased funds and staff for the Department of Agriculture and Stock, as it was then, in a massive expansion of activities and services.

**Mr. Dewar** interjected.

**Mr. DAVIES:** Once again the Minister for Labour and Industry has interjected in an irrelevant way. It would be better if he concerned himself with the extension services provided by the Department of Primary Industries, because they compare very badly with similar services provided in New South Wales and Victoria.

Labour Governments established research stations and laboratories to service the pastoral industry, and they concentrated research experimentation on cotton production and cereal-crop industries. Some hon. members opposite know how many years it took officers appointed by Labour

Governments to persuade dairy farmers to tolerate any form of herd testing. It was years before they accepted that herd testing would benefit their production. I can remember the time, too, when many farmers wanted only to exploit their soil and made no effort to practise methods designed to prevent soil erosion. Labour Governments sent out men to contour plough the land of farmers in many parts of the State, and they did it free of cost. I have yet to hear of any Government sending out men at Government expense to assist trade unions to run trade union affairs. Everything possible was done to assist the farmer by way of scientific and research work, and Labour Governments laid a sound foundation in this respect.

I know that my time is short, but I have statements here by men of note, men who have given service to the community, not men who have made their portion on the land and then retired to live a lazy life. I refer to men such as Mr. Muller and the late Mr. Plunkett, who gave great service to the working farmers throughout the State. I have here a very gracious tribute, too, from the Minister for Works and Housing when he was a private member. Mr. Muller said, “The department is to be commended on its pasture improvement work.” Yet we have the hon. member for Clayfield, who has lost touch with the North, making certain statements. He could not have been of any service to them or they would still have him up there. He spoke as though we were never interested in pasture development, but Mr. Muller, who is a far sounder man in this sphere, said in 1956—

“The Department is to be commended on their pasture improvement work. They have experienced many difficulties but after years of work good results are being achieved. There was a time when it was thought that irrigation for pasture improvement was too expensive, but in view of the tremendous possibilities, I am now convinced to the contrary.”

He commended the endeavours to improve pasture under dry-farming conditions. I have a list of the important centres in the State where we started dry pastures. We started the Coolum experimental area, Brian Pastures in the Gayndah area, and several other areas throughout the State.

**Mr. Campbell:** You were only playing around.

**Mr. DAVIES:** We started it; we were the pioneers and we did it in spite of war problems and post-war problems. They were met by our Government. Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, now Minister for Housing, spoke as well of certain men engaged in this work. He said—

“I express appreciation of the services of the men engaged in this work. They are doing an excellent job and nothing is too much trouble for them—encouraging farmers and working up enthusiasm for this important work.”

He was speaking in an agricultural debate in this Chamber. I can remember that particular debate because I rose in my place and commented on the extraordinary tributes that were paid by members of the Opposition to the Labour administration for the work it had done in the interests of the farmers in the community. I say again that it would be much better if some of these people who have done so little for the farmers and who have never given service outside their parliamentary jobs did as Mr. Muller and Mr. Plunkett were doing in assisting agricultural industries.

**Mr. Ewan:** Why are they plebisciting you in Maryborough?

**Mr. DAVIES:** I can look after myself in my electorate.

We hear today of the magnificent expansion in the sugar industry. It is good, but between 1945 and 1955 under Labour the area under sugar-cane increased from 390,000 acres to 700,000 acres.

**Mr. Campbell:** In 10 years? Good Lord!

**Mr. DAVIES:** People who hang around the capital city should be endeavouring to get others out of it instead of doing everything they can to increase the metropolitan percentage of the population.

**Mr. Campbell** interjected.

**Mr. DAVIES:** I will leave the hon. member's poultry industry for a later date.

(Time expired.)

**Hon. T. A. HILEY** (Chatsworth—Treasurer) (10.58 p.m.), in reply: On this occasion the Budget debate has been contributed to for the maximum time by more than half the members of the Committee. Many subjects have been raised. I have lost financial account of all the various proposals that have been made, but I do not think any hon. member, apart from the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, in about 50 minutes wanted to put £500,000 on to our Consolidated Revenue expenditure and about £5,000,000 to resume the whole of the area from Margaret Street down to the Botanic Gardens.

There were two main lines of presentation, namely, industrial unrest and police stations. The Minister for Labour and Industry has dealt substantially with the second subject and on the first I propose, with the permission of the Committee, to show tomorrow that it was presented on a confused and even a self-contradictory basis. I intend to have something to say on that important subject and on a number of other matters that were raised. As the hour is late, I move at this stage that the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 11 p.m.