

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 1961

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

my colleague the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry was present, when assurances were given that the Commonwealth Government was keeping a very close surveillance of the whole situation."

ABORIGINAL SETTLEMENTS

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) asked the Acting Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"(1) What was the aboriginal population under the care of the Director of Native Affairs at each State Settlement and what was the net cost to the State for the provision of all facilities for the year ended 30 June, 1960?"

"(2) What is the aboriginal population of each church mission in Queensland and what was the amount of State Government contribution to each mission for the same period?"

"(3) Has any consideration been given to the State taking over full responsibility for the provision of hospital, medical services and educational facilities at all church missions?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

"(1) The population and amounts expended from State funds for the maintenance of State Settlements and Church Missions in the year ended June 30, 1960, were:—

Settlement	Population	Amount
Cape York (Bamaga) ..	735	£286,473
Cherbourg ..	1,207	
Palm Island ..	1,527	
Woorabinda ..	697	
	4,166	

WEDNESDAY, 22 FEBRUARY, 1961

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

QUESTIONS

IMPORTATION OF AMERICAN FRUIT

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Premier—

"In view of his reported statement at Mundubbera, on 21 January, that Queensland's fruitgrowing industry could be imperilled by unrestrained imports, that valuable dollars were being used up in the importation of American fruit and that he feared a flood of imports from California and other American States, is he able to inform the House that he has made strong representations to the Commonwealth Government with the aim of removing this threat to the Queensland fruitgrowing industry?"

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

"The question was raised with the appropriate authorities. In addition, the matter of trade in primary products was discussed at the recent meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council, at which

"(2)

Mission	Population	Government Contribution
		£
Yarrabah ..	628	85,160
Mitchell River ..	529	
Lockhart River ..	351	
Edward River ..	252	
Aurukun ..	560	54,779
Mapoon ..	252	
Weipa ..	183	
Morrington Island ..	450	
Mona Mona ..	337	18,166
Doomadgee ..	393	8,191
Hope Vale (including Bloomfield) ..	520	21,362
Total ..	4,455	£187,658

In any comparison of money spent on the maintenance of State Settlements and Church missions it is necessary to bear in mind the relative state of advancement of the populations of Settlements and Missions respectively. The State Settlements, with the possible exception of Bamaga, are situated close to the major centres of population and the natives residing thereon have attained a state of life closely approximating, if not equal to, that

of the general population. On the other hand, the Church Missions are, in the main, situated in remote areas of the State and their people have not yet reached the state of advancement of those of the Government Settlements. It is accepted by all with close experience of Aboriginal welfare that it is much more costly to maintain advanced Aborigines approaching assimilation, than the less advanced Aborigines such as are found in the main on Church Missions. Only minor illnesses and uncomplicated maternity cases are cared for in Mission Hospitals, the others are cared for in State Hospitals. Medical and dental services are free to the Missions and drugs are supplied. The question of education on Church Missions is being considered."

COMMONWEALTH FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO DEVELOP NORTHERN AND WESTERN QUEENSLAND

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) asked the Premier—

"Has he yet received any advice from the Commonwealth Government in relation to special financial assistance to develop Northern and Western Queensland as a result of the tour of these areas by Federal Liberal and Country Party Members of Parliament, arranged by the then Acting Prime Minister, Mr. McEwen, during the last State Election Campaign or was this tour just another political confidence trick perpetrated on the people of this State by the Federal Government?"

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

"I am unaware that the Government was expected to look for special financial assistance from the Commonwealth as a result of the visit to Queensland of Federal Members of Parliament. As members of the National Parliament, they are just as much interested in, or perhaps I should say more interested in, Queensland's economy and development than the Honourable Member and some of his colleagues opposite."

DEVELOPMENT OF QUEENSLAND BY COMMONWEALTH AND STATE GOVERNMENTS

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"(1) Was he correctly reported in 'The Courier-Mail' of October 6, 1960, as saying 'The State and Commonwealth Governments were getting together as never before to work out Queensland's future development schemes'?"

"(2) If so, has the alarming deterioration in Queensland's economy over recent months been a result of this 'getting together'?"

"(3) If not, when can Queenslanders expect to see some beneficial results of this 'getting together'?"

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

"(1, 2 and 3) The Honourable Member should stop getting together with the State's Jeremiahs and get together with knowledge of what is happening in his native State. Expansion at Mt. Isa, the opening up of Weipa, record expansion in tobacco, the first oil refinery, every year a bigger year for Tourism—these make nonsense of his calamity howling. As for beneficial results from recent talks with the Commonwealth, I indicated yesterday that two helpful announcements were expected. The Prime Minister last evening indicated that the Commonwealth proposed special road assistance and specifically mentioned North and Western Queensland. I expect that next week will bring an announcement to help the building industry."

ALLEGED PROFITEERING ON WOOLLEN GARMENTS

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) asked the Minister for Justice—

"(1) Is he aware that the Victorian State Leader of the Country Party, Sir Herbert Hyland, has recently called for investigation of alleged profiteering on woollen garments having regard to the extreme difference between the price paid by the consumer and the return to the wool-grower?"

"(2) In view of this and the fact that his colleague, the Member for Roma, on October 13, 1960, told Parliament that on a two-piece ready-to-wear suit selling at £25, the retail margin of £7 18s. was almost four times the cost of raw wool content—£2, over eighty per centum in excess of the fabric manufacturing cost of £4 12s. and over seventy-five per centum of the cost of cutting, making and trimming—£10 10s., will he have this matter investigated by the Prices Advisory Board and submit their report to Parliament?"

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

"(1) I do not propose unnecessarily to take up the time of this Parliament in commenting on statements which may or may not have been made by the Victorian State Leader of the Country Party. I have many more important matters to attend to much nearer home."

"(2) See answer to No. (1). To this I might add that my good friend, the Honourable Member for Roma, is quite well aware that if he, at any time, wishes to place before me any authentic information, I am very happy to discuss any relevant matter directly with him. I would also point out that an investigation as suggested in this question would be of major magnitude, and little purpose would be served as most of the garments sold in Queensland are manufactured in other State."

PICNICS FOR INMATES, BRISBANE MENTAL HOSPITAL, GOODNA

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) asked the Acting Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"Is it a fact that picnics by bus previously available at Brisbane Mental Hospital, Goodna, for approved patients have recently been discontinued and, if so, why?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

"Bus picnics are held once each month of both male and female patients. The last male picnic was on January 22 and the last female picnic on January 25. I can assure the Honourable Member that these picnics will continue."

TRANSPORT OF MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT TO TRANSPORT ADVISORY COUNCIL, TASMANIA

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) asked the Premier—

"(1) In view of (a) the present Treasurer's statement from the Opposition benches in the House on October 9, 1956, that there was considerable room for saving in the number and use of Government motor vehicles and (b) the Treasurer's present insistence on overall departmental economies, will he inform the House whether a ministerial car was used by the Minister for Transport to attend the recent meeting of the Transport Advisory Council in Tasmania? If not, what transport was used?"

"(2) What was the nature of (a) the total staff personnel or other persons accompanying the Minister, (b) the transport itinerary and (c) the cost?"

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

"(1) It will be patent to all fair-minded citizens that it is a prime requirement for Ministers of this and any other Government to obtain as much first hand knowledge of the operations covered by their administration as is possible and all Ministers of this Government have been assiduous to this undertaking, having regard at all times to Departmental economy. A knowledge of weighbridge and general operations of heavy transport in other States, as well as Queensland, is an essential for the Minister for Transport and if he can accomplish this when travelling to important conferences so much the better. On such an inspectional basis the Minister for Transport utilised his Ministerial car en route to Tasmania."

"(2) (a) The Minister was to have been accompanied by his Private Secretary but that gentleman had to cancel his departure at the last moment on account of family illness. The fact that the Minister was accompanied by his family, whose living expenses were borne by him, is purely incidental. (b) The Conference itinerary was

from Friday, February 10, to Wednesday, February 15. The vehicle left Queensland on Wednesday, February 8, and returned on Saturday February 17. (c) The cost to the Department was £75 8s. 4d. Had the Minister travelled by air his fares would have been £69 2s., but he would not have been able to acquire a first hand knowledge of weighbridge operations and Transport administration in New South Wales and Victoria, which was the object of the road journey."

DISMISSALS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) asked the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—

"(1) How many persons including clerical staff employed on Public Works Department projects have been dismissed since January 14, 1961?"

"(2) How many were tradesmen and what were their trades?"

"(3) How many were semi-skilled and unskilled and what were their classifications?"

"(4) How many were clerical staff and what were their classifications?"

Hon. L. H. S. ROBERTS (Whitsunday) replied—

"As is usually the custom in my Department during the latter part of each calendar year and essentially in an endeavour to have urgently needed school classroom accommodation available for the commencement of each following school year, a considerable number of temporary employees are engaged and of course at the expiration of this emergency period the services of those who are temporarily engaged are then terminated. On November 15 last, the total Day Labour force of my Department was 2,689 from which it increased as follows:—November 30, 2,776; December 16, 2,863; December 30, 2,886; January 13, 2,939; January 30, 2,948. Whilst dealing with this question of unemployed and by way of interest to the Honourable Member, I give the following additional information:—Number employed as at February 15, 1961, 2,705; Peak employment (all time high) January 31, 1961, 2,948; Number employed as at June 30, 1960, 2,318; Number employed as at June 30, 1957 (during previous Government's term of office), 1,742; Peak employment during previous Government's term of office, March, 1956, 2,123; Expenditure on Building Construction and Maintenance 1956-1957 (previous Government's last year of Office), £3,535,246; Appropriated for expenditure on Building Construction and Maintenance Year 1960-1961, £7,096,000. So far as the Honourable Member's question is concerned, I would advise as follows:—

"(1) 270.

"(2) 180 were tradesmen, as follows:—140 capenters, 24 painters, 4 plumbers, 11 bricklayers, 1 electrical fitter.

"(3) None was semi-skilled and ninety were unskilled builders' labourers.

"(4) None was clerical staff."

DELIVERY OF COAL BY TRAIN TO
NEW FARM POWER HOUSE

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) asked the Minister for Transport—

"(1) What has been the monthly delivery of coal by train to the Brisbane City Council New Farm Power House for each month, July to December inclusive?"

"(2) What has been the weekly delivery of coal by train to the same place for each week since January 1, 1961?"

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

"(1 and 2) The information sought concerns the business affairs of one of the Department's customers, and, therefore, is confidential unless the Honourable Member produces the customer's authority that such information be made available to him."

CLOSURE OF POST-NATAL WARD AT PRINCESS
ALEXANDRA HOSPITAL

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) asked the Acting Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"(1) What was the reason for the closure of the post-natal ward (C5) at the Princess Alexandra Hospital?"

"(2) Is it not a fact that the ward was generally fully occupied except for the normal two-bed emergency provision?"

"(3) Is it not a fact also that general practitioners in the suburbs are opposed to its closure?"

"(4) What is the present bed-capacity of unused wards at this hospital?"

"(5) Does he agree that both a maternity section and a children's section are a necessity at this hospital?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

"(1) The post-natal ward for intermediate patients at the Princess Alexandra Hospital was opened only as a temporary measure when a very heavy demand on the Brisbane Women's Hospital persisted for some months. As such the ward was never intended to be a permanency. In the intervening time the demand for intermediate accommodation at the Brisbane Women's Hospital has shown a decline. In consequence, and with the opening of the 140 bed Mater Mother's Hospital, the Brisbane Women's Hospital has ample accommodation to meet the demands upon it.

The circumstances which gave rise to the temporary opening of the post-natal ward at the Princess Alexandra Hospital do not now exist. Moreover, it has to be borne in mind that the Princess Alexandra Hospital was provided expressly as an acute hospital for adults."

"(2) On the average, the beds in the ward were less than three-quarters occupied."

"(3) Representatives of south side doctors made representations for the continuation of the ward."

"(4) Two wards, including the closed post-natal ward with accommodation for sixty-eight acute patients."

"(5) The Princess Alexandra Hospital was provided expressly as an acute hospital for adults and it will certainly be required for that purpose."

DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS TO RELIEVE
UNEMPLOYMENT, CAIRNS AND DISTRICT

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) asked the Premier—

"Owing to the grave unemployment position now confronting workers in Cairns and district and the possibility of the position becoming worse, what measures have been taken by the Government regarding developmental projects to give employment in this area?"

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

"The Honourable Member is now aware that yesterday I fully outlined the Government's views on the unemployment situation in this State, and the efforts it is making to counteract its effects not only in the Cairns area but in all parts of the State."

CLOSURE OF CAIRNS RAILWAY WORKSHOPS

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) asked the Minister for Transport—

"Is there any foundation in the reports circulating in Cairns and causing grave concern to railway workers that the Cairns Railway Workshops are likely to be closed down and that only a skeleton staff will be kept on?"

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

"At present there is no intention of closing down the Department's Workshops at Cairns. However, a general review is taking place of non-paying Branch Lines, and should it be found necessary to close any lines in the Northern Division then such could have some effect on Cairns. At this stage I cannot give any indication relating thereto."

FEDERAL AND STATE MINISTERS TO VISIT
ROCKHAMPTON AND ADVISE ON UNEMPLOY-
MENT PROJECTS

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) asked the Premier—

"In view of the fact that the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Holt, and the Minister for National Development, Mr. Spooner, will be coming to Brisbane this month, will he make the necessary arrangements with these Federal Ministers to accompany himself and his Deputy Premier to Rockhampton to address a public meeting on any plans to ease the unemployment in Central Queensland also on the five-year plan for the development of Central Queensland as outlined by his Deputy Premier, Mr. Morris, in 1957 and 1958?"

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

"No."

CONSTRUCTION OF POWER HOUSE IN
CENTRAL QUEENSLAND

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

"Will he inform the House if a decision has been made where the power house will be built and when an announcement will be made, as this question is of vital importance to Central Queenslanders?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Forestry), for **Hon. E. EVANS** (Mirani), replied—

"No decision has been made as to the location of a power house. The investigation is still in progress and it is impracticable at this stage to indicate when an announcement will be made."

MERZ AND McLELLAN REPORT AND PRICE OF
COAL

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

"(1) Will he inform the House if the Merz and McLellan Report was released in part or was the full report given to the electricity authorities, mine managers, and other interested parties?"

"(2) If the answer to Question (1) is in the negative, will he inform the House who released the figures as quoted in the Press at being 15s. 8d. per ton for Callide coal as against 60s. for West Moreton?"

"(3) As this so called secret report has been given a large amount of publicity at Rockhampton, will he inform the House when this report will be tabled in the House?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Forestry), for **Hon. E. EVANS** (Mirani), replied—

"(1) A preliminary report has been made available in part to the Heads of Electric Authorities and to a number of Government Departments in order to clarify certain matters and confirm assumptions made. It has not been released to Mine Managers or other interested parties."

"(2) I am not aware as to where the Press would obtain the figures said to have been published."

"(3) I am unable to indicate when this report will be tabled. As indicated in my answer to another question by the Honourable Member the investigation is still in progress."

DEVELOPMENT OF SOUTHPORT BROADWATER
AND THE SPIT

Mr. GAVEN (South Coast) asked the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation—

"In reference to investigations carried out relative to the cleansing of the residue from and the rehabilitation of the Southport Broadwater and the development of the area known as The Spit, and as five months have now elapsed since applications closed for same,—

(1) In response to his invitation how many applications were received?

(2) Was one proposal recommended for acceptance subject to certain conditions?

(3) Is it true that one of these conditions demanded the construction of an erosion protection concrete wall to cost approximately one and one-half million pounds, and a further demand for an erosion protection concrete wall to be constructed between Sans Souci Private Hotel and The Spit, which is entirely outside of the proposed area to be developed?

(4) If his answer to Question (3) is in the affirmative, will he inform me if his advisers in this matter are the same advisers who three years ago told a deputation from the then South Coast Town Council, led by me, that the construction of concrete walls to prevent erosion on the ocean front on the South Coast was a waste of time and money?

(5) What has happened in the interim period of three years to bring about this change of opinion?

(6) Why has a decision on this very important matter been delayed so long?

(7) Is it the intention of the Department to give effect to one or any of the applications received?"

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

"(1 to 7) During the post-war years many approaches were made by persons desirous

of developing the area known as 'The Spit' at Southport. As a result of those approaches applications for the development of 'The Spit' were invited during November, 1958. Two applications were received. These applications were reviewed by a select committee consisting of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works and representatives of the Department of Harbours and Marine, Public Lands, Main Roads and the Tourist Bureau. That committee was of the opinion that the Government should not sponsor or encourage the development of 'The Spit' for residential purposes, in view of doubts as to the stability of the area. Further inquiries were received from persons interested in developing this area and the view was taken that provided a scheme for development ensured adequate protection from the sea and also from the Nerang River, development may be a possibility. Applications were invited during May, 1960, when applicants were advised as follows:—"The changes which have occurred in the formation of the area to be developed have raised the question of its stability and in examining any application for development, particular consideration will be given to the protection scheme which gives the soundest stabilization. Applicants are required to state fully the method proposed to be adopted for the stabilization and permanent protection of the present high water mark against erosion on the ocean side of the area'. Four applications were received. These applications were referred to a select committee constituted by the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works and a representative of the Departments of Public Lands, Main Roads, Harbours and Marine, and Mines. This committee has examined the applications in detail and at the present time is holding discussions and negotiations with the applicant company whose application has been selected as the one more in the public interest. There are many matters of a technical nature to be examined and to date the final report of the committee has not been received for consideration. At this stage it is not known whether one of the applications will be accepted and development lease granted. No proposal has been recommended for the acceptance and no proposal in its present form is completely acceptable. Whether or not an acceptable scheme can be negotiated, bearing in mind the matter of public interest, remains to be seen."

RENTAL REBATES FOR STATE RENTAL HOUSES BUILT SINCE 1956

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"Owing to the serious unemployment position that has taken place in Queensland since December were any steps taken by him at the Housing Conference which took place last week to have the

Rental Rebates System applied to State Rental homes built since 1956 in order to give some relief to those people in such homes who are affected by unemployment?"

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

"The matter of rebates of rent was fully argued by all States at the 1956 Conference and again at the May, 1960, Adelaide Conference of State Housing Ministers when the Commonwealth was requested that any new Agreement should provide for the sharing by the Commonwealth of rental losses in the same manner as the 1945 Agreement. At the Conference at Canberra last week the Commonwealth Minister advised that he had put the views of the States before the Federal Cabinet and that the Commonwealth maintains its previous view upon the matter and is not willing to accede to the request of the States. The Commonwealth is adamant on this matter."

REGISTRATIONS FOR EMPLOYMENT, APPRENTICESHIP OFFICE, BRISBANE

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"(1) What was the number of young people who registered with the Apprenticeship Office, Brisbane, for employment for the months of December and January?"

"(2) Of this number how many were signed up with private employers, and what number was taken on by Government Departments?"

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZHEY (Isis) replied—

"(1 and 2) The Apprenticeship Office does not serve as a registry for employment. Registration for employment is undertaken by the Commonwealth Employment Service. The Apprenticeship Office does not arrange employment but approves and allocates apprentices in the various trades. Employers who desire to engage further apprentices approach the Apprenticeship Office for approval and allocation of apprentices after employment has been arranged. In December, 1960, 135 apprentices were allocated in all trades. In January, 1961, 250 apprentices were allotted. The Apprenticeship Office records apprentices according to their trades, but does not list them in categories of private and Governmental employment."

IMPORTATION OF HIDES AND FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) asked the Premier—

"(1) Has his attention been drawn to a report in 'Country Life' newspaper for 16 February expressing concern at the danger of infection to Queensland cattle by

foot and mouth disease, resulting from the importation of raw or green hides from countries where this dangerous disease had caused staggering losses of livestock?"

"(2) Assuming that his attention has been drawn to the matter and in view of its seriousness, what steps has he taken to demand from the Federal Government a total prohibition of such imports?"

"(3) In respect to that part of the report alleging that the value of hide imports had risen from £26,000 in 1959 to £371,000 in the four months to October, will he advise the reason for such increase and its effect, if any, on local supplies or prices?"

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

"(1, 2 and 3) The matter raised by the Honourable Member is primarily one for the Commonwealth Department of Health. My information is that hides from countries other than New Zealand, Fiji, Norfolk Island, Western Samoa, New Caledonia, Tonga or New Hebrides can be imported only if derived from animals killed by slaughter for human consumption and submitted to ante mortem and post mortem veterinary inspection and found free from disease including foot and mouth diseases or alternatively that the hides have derived from animals killed by slaughter and have been disinfected for 24 hours. Appropriate supporting declarations are required and the hides have to be taken to an approved tannery immediately after landing and there treated in accordance with regulations. The source of the figures quoted by the Honourable Member is not known, but I should like to inform the Honourable Member that the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics advises that the value of cattle hides imported into Australia in 1958-1959 was £50,243 and in 1959-1960, £100,646. I am not fully acquainted with the reasons for this increase but shortage of slaughterable cattle in Australia in 1959-1960 can be regarded as a contributing factor."

DISMISSALS FROM CONSTRUCTION WORK, GLADSTONE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) asked the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—

"How many men have been dismissed from the work of constructing urgently needed accommodation at the Gladstone High School and are any further dismissals contemplated?"

Hon. L. H. S. ROBERTS (Whitsunday) replied—

"I would inform the Honourable Member that due regard has been paid to the requirements of the Gladstone State High School and the urgent needs of the Department of Education as made known to my Department have not been met. The balance

of approved new construction at this school is to provide for the transfer of the 8th Grade pupils who are already housed at the Primary School and in the category of replacement accommodation the work automatically assumes a lesser priority. The services of four employees who were working at the Gladstone State High School were terminated recently. A further three employees at the school will be paid off this week."

CHARGES FOR DENTAL WORK

Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) asked the Minister for Justice—

"In view of the excessive and exorbitant charges that are being imposed upon the general public by those engaged in the dental profession throughout Queensland, will he have an investigation made by the Prices Advisory Board to see if ways and means can be introduced to prevent this glaring and unnecessary exploitation of those in need of dental treatment?"

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

"As this question is based on false premises, it necessarily follows that no case is established for an investigation as suggested."

MACKAY ABATTOIR

Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) asked the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry—

"What progress has been made by the Mackay Abattoir Board with regard to the proposal to erect an abattoir or central killing works in Mackay?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

"Preliminary plans have been prepared and examined by the Board and the meat inspection staffs of the Department of Primary Industry and the Department of Agriculture and Stock. Certain necessary changes in design have been suggested and the inclusion of a new type of slaughtering equipment is being considered. The engineers responsible for the design of the works and completion of the plans and specifications are now working on them and hope to have them finalised by the end of March."

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CAIRNS AND DISTRICT, AND STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF FAR NORTHERN QUEENSLAND

Mr. WALLACE (Cairns) asked the Premier—

"In view of the numerous warnings emanating from all sections of the community of the quickening approach of an economic pattern very closely resembling the dreadful days of 1929-1932, the repeated expressions of alarm and dismay by all sections of the community of Cairns and district at the continued rapid deterioration of the district economy and in

view also of the ready recognition by all political parties of the value of Far Northern Queensland in relation to the survival of the rest of the Commonwealth as an integral section of the British Commonwealth of Nations, what action, if any, has his Government taken or contemplates taking to offset the tragic and catastrophic state of affairs relating to employment now obtaining in that area?"

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

"I am not aware of the emergence in Queensland of any economic pattern in any way resembling the world-wide depression of 1929-1932 and I think the Honourable Member has let his imagination run away with his vocabulary when formulating this question. However, my Government is doing everything within its power to eliminate unemployment where it does exist and to bar the door to it where it threatens to exist as was amply demonstrated in the debate which took place in this House yesterday. I might add that figures showing registered unemployed males in the Cairns district at the end of January, 1961, which as the Honourable Member is aware, is the seasonal peak period, show an increase of less than 12 per cent. over the figures for the corresponding period in 1959. Concerning the Honourable Member's reference to the resemblance of the existing economic pattern and the 'dreadful days of 1929-1932,' I would point out that official unemployment figures show that the Honourable Member is 'drawing a long bow'. Whilst dealing with this aspect, however, it is interesting to note that in January, 1937, under the Labour Government, the number of registered unemployed males in Queensland was three times the number registered in January, 1961, when the total labour force greatly outnumbered the total labour force in 1937."

OPERATIONS OF AMAGRAZE MEAT COMPANY IN NORTH QUEENSLAND

Mr. WALLACE (Cairns) asked the Minister for Labour and Industry—

"In view of his numerous statements that the beef industry in Far Northern Queensland as a result of the foresight shown by the Amagraze Company in building freezers on the Cairns Wharves and the moving of cattle by marine transport from the Cape and Gulf areas would mean continuity of employment on a twelve-monthly basis with a resultant uplift in the economy of Far Northern Queensland—

(1) What set of circumstances necessitates (a) the offering for sale by Amagraze of the newly completed freezers on the Cairns Wharves, and (b) the cessation of cattle transport by sea to the newly erected unloading jetty at Swallow Wharf, where £10,000 of

Harbour Board money appears to have gone down the drain as a result of misrepresentation?

(2) What is the approximate date on which the Amagraze Company is likely to commence full-scale killing on a guaranteed twelve-monthly basis?"

Hon. K. J. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha) replied—

"(1) (a) The freezers have not been sold and at the present moment are not, to my knowledge, under offer to anyone. (b) I should think that the Honourable Member knows that the 'Wewak' was wrecked, so sea transport has been temporarily suspended due to its loss and other factors, but negotiations are under way for the re-instituting of this service."

"(2) Achievement of year-round killing demands continuity of supplies through sea transport and/or other means of transport such as the recommended Gulf roads. The Government is presently working on provision of these necessities."

EMPLOYMENT OF DISMISSED EMPLOYEES FROM PLY MILL AT SILKWOOD ON SILKWOOD-KURRIMINE ROAD

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

"As the closing of the ply mill at Silkwood has caused approximately sixty-five men to become unemployed with consequent distress, will he authorise early approval and provide the necessary funds for having the remaining four miles of the Silkwood-Kurrimine road bituminised in order that these men might be employed and so lessen the hardship already existing?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Forestry), for **Hon. E. EVANS** (Mirani), replied—

"The preparation of plans and estimates for this section is in hand following recent surveys. However, it is not possible to indicate when the scheme could be released for construction as it has not been possible as yet to allocate the necessary funds in view of commitments for other works in progress in the area."

IMPORTATION OF PLY WOOD

Mr. BYRNE (Mourilyan) asked the Premier—

"Has he made any protest to the Commonwealth Government against the importation of ply produced by cheap labour countries to the detriment of the Queensland industry with the consequent closure of mills thereby creating a great deal of unemployment and distress? If so, would he make a full statement on the result of his representations?"

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

"This matter was raised by me at the recent Loan Council Meeting, where I emphasised how detrimentally the Queensland Ply Industry would be affected by these overseas imports. The question is being kept under close observation by the Government, which will take all appropriate steps within its power to protect this most valuable Queensland industry."

ENROLMENT OF STUDENTS AT STATE HIGH SCHOOLS

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"(1) How many paying students are enrolled at State High Schools in Queensland?"

"(2) Of these, how many sat for the State Scholarship Examination?"

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis) replied—

"(1 and 2) This information will not be available until late in the first term. It is suggested that the Honourable Member repeat this question later in the session."

ALLOTMENT OF HOUSING COMMISSION RENTAL HOUSES

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"How many Housing Commission rental houses were allotted to tenants in the three months period ended 31 January, 1961, in the Brisbane metropolitan area exclusive of Inala?"

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

"Sixty-six applicants were offered houses and 58 of them accepted the offers. In addition to State Rental Houses, 28 flats at Holland Park were offered to 38 applicants, 10 of them declining such offer."

DISMISSAL OF CROWN EMPLOYEES

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) asked the Premier—

"How many State Government employees were dismissed in the three months period ended 31 January, 1961?"

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

"The Honourable Member's question requires clarification. Does he refer to dismissals as a result of punitive action or to the termination of services of employees for financial reasons or because of work fluctuation, which is an annual occurrence? The Honourable Member is doubtless aware that large numbers of Crown Employees are engaged throughout the State and that information as to fluctuations in employment is not readily available and the collection and compilation of statistics in respect thereof would take some time."

WAITING TIME FOR ALLOCATION OF RENTAL HOMES AND LOANS, STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

Mr. DONALD (Ipswich East) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"(1) What is the approximate waiting time from the date of lodging application until the allocation of rental homes in the metropolitan area, and in the City of Ipswich?"

"(2) What is the approximate waiting time for the advancement of a loan to people wishing to purchase or build a home through the Housing Commission?"

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

"(1) The waiting time depends on the housing need of the particular applicant, i.e., on the points priority of his application. The Queensland Housing Commission has been able to offer rental homes to meet expiry dates or extended expiry dates in all cases where applicants are facing eviction under warrant of possession or in cases where applicants are homeless due to other circumstances. Most offers of accommodation to Ipswich applicants in these categories have been houses at Inala?"

"(2) In cases of persons building a home on their own allotments through the Commission six months from signing of mortgage to calling of tenders. For the purchase of a home two months from selection of site to calling of tenders, when an applicant selects a building site owned by the Commission and selects a Commission house design, and six months when he desires a design to his own requirements."

NEW PSYCHIATRIC WARD, TOWNSVILLE GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) asked the Acting Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"(1) Is he aware that (a) the psychiatric ward at the Townsville General Hospital (ward No. 15), which serves the 250,000 people of North Queensland, is hopelessly inadequate to cope with such a population, (b) the two old homes which have been joined by a covered walk are bulging at the seams with fifteen male beds and fifteen female beds, including two cells on each side, (c) every inch of available space has been used with beds on verandahs and in a kind of hallway, in one room, sixteen feet by eighteen feet there being seven beds, and (d) that the toilet and bathing facilities consist of one W.C. and one plunge bath for females and the same for males?"

"(2) In view of the above, will he take immediate steps to have a new psychiatric ward constructed on the grounds set aside for that purpose, commensurate with that presently obtaining in Brisbane?"

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick) replied—

"(1 and 2) It is not correct to assume that the Psychiatric Ward at the Townsville General Hospital is the only psychiatric service for the population of North Queensland, as the Charters Towers Mental Hospital provides 215 beds. It is our accepted policy that the treatment of psychiatric illness be integrated as far as possible with General Hospitals. In this regard Queensland is in advance of the other States, and, in fact, most parts of the world. However, the implementation of this policy is still in a formative stage and it is necessary that great care is taken before large expenditure is involved at any given hospital. The Director of Mental Hygiene was sent overseas to enable him to view and examine latest developments in buildings and treatment. Unfortunately he has been away from duty owing to illness, but will be taking up duty again in the very near future. Consideration of the plan for a Psychiatric Unit at Townsville has been held over awaiting Dr. Stafford's return so that advantage may be taken of the experience gained by him."

QUANTITY OF FISH TRANSPORTED FROM BOONAROO FISHING CENTRE TO MARYBOROUGH FISH BOARD

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"What quantity of fish was transported from Boonaroo fishing centre to the Maryborough Fish Board during each of the following years, 1958, 1959 and 1960?"

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

"The quantities of fish received at Maryborough Fish Market are published in the annual report of the Fish Board for each of the financial years 1957-1958, 1958-1959 and 1959-1960. Dissections are not kept in respect of fish intake from the separate centres in the Maryborough District."

DEVELOPMENT OF BRIGALOW BELT, WET TROPICS AND THE CHANNEL COUNTRY, BY COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) asked the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation—

"In view of the report in 'The Courier-Mail' of 10 February, 1961, that he stated that he was hopeful that background information which he furnished to Mr. McEwen on the brigalow belt, the wet tropics and the Channel Country might prove useful if and when the Federal Government was considering how it might help development in this northern part of Australia; will he state (a) when he expects the Federal Government to commence giving consideration as to how it might help develop this Northern part of Australia, (b) why the Menzies-Holt Government has not given thought to this matter previously, and (c) reasons for the Federal Government's lack of interest?"

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

"(a, b and c) Personally, I have reason to believe that the Federal Government is already giving consideration to the possibility of development of the Northern part of Australia, including the Channel Country and the Far North Tropical areas. I visited Canberra at the express invitation of the Right Honourable J. McEwen to discuss relevant matters in the light of detailed information and knowledge available to me as Ministerial Head of the State Lands Department."

CIVIL DEFENCE ORGANISATION

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) asked the Premier—

"In view of the serious charge made by Sir Raymond Huish, the Returned Servicemen's League State President, against his Government when he stated 'Obviously the State Government is not seriously interested in developing a proper civil defence system for Queensland. The State Government is simply shutting its eyes to civil defence,' will he state if there is any justification for these grave accusations and, if so, what are the reasons for any lack of positive action and what steps his Government is taking to make civil defence organisation in Queensland effective?"

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

"The Honourable Member, who usually bases his questions on newspaper articles, could not have read the Daily Press in which I replied fully to Sir Raymond Huish's statement on the matter of Civil Defence. However, in Civil Defence preparations, all States (except New South Wales) are following an unchanged policy of the Commonwealth Government that in present circumstances there should be paper planning with no expenditure of money, manpower or materials upon Civil Defence. The question of the establishment throughout the Commonwealth of active Civil Defence Corps was raised last year and the former Commonwealth Director of Civil Defence, Brigadier Wardell, visited all States and, in collaboration with Civil Defence Authorities, prepared plans of action. In Queensland Brigadier Wardell met the Central Co-ordinating Committee and a Zoning System of the State with the appointment of full-time officers responsible for the recruitment and training of a Civil Defence Corps was examined. Proposals were prepared on this basis for submission and determination at a meeting of State Premiers with the Honourable Gordon Freeth, Minister for the Interior. At this meeting, the State Premiers stated their willingness to co-operate with the Commonwealth in an expanded Civil Defence programme and indicated the

extent to which they were prepared to maintain their Civil Defence Organisations from their own financial resources. It was agreed that the States' views should be considered by the Commonwealth. Queensland is in no different position as regards Civil Defence than the States of Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania. All Premiers hold the view that Civil Defence is the fourth arm of defence and is a matter which affects not only one State but the whole of the Commonwealth. Over-all policy and planning of the nature and extent of organisation throughout the States and the provision of the necessary funds are matters for the Commonwealth Government which probably for very good reasons has deferred taking positive action in this regard. Within the limited charter, much has been done in Queensland for the indoctrination of key persons in Civil Defence. Civil Defence Committees have been established at principal cities and towns throughout the State and members have gone to the Civil Defence School, Macedon, for instruction. The Government appreciates the very full co-operation which it has received from the R.S.S.A.I.L.A. in the setting-up of these Civil Defence Committees."

NEW WING, SANDGATE SCHOOL AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING, BRIGHTON SCHOOL

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"(1) When will work commence on the erection of the new wing of the Sandgate State Primary School?"

"(2) Will he give consideration to providing vocational training for the eighth grade students of the Brighton State Primary School?"

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis) replied—

"(1) The Department of Public Works advises that the construction of the new wing to replace accommodation destroyed by fire at the Sandgate State School will commence on or as near as possible to March 13, 1961."

"(2) Consideration will be given to the provision of Vocational Training for Grade VIII pupils of the Brighton State School when accommodation becomes available."

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Order in Council under the Co-operative Housing Societies Act of 1958.

Order in Council under the Co-ordination of Rural Advances and Agricultural Bank Acts, 1938 to 1951.

Order in Council under the Explosives Act of 1952.

Order in Council under the Fisheries Acts, 1957 to 1959.

Order in Council under the Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1959.

Order in Council under the Racing and Betting Acts, 1954 to 1960.

Proclamation under the Pollution of Waters by Oil Act of 1960.

Regulations under the Fisheries Acts, 1957 to 1959.

Regulations under the Fish Supply Management Acts, 1935 to 1959.

Regulations under the Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1959.

Regulations under the Motor Vehicles Insurance Acts, 1936 to 1959.

Regulations under the Stamp Acts, 1894 to 1959.

Order in Council under the River Improvement Trust Acts, 1940 to 1959.

IRRIGATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. A. R. FLETCHER (Cunningham—Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Irrigation Acts, 1922 to 1959, in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

IRRIGATION AREAS (LAND SETTLEMENT) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. A. R. FLETCHER (Cunningham—Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Irrigation Areas (Land Settlement) Acts, 1933 to 1959, in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

WATER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. A. R. FLETCHER (Cunningham—Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Water Acts, 1926 to 1957, in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

WORKERS' HOMES ACTS REPEAL BILL

INITIATION

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

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to repeal the Workers' Homes Acts, 1919 to 1957."

Motion agreed to.

AMOCO AUSTRALIA PTY. LIMITED AGREEMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. K. J. MORRIS (Mount Coot-tha—Minister for Labour and Industry): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill with respect to an Agreement between the State of Queensland and Amoco Australia Pty. Limited; and for purposes incidental thereto."

Motion agreed to.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

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

Hon. K. J. MORRIS (Mount Coot-tha—Minister for Labour and Industry) (11.59 a.m.): I move—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced with respect to an Agreement between the State of Queensland and Amoco Australia Pty. Limited; and for purposes incidental thereto."

Mr. Walsh: The title of this Bill should be, "Rexie's Downfall."

Mr. MORRIS: We may be able to talk about that afterwards.

The introduction of this Bill marks the end of the first stage in a development which I feel is of outstanding importance to Queensland, and I am particularly happy to have the privilege of introducing it in Parliament. The Bill itself contains the agreement which has been negotiated between Amoco Australia Pty. Ltd. and the Queensland Government. All details of that agreement are included in the schedule and will therefore be available to hon. members as soon as the Bill is printed. Therefore I shall not go through the whole of that section of the Bill. It consists of 10 pages of very closely printed matter, and it would be impossible to give all the details at this stage. I know hon. members will be anxious to read the details themselves. I shall present what may be described as the highlights of the agreement, and the history and background of the important stages leading up to it.

Broadly, as has already been announced in the Press, the agreement provides for the construction by Amoco Australia Pty. Ltd. of

an oil refinery at Bulwer Island near the mouth of the Brisbane River. The company is a refining and marketing subsidiary of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana, U.S.A., a company of much substance.

Standard Oil (Indiana) is a fully integrated oil company. Its general offices are at Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A., and it conducts its operations through a number of subsidiary companies.

Founded in 1889, Standard Oil (Indiana) had total assets exceeding £1.25 billion at the end of 1959 and a total income in that year of nearly £900,000,000. Capital expenditure of the consolidated company in 1959 totalled nearly £120,000,000.

Among its principal subsidiaries, Pan American Petroleum Corporation engages in finding and producing crude oil and natural gas. American Oil Company conducts product research, manufacturing, transportation and marketing operations. It operates 12 refineries in the United States. In the field of petrochemicals Amoco Chemicals Corporation is the Standard Oil (Indiana) subsidiary which manufactures and markets chemicals derived from petroleum. Hon. members will realise why it may be said that this is a company of considerable substance.

I shall now proceed to give some brief details.

Mr. Davies: We would like to hear all the details.

Mr. MORRIS: The hon. member will receive them and he can read them for himself.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. MORRIS: All hon. members know that they have every opportunity of saying what they want to say, and nobody minds what they say. I am quite happy to listen to them, and I suggest that at this stage they listen to me.

In regard to the refinery, these are the details—

1. Amoco agrees to construct a refinery in the State with minimum crude oil processing capacity of 15,000 barrels per stream day. There are 35 gallons to the barrel.

2. Commercial operation shall commence not later than 31 December, 1966.

3. Construction will commence within six months after at least 250 acres of a site has been reclaimed to comply with specifications.

With reference to that I should like to explain that a considerable portion of the 250 acres was reclaimed before this project was under consideration. It was in the process of being reclaimed in the course of dredging the river. I have no doubt that the Treasurer will comment on that aspect at a suitable time.

Mr. Duggan: Who is bearing the reclamation costs for what you have already done and propose to do?

Mr. MORRIS: Let us go through it, and we will be able to follow it. Any questions that hon. members wish to pose may be asked later, and in my reply I will answer them.

4. Agreement can be terminated by notice in writing if Amoco fails to adhere to schedule of construction.

The schedule of construction will be submitted to us at a very early date and will set out the plans that Amoco have in relation to their development. I elaborate that by saying that should they not keep to their proposed development to give us a refinery by the end of 1966, then the Government, if they wish, may terminate the agreement.

Mr. Walsh: What if they are affected by the credit squeeze?

Mr. MORRIS: The honourable member will get all the answers in the Bill. He knows perfectly well that he is only trying to be silly, and he does not have to exert himself very much.

The reason for that section of the agreement is that it is not considered desirable that matters may stay in a state of inaction with the Government powerless to do anything about it. In my opinion, there is no fear of that, but the agreement contains that clause.

5. If reclamation is not completed within specified time the date of completion of the refinery shall be extended for a corresponding period.

It is obvious that if, for some unknown reason, we are unable to proceed with the reclamation, it is only right that the company shall have that right.

In regard to the lease for Bulwer Island, if it meets the company's specifications after engineering study a 30-year lease will be granted. A great deal of study has been made and every indication is that it is suitable for the purpose.

Mr. Davies: Does the Minister indicate that the company is not yet satisfied with the site?

Mr. MORRIS: I should imagine I have already indicated to the hon. member that if he will be patient and wait until he reads the Bill, he will find that everything is explained in it, and so clearly explained that he will be able to follow it.

The rental for the first period of 10 years is as follows—

1st term of 4 years	£4,000 p.a.
2nd term of 3 years	£6,000 p.a.
3rd term of 3 years	£12,000 p.a.

For the balance of the period the rental to be paid is to be determined by the Land Court. It must be remembered that all of the 500 acres has not yet been reclaimed. Part of it is still under water.

If Bulwer Island is suitable, the Government will reclaim 500 acres of land to a

reference level of at least 12 ft. above low water datum. At least 250 acres are to be reclaimed within one year after granting of the lease, and thereafter it is to be reclaimed at the rate of 100 acres a year. The Treasurer will explain to you that that is well within the normal compass of the operations in the river and part of that would have been done in any case under normal dredging operations.

Mr. Burrows: Will dredges from all parts of Queensland be concentrated on this place for a number of years?

Mr. MORRIS: No. If Bulwer Island is not suitable, the company may apply for an alternative site. But there is evidence that it will be suitable. Actually drilling has been proceeding even since the signing of the agreement.

Mr. Bennett: Shouldn't they know by now whether the site is suitable or not?

Mr. MORRIS: That is the silly sort of question I would expect.

Mr. Lloyd: It is getting a silly answer.

Mr. Bennett: You said investigations have been going on for a long time.

Mr. MORRIS: Sensible people do not spend many thousands of pounds on a proposal until they have some indication that the money will not be wasted. Obviously not a great deal of money was spent in drilling to make a final decision whether the site would be satisfactory. I have been advised by various people that there is very little doubt about it. As a matter of interest I might say that the company has already erected refineries in situations that are very much less satisfactory than this.

Amoco has the option either to obtain a perpetual lease or to purchase freehold the subject land.

Mr. Bennett: What about the price of freehold? Has that been set?

Mr. MORRIS: The price for the freehold has not been set. That will be determined in the same way as similar matters are determined, namely, by Government valuers. I well remember that, during the course of discussions, the Treasurer said that the Government do not mind if it is developed into freehold because the income will still be there for the Government in one form if not in another.

As to product supply—firstly, the Government shall purchase all products, excluding bitumen, for a period of 10 years from date of commencement of production.

Secondly, Queensland Oil Refinery may share the supply of bitumen after the expiration of the agreement in 1965, that is, 7,500 tons the first year, thereafter decreasing by 1,000 tons each year.

Mr. Walsh: Irrespective of quality?

Mr. MORRIS: Not irrespective of quality. If the hon. member will only be patient he will hear all the details.

Mr. Dufficy: It is rather difficult to be patient with you.

Mr. MORRIS: Thirdly, the price shall not exceed by more than 5 per cent. the average price charged in the other capital cities to State Governments. That, of course, is simply in line with the policy of this Government. We exercise the right to that 5 per cent. provision in all our purchases.

As to establishment aid—the Government shall dredge an entrance channel 1,000 feet in width to a depth of 45 feet at low water spring tide in the north-west channel and within the rest of the bay a channel 1,000 feet wide and a swinging basin 2,000 feet in diameter, both to a depth of 42 ft. 6 in. at low water spring tide.

The dredging operation is to be completed at least 120 days prior to the date of commencement of commercial operation. Thereafter the channels and basin will be maintained to the specified depths.

An Honourable Member: We cannot hear.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Minister if he will please speak up because hon. members on my left say they cannot hear.

Mr. MORRIS: I am most happy to speak up but I am not going to speak up to the extent that I am required to drown interjections. If hon. members want to hear, they may listen. If they do not want to listen, that is no concern of mine.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! In introducing this Bill, the Minister has indicated clearly his attitude towards interjections. He has asked hon. members to refrain from interjecting and to listen so that they may comment when making their speeches. I ask hon. members on my left to respect that request, and I feel that it will be discourteous to the Chair if it is not complied with. I should not have to call for order continually.

Mr. DUGGAN: I rise to a point of order. I wish to say on behalf of the Opposition that we accept your request for co-operation from hon. members on this side of the Chamber. But I would also ask you, Mr. Taylor, to ask the Minister to articulate clearly so that his speech may be heard by all hon. members. This is a tremendously important Bill, and it contains, from what we have heard already from the Minister, very important principles. The House is entitled to hear what those principles are now, not have the Bill introduced and then read something about it tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think hon. members will realise that I have already appealed to the Minister to speak in a tone that can be heard, but I do ask hon. members to allow him to be heard.

Mr. WALSH: I rise to a point of order. I wish to make it quite clear to the Minister, as I am sure you, Mr. Taylor, are well aware, that the first complaint about not being able to hear the Minister came from his own side.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORRIS: I am aware that the complaint came from this side of the Chamber, but it was because of the noisy interruptions from hon. members opposite. Nobody can ever say that I do not articulate clearly. I wish it were as easy to hear the Leader of the Opposition, who has charged me with not articulating properly.

Mr. Duggan interjected.

Mr. MORRIS: The trouble with the hon. member is that he gets so excited that he runs one word into another.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORRIS: The second point is that it after six months from the signing of the document, dredging cannot be accomplished by suction dredge, the Government, after written notice to Amoco, is released from its undertaking to perform this dredging. Amoco then has the option of terminating the agreement within 30 days' notice.

Many of these clauses have been inserted to make sure that every aspect is covered, and many of them will never be used.

As to harbour dues, firstly, Amoco shall pay 50 per cent. of harbour dues on motor spirit for all crude imported for refinery use provided the rate does not exceed by 5 per cent. the average of harbour dues in respect to the refineries at Matraville, Kurnell, Geelong, and Noarlunga.

The company plans to discharge by sea pipe-line and to discharge outside the river somewhere near the Pile Light. The tankers will not enter the river to discharge, according to present plans, and if those plans are departed from at any stage it will be only in case of emergency.

Secondly, the company shall pay 80 per cent. of harbour dues on all crudes other than for refinery use. Thirdly, no harbour dues shall be payable on exports of refinery products derived from crude oil arriving by sea. Fourthly, the company shall supply the Government with information of total intake, sales, and crude used for refinery and exports. If in any particular year the exports exceed 50 per cent. of production, all harbour dues on the excess shall be refunded. Fifthly, if Amoco receives crudes other than by sea, the provisions of the agreement about harbour dues shall be determined and new negotiations will be undertaken to determine harbour dues.

It is the hope of many that oil will be found in Queensland. If it is, we have protected the situation, and that is the background of that clause.

The Government will use their good offices to prevent any State-imposed prohibition against construction and operation by Amoco of service stations and other petrol outlets in Queensland.

Amoco agrees to investigate the establishment of petrochemical projects. I shall say a little more about that later on, but I emphasise that part of the agreement. Amoco agrees to investigate the establishment of petrochemical projects. Where a petrochemical industry is in existence in other parts of the world it provides a whole range of products. I think that it is almost above all others a desirable industry to have in Queensland. There is no doubt about the benefit that the State will obtain through the decision by Amoco to establish an oil refinery in Queensland. It is indeed another indication of the benefits that are accruing to Queensland through the far-sighted policy of the Government, many other indications of which have been given in the past 48 hours.

The Amoco company in Australia is two companies, namely an operating company with a capital of £2,000,000, and a holding company with a capital of £1,000,000. The operating company was registered in Queensland on 17 February. It is also incorporated in Canberra, and the initial capital will be increased as the parent company in America brings funds in as they are required.

I repeat that the refinery is to be built on 500 acres of Bulwer Island and adjoining land, some of which has been reclaimed, and another area which has yet to be reclaimed. I would stress at this stage that Amoco is not in any way associated with any of the present companies in Australia, to the best of my knowledge. With the establishment of the refinery it is hoped that it will be found practicable to establish a petrochemical plant. I am confident that the establishment of such a plant on a long-term basis will provide not only greater employment, but also a greater diversity of interests, and is sorely needed in Queensland.

The agreement deals solely with the establishment of an oil refinery, as obviously it could not include the establishment of a petrochemical works because, at this stage, a decision in that regard must await production from the refinery.

I feel it incumbent on me to give the Committee a fairly full description of the history of the negotiations that have led to the introduction of the Bill. On being allocated the administration of the Department of Labour and Industry in August, 1957, and being anxious to secure industrial development for Queensland, one of the first general tasks I undertook was to discuss with Mr. Young, Director of Secondary Industries, the broad

picture of what Queensland in fact required to give it a balanced development. Briefly, our conclusions were that the State needed in large-scale new enterprises—

- (a) an oil refinery;
- (b) the development of a basic chemical industry;
- (c) an iron and steel industry; and
- (d) a broad coverage of additional industries that could be classified as being somewhat ancillary to the aforementioned.

The last category would naturally comprise specialised engineering shops and, if possible, motor-car manufacturing and assembly works and a host of similar organisations. At that stage such development was merely a dream in Queensland and not the actuality it is today. There are other matters with which I could deal, but I do not intend to develop them because this Bill deals entirely with the establishment of an oil refinery and matters that stem from it.

During the whole of the exploratory period of my first three months of office, in 1957, and since, the knowledge and capacity of the present Director of Secondary Industries has been invaluable. Indeed, I do not hesitate to say that without his assistance and knowledge much of the work could not have been accomplished. I am very pleased and proud to pay a tribute to the work that he does. It is very valuable to the State of Queensland.

It will be remembered that towards the end of 1957 the Chamber of Manufactures, Brisbane Development Association and the Chamber of Commerce initiated a move for prominent Queenslanders to go overseas to assist in attracting new industries to this State. They wrote to the Premier asking him to appoint me, the Minister for Labour and Industry, to lead the mission.

The original conception was that this delegation should visit the United Kingdom and the Continent, and early planning proceeded along those lines. However, the need for some overseas action for the establishment of an oil refinery became very evident at this stage; consequently, a visit to the United States of America was superimposed on the itinerary of this mission, allowing for some four weeks in the United States before the delegation actually commenced duty in the United Kingdom. Three of the delegation accompanied me on the prior United States visit.

The necessity for this visit in relation to the establishment of an oil refinery in Queensland became evident because in the last three months of 1957 I discussed with various members of the oil industry in Australia, the possibility of the establishment of a refinery in Queensland, but these approaches within Australia proved most disappointing. So, in order to secure such an industry, it became perfectly obvious that

greater opportunities existed with some independent oil organisation not then operating in Australia.

I am sure it will be recalled by many hon. members that in March, 1958, Vacuum announced its intention of building a refinery in Adelaide, negotiations for which had been proceeding since at least early 1957, before the election of my Government in Queensland.

In that same month, March, 1958, I had discussions in America with three groups of people, each of whom was prominent in the oil industry overseas but not operating at all in Australia.

I find it very interesting now to refer to a diary of business interviews that I made during our overseas mission where I recorded, on 30 and 31 March, that I had visited these people—naming them—and proposed that they should interest themselves in the development of a refinery in Queensland. Again I am pleased to remember that the first report that I forwarded to the Premier, written on 5 April, 1958, contained a statement that I believed that Queensland would have an oil refinery, consequent upon my visit.

Subsequently, on my return to Australia, correspondence passed between me and these organisations and, indeed, some 18 months ago I took a representative of one of them to Canberra on the matter. There are some people who believe that negotiations on matters such as this can be completed quickly but that, of course, is a fallacy. Much background information has to be obtained before serious physical investigation can be carried out at all. I would add that similar research is at present taking place in regard to certain other industries which I do not propose to mention here today.

From early 1960 matters accelerated as a result of a visit to Queensland in March of that year by one of Amoco's directors, Mr. Watters. Thereafter, Mr. Young, Director of Secondary Industries, has worked unceasingly on this project, assisted very greatly by officers of other departments, and I shall mention those departments later.

Mr. Watters, who is the Secretary and a Director of Amoco, visited Queensland originally in March, 1960, not only with the specific objective of investigating the desirability of setting up an oil refinery, but also to make exploratory investigations in regard to general investment of United States capital in this State.

After preliminary discussions with Mr. Young, Director of Secondary Industries, Mr. Watters returned to the United States and submitted to his Board of Directors a recommendation for a full physical and technical investigation into the prospects for the establishment of an oil refinery in Queensland.

Dr. McGill, consultant to the Standard Oil Company, came to Queensland, discussed the

matter with me and Mr. Young, and inspected various sites, including coastal ports in Central and North Queensland.

Mr. Davies: Would the Minister name which ports were investigated?

Mr. MORRIS: I can state some of them with certainty, although off-hand I cannot give the names of all of them. I know they went to Gladstone, Port Alma and Mackay, and some others. Without reference to papers, I could not be definite about the others.

Mr. Mann: If you sent them to Port Alma, you were double-crossing Ampol.

Mr. MORRIS: We do hear some silly things at times, but I am surprised at the interjection of the hon. member for Brisbane. How in the name of fortune can he speak of the double-crossing of Ampol when at that stage Ampol had no option at Port Alma? Every organisation with which I discussed this matter knew perfectly well that the Government's objective was to get a satisfactory agreement with some oil company to build a refinery in Queensland. We are not interested in companies A, B, C, X, Y, or Z, or in plugging for one company as against another. All we are interested in is ensuring that there is an oil refinery in Queensland.

Mr. Duggan: Why didn't you publicise the conditions so that others could come in? Why engage in secret negotiations with one company?

Mr. Ramsden: You did the same with "Dim Sim." What are you talking about?

Mr. Duggan: I did not.

Mr. MORRIS: The Leader of the Opposition sometimes speaks without thinking. A little mature thought would make it perfectly clear to him that the proposal he has suggested would be ridiculous. I will probably deal with that a little later on.

Mr. Duggan: The electors will probably deal with you and your Government later on.

Mr. MORRIS: At least I have not been kicked out of the area in which I live because I talked about "Right or wrong, wise or unwise", and I did not go to another part of Queensland and there be turned down by the electors.

Mr. DUGGAN: I rise to a point of order. I am not unduly upset, but I expect the Deputy Premier to have some sense of responsibility. Is he entitled to reflect on my personal integrity regarding the seats I contested?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already drawn the Minister's attention to the fact that he has departed from the measure before the House.

Mr. Duggan: And in a most offensive way, too.

Mr. MORRIS: I will carry on when the Chamber becomes quiet, and the dogs stop barking.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORRIS: I repeat that after preliminary discussions with Mr. Young, Director of Secondary Industries, Mr. Watters returned to the United States and submitted to his Board of Directors a recommendation for a full physical and technical investigation into the prospects for the establishment of an oil refinery in Queensland.

Dr. McGill, consultant to the Standard Oil Company, came to Queensland and discussed the matter with me and Mr. Young, and inspected various possible sites, including coastal ports in Central and North Queensland. Dr. McGill, having inspected them stated most emphatically that, as 50 per cent. of the sale of refinery products in Queensland are made within reasonable distance of Brisbane, he could not consider any other proposed site, despite the information submitted by my department with particular reference to Central and Northern Queensland. I repeat that Mr. Young, the Director of Secondary Industries, insisted emphatically that all the people who were investigating the possibilities of establishing a refinery should examine all parts of the State and not one, and one alone. Dr. McGill then returned to America.

Following that visit by Dr. McGill, the Standard Oil Company sent a task force of 45 men to investigate market prospects in Australia and they, too, returned to the United States with a favourable report.

Amoco, having finally completed preliminary investigations in January, 1961, submitted a proposal to me for the development of an oil refinery in Queensland.

On receipt of Amoco's concrete proposal, the only—and, I must repeat—the only detailed offer received from any company about a refinery, I took the matter to Cabinet. They had discussed it previously when an option was given to this company on a piece of land, and they discussed it again in considerable detail and then appointed a committee of three, the Premier, the Treasurer and myself, to draw up details of the agreement. This proceeded, and finally it was submitted to Cabinet for approval and was agreed to and signed.

At this stage I wish to express my most grateful appreciation to my two Cabinet colleagues who worked so hard on the detailed work that was required. I also express appreciation to the officers of the Department of Harbours and Marine and the officers of the Department of Justice who have so readily assisted the Director of Secondary Industries in clarifying all matters associated with this agreement.

Mr. Davies: Will you give reasons why the other ports were not suitable?

Mr. MORRIS: I have already stated the overwhelming reason that was given by Dr. McGill in relation to the other ports, but the hon. member did not listen.

Mr. Davies: Can you give detailed reasons why Port Alma, Urangan and other ports were not suitable?

Mr. MORRIS: I have already told hon. members. I will repeat it although it does not require repetition. I told hon. members that Dr. McGill and Mr. Watters inspected the other ports in Central and Northern Queensland and they were very much influenced by the market for the products of the refinery. I said a little while ago that their investigations indicated that more than 50 per cent. of the products of the refinery would be used in the close-Brisbane area and therefore it would be most economical to put the refinery in that area. I have a letter setting out in detail how the cost would be very much greater if an area, other than the area suggested, was used. I have not that letter with me now, but I will produce it on the second reading, if required. Of course, we must recognise that in the final estimate, no matter what the industry is, the decision whether to establish it or not to establish it is made not by a Government, not by any officers of the department, but by the company concerned. It makes its own decisions, and it decides where the industry is to be established if it is to be established anywhere. I say without hesitation that, had we projected into the discussion such a suggestion as "We would like to have you with your refinery but we will not let you come to Brisbane. We want you to go somewhere else," I know what the company would have said. Obviously they would have said, "Go jump in the lake" and we should not have had a refinery.

Mr. Davies: Did you offer any freight concessions from a northern port back to the capital if they went north?

Mr. MORRIS: No, we did not.

Mr. Davies: The Minister for Labour and Industry under the Australian Labour Party Government did offer freight concessions to various industries.

Mr. MORRIS: Oh, but they did all sorts of stupid things.

Mr. Davies: You used to blame the Government when we were in power.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORRIS: It is a matter of considerable regret to me that, following the announcement of the signing of this agreement, which I believe to be of outstanding importance to the whole of Queensland and not just one part of it, much has been said in Central Queensland by way of criticism. I am sorry to hear that there are even hon. members of this Chamber who, for some reason known to themselves no doubt, are

opposed to development in the State by the establishment of this refinery. If that is the thinking of hon. members opposite, we can recognise that the future for the State if ever it fell into their hands would be bleak and black indeed. I am beginning to see why they are such dismal people and why they are always predicting gloom and despair. It is because they have it in their own hearts. Quite obviously there would not have been a refinery had it been left to them to initiate negotiations.

During the last three years, I and my department have had discussions with three distinct overseas oil refinery groups. In addition, four Australian petrol distributors have from time to time had discussions with members of the Queensland Government and in each case, without exception, the companies have asked, and quite rightly asked, that negotiations that were proceeding with them should be regarded as confidential so that the world would not know, and that in particular their competitors would not know, what their plans were until they were completed. We readily agreed, with the condition that all companies knew from the inception of negotiations, and particularly in the latter stages, that we as a Government believed that we wanted an oil refinery and that the first proposal submitted to the Government would be seriously considered. They all knew that and they were entitled to know it. I said a few moments ago that I had discussed this matter with several overseas companies and with several Australian companies. I do not propose to mention the names of those companies because that would be unfair to them. However, the name of one company has already been announced quite publicly, and also by the Opposition in the Chamber this morning, so I can mention it without being unethical. That company is Ampol. They requested the Queensland Government to give them an option on land at Port Alma. I pointed out to them that it was not Government land, therefore it was not within the province of the Government to give Ampol Petroleum Ltd. an option at Port Alma. The Premier said to me, "I believe that this is a matter of considerable importance. I should like you to negotiate personally with the Rockhampton Harbour Board, which controls Port Alma, and see if you can secure from it the option that Ampol have asked for." I did that and, as a result, Ampol secured an option.

Mr. Coburn: When does that option expire?

Mr. MORRIS: I think it expires on 31 March, but I am not sure. The option was granted to Ampol on 27 July, 1960, and goes, I think, to 31 March this year.

Officers of Amoco who were not in Queensland when that option was granted to Ampol immediately got in touch with me, and they, too, asked for an option, this one in Brisbane, of their own selection. Of course, I naturally took this request to Cabinet, also. Cabinet agreed that the option

should be granted. I should like to point out that the Government had been instrumental, in one case with its own land and in another case with harbour board land, in providing options for two organisations, one on 27 July and the other on 12 September.

I wish to make certain things abundantly clear, and I am rather glad that I had an opportunity of referring to them earlier today.

My Cabinet colleagues, my departmental officers and I believe that it was vitally necessary that Queensland should secure an oil refinery. Secondly, discussions have been held with at least four Australian petrol distributors and at least three organisations not at present in Australia. Thirdly, in no case have we exercised influence to secure the refinery for one particular area in Queensland at the expense of any other. Indeed, as regards those who have been in touch with my department, we have insisted that officers of each company concerned should make inspections in other places. I repeat that the Director of Secondary Industries has insisted in every case that there should be an investigation into the ports of central and Northern Queensland. The fourth point I wish to make is that we have not at any stage revealed to one company the plans or details of any negotiations with any other company. The most I have ever done is, during the past three months, and with the knowledge of all parties in touch with me on this subject, to advise others that negotiating time was running out and that—this is very important—the first acceptable proposal submitted would be immediately and seriously considered, irrespective of which company first submitted a firm proposal.

The fifth point is that a concrete proposal and offer to build a refinery in Queensland was received from one company, and one company alone, namely, Amoco. I am quite certain that it will be acknowledged by all hon. members that we would have been seriously lacking in a true sense of public responsibility and recognition of Queensland's needs had we deferred a concrete proposal by one company in the hope that another more satisfactorily placed from a decentralisation point of view would be forthcoming in the future and, even if it were forthcoming, would prove acceptable. Had we as a Government followed that course we could very well have been soundly criticised, and I should say that we would have deserved such criticism. Had we grasped the shadow rather than the substance we should not have had a refinery, and Queensland would have been the sufferer. I want to repeat something I said before because to me it is important. I think that I should again tell the Committee that from my knowledge of the background and operations of Amoco I believe that they will proceed with the establishment of a large petrochemical industry when the refinery comes into production. I must again make it quite clear

that Amoco have not been asked to give us any such undertaking. But I make that statement in the light of my knowledge of their general operations, which I have followed very closely for three years.

When the Bill incorporating the whole agreement with Amoco is distributed I shall be perfectly ready and happy to answer any questions that hon. members may care to ask about the details of the agreement.

In an interjection the Leader of the Opposition posed the question, "If you wanted an oil refinery why didn't you advertise and call tenders for it?" Perhaps I could quite easily say to him, "Why didn't the previous Government advertise and call tenders for the bitumen refinery? Why didn't they do that?" The whole thing is so completely ridiculous because for three years we have done all within our power to persuade one oil company—a reliable oil company that could be depended upon to do a good job—to build a refinery in Queensland, as long as the conditions of the agreement were acceptable to the Government. All companies had the knowledge that they could submit a proposal if they desired. Not only did they have that knowledge, but they were pleaded with on many occasions. In my opinion this is an occasion when I have some modest cause for being proud of the outcome. It is an occasion when the Government have demonstrated completely their desire to secure rapid development for Queensland. Through this agreement will flow very rapid development in many fields.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (12.54 p.m.): I should be very surprised if the Premier was happy with the speech made by his Deputy when he introduced this Bill. I have long regarded the Minister for Labour and Industry in his peregrinations in speeches on legislation as being ineffective. Today he has been not only ineffective, but also personally offensive.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. DUGGAN: To set the hon. gentleman's mind at rest I want to say at the outset that not one single member of the Opposition opposes the establishment of an oil refinery in Queensland. Indeed, we welcome the establishment of a refinery just as we are happy to know at any time of any steps that may be taken for the establishment of such an important economic unit in the community. But I am very surprised indeed at the secret methods that have been chosen, and the benefits that are proposed to be conferred upon a foreign organisation with no previous commitments in this country, in the light of the existing investment of oil companies in Australia to the order of £383,000,000. That £383,000,000 includes investment by wholly-owned Australian companies and other foreign companies domiciled in this country.

I am not in any way—nor is the Opposition—putting up a case for any particular company, but the whole of the negotiations

surrounding this matter have been, in the Minister's own words, conducted with the utmost secrecy. He has gone out of his way to point out that he has been most zealous to guard from any particular company what might be developing on other fronts. So, there has been a complete political contradiction, a political breach of trust. I think the Premier, if he has any sense of responsibility for his job—I am not attacking him personally; he knows me well enough to know that—must feel somewhat ashamed in view of reports which I have here with letters over his signature inviting and encouraging, and offering facilities for the establishment of a refinery by an Australian-owned company. Whilst he is doing that and whilst all the contingencies are being provided by the harbour boards and other instrumentalities, one of his Ministers for three years, by secret negotiation, is attempting to destroy what the Premier is trying to initiate.

Mr. Pilbeam interjected.

Mr. DUGGAN: I disagree on political matters with the Mayor of Rockhampton, but neither I nor the hon. member for Rockhampton North intend on this occasion to do other than what we have indicated. If the hon. member carries on his protest, as he has indicated to the hon. member for Rockhampton North, the contribution he makes will place him and the Opposition in complete agreement on this political somersault. If we are guilty of confused thinking it is only because we have been dizzled and dazzled by the Minister's merry-go-round. It is very difficult to keep any sense of balance in trying to follow that gentleman's logic and sense of fairness. The Government apparently do business on the basis of "Trust us, we are men of integrity."

The provisions contained in this Bill cut across the endeavours of the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, who was attempting to bring Phillips Petroleum Company to Queensland. What do the Government propose to do on the expiration of the agreement with Queensland Oil Refineries Pty. Ltd. which saves this State over £100,000 a year in the Department of Main Roads and other large sums for the Local Authorities? They propose to hand over half the output to this new refinery and therefore to reduce the output of the existing refinery on which over £1,000,000 has been spent. Will it build up confidence in this State and attract new industries, if people who spend millions of pounds here, know that a Minister of the Crown, secretly and over a period of three years, with complete premeditation, has gone about trying to cut across the basis of the establishment of such industries?

The Minister has thrown a challenge at me about Queensland Oil Refineries Pty. Ltd., and I accept it. There was no secrecy about the negotiations when I was acting Premier as photostats of the papers will show. The photostats are here and the Minister can see

them if he wishes. I indicated publicly that the Government were interested in the establishment of a bitumen company here and we gave all the existing oil companies an opportunity by the issue of that preliminary information. We set up a committee long before the agreement was signed. The Minister has not indicated to the people of Queensland that he had a committee investigating the matter at all. We named the men on our committee—the Commissioner of Main Roads, a representative of the Treasury Department, and the Surveyor-General—and everybody knew that those men were engaged on that particular investigation.

The Minister has challenged me with having done something secretive regarding the establishment of Queensland Oil Refineries Pty. Ltd. I have pointed out that we gave wide publicity to our intentions and that we had issued a statement giving the composition of the committee. But no financial guarantee was given to Queensland Oil Refineries Pty. Ltd. We freely indicated that, if anyone was interested in the establishment of a refinery of that character here, the door was open for that company to negotiate with the Government. There was no response to that general invitation and the committee recommended that the Government enter into an agreement with Queensland Oil Refineries Pty. Ltd. I repeat that the Government were not involved in any financial guarantees, nor were they asked to provide any financial assistance to the company. We did not give them any advantage over anyone else except to the extent that we undertook to buy their product, on the understanding that the price to the Department of Main Roads and to local authorities would not exceed the ex-refinery price in southern States plus the freight to Queensland. In consequence of the action taken on that occasion and on other occasions, which I was privileged to take as a member of the previous Labour Government and which I particularly was able to take in my capacity as Acting Premier, the Brisbane "Telegraph" published a series of articles about southern firms being eager to come to Queensland and the rapidly mounting bid for Queensland factory space. The article appeared in the issue of 29 September, 1953. It said—

"Business leaders are saying that 1953 has been a new era for secondary industry throughout the State.

Real estate agents are receiving an increasing demand for land on which to erect factories.

Some of the more eager inquiries are for properties to lease while the firms get their own building projects under way.

Southern industries anxious to get a foothold here include—"

Then the article lists a paint manufacturer, a manufacturer of electrical machinery, a tobacco manufacturer, a manufacturer of farm machinery, and then goes on to give

a number of other factories. How then has the Minister the temerity and colossal political hide to get up here and say that Opposition members are knockers of the development of industry in this State? Through the Treasurer and through the Premier he has been mouthing phrases throughout the length and breadth of the State about the tremendous impetus given to the development of Mt. Isa since the Labour Government were removed from office. We gave a financial guarantee to the Mt. Isa company, but who opposed the agreement? None other than those who constituted the then Opposition, members of the Country-Liberal Party, or the Country Progressive Party, as it was then called. They said that it was a colossal waste of money. In addition to the financial guarantee, we gave the Mt. Isa company freight concessions for a number of years. We were attacked by members of the then Opposition for what we had done. We prepared the plans for the development costing £28,000,000. The Labour Government submitted them to Sir Arthur Fadden, the Federal Treasurer, in Canberra, and they were approved by him.

In regard to the Weipa agreement, about which so much has been said by Government members in an effort to show how much they have done to bring industry to Queensland, I point out that I personally had consultations with others on the matter. I was not the Minister directly involved. The Minister for Public Lands, the Treasurer and the Premier of the Labour Government at that time, Mr. Gair, had frequent consultations with Mr. Byrne and Mr. Mawby, Mr. Robinson, and Mr. Hibberd, a Federal Treasury official of high standing. They were prepared to come here and lay down plans and enter into agreements with the Government to develop industry in this State. Yet we have this man who is the spokesman for this Government saying that we are an Opposition of knockers, and people have no confidence in us. Every one of the undertakings we gave to businesses, whether they were big or small, was honoured by Labour Governments of the past. When Labour resumes its occupancy of the Treasury benches no business man need fear that we will engage in secret negotiations. There need be no fear that future Labour Governments will morally breach a contract or repudiate a legal contract that has been entered into. The Government have had liaison officers setting out to bring industries to Queensland. If I were a southern industrialist I know how I would feel if I had an ex-chief of a Government coming down as a liaison officers to induce me to spend money in this State. I would say, "Can you give me an undertaking, Mr. Liaison Officer, that is if you have power to do so, or whether there are similar business propositions being secretly hawked about somewhere else. Before going to Queensland to explore the position I need to know whether other inducements are being given by other members of your Government to somebody else."

This morning, in reply to an interjection, the Minister said, "What company would spend money on exploration, or explore the position here, if it thought that its money would be wasted?" Is he going to suggest that the company that the Premier, according to the Press, was prepared to specifically induce to come to Queensland—I refer to Ampol at present—have not spent money in exploring the position? I challenge the Premier and the Minister to lay on the table of the Chamber the documents from their respective departments and correspondence that has passed between this or other businesses to show just how far they have encouraged these people. They will no doubt say they have not repudiated anything, and legally they have not. They would say to Ampol Petroleum (Qld.) Pty. Ltd., "Your option expires on 31 March; exercise it!" I invite the Premier to say now whether Ampol went entirely of their own volition to Port Alma or whether they were encouraged to go there by himself, the Deputy Premier, or some authorised officer on behalf of the Government. The Minister went up there and talked about developments with the Mt. Morgan people for the exploitation of their sulphur pyrites, for the manufacture of sulphuric acid; he talked about negotiations with the Grace Corporation of America, which is a big business incorporated in America, but that came to nothing. If I thought the Government were sincere and anxious over the years to build up industries in this State, I should think very seriously about the practicability of establishing a refinery at Port Alma, and no doubt that was in the minds of the Ampol company and in the minds of the Government. What incentive is there for a company to spend money if they are going to find secret, behind-their-back deals going on? Because we mention Ampol petroleum, the Minister shakes his head and says, "The people over there are a hopeless lot of nitwits and would not know what I was talking about." We have evidence of a progress meeting in Rockhampton attended by 7,000 people. There were so many there they could not be accommodated in the city hall and they were obliged to hold the meeting behind the city hall. For the first time to my knowledge in public an Anglican bishop came out and said it was a case of political treachery and yet the Minister says we are a lot of irresponsible nitwits on this side of the Chamber. By deliberately insulting us by making such a charge he is insulting the 7,000 people who attended the meeting at Rockhampton and unanimously carried a resolution condemning the Government.

In order to show how politically dishonest the Government are I challenge them now whether, in order that they might preserve the seat at Rockhampton, they did not last night give authority to the hon. member for Rockhampton South to criticise this Bill as long as he did not do it too severely or too critically. The people of Queensland are becoming sick to the teeth of all these pleas

by this peregrinating Minister—four times overseas—and all his talk about what he is doing and the industries he is attracting here, and how three years ago he was responsible for negotiating this business when he went to New York. According to his statement in this Chamber on 27 July, 1960, two years after the secret negotiations were going on, he entered into an arrangement through the Premier for an option to be exercised for the establishment of a refinery at Port Alma. What was the cost of the proposed refinery? £18,000,000. Approximately twice the capacity of this proposed refinery! Before committing the Government and expressing preparedness to give Government guarantees, has any estimate been made to determine whether the refinery will have the capacity to cater for Queensland's requirements by the time it is completed? On a forecast of the market based on a 7 per cent. increase to 1965, it is suggested that we require 1,457,000 tons of crude to be treated in a refinery. The capacity of this proposed refinery is considerably less than that, yet the Minister says the Government are catering for the future requirements of the State. Then what do they do? They give certain financial guarantees. Moreover, they incur certain expenditure in dredging costs, which has not been revealed to the Committee. Certainly we have been given the costs the Government propose to levy by way of rental, but we have not been told what their capital costs are, for us to form an estimate whether they are a fair charge or not. I am not quarrelling particularly with charges at the moment. At least the Minister has not told us what they were, and by way of interjection I invited him to reveal them. Airily he said, "No doubt the Treasurer will deal with that in due course." It is the Minister's job to give information to the Assembly in an important matter of this kind.

Then what does he do? He says the Government are to take these products by giving a 5 per cent. preference. Was that a financial inducement known to every other company? That could have been one of the balancing factors with other large interests in this country who may have been prepared to come here—companies have already spent £383,000,000 in investment in this country. Is the Minister going to say that £11,000,000 will frighten those companies? Certainly not! They are spending in Queensland alone on normal expansion of retail output at the present time something of the order of £2,000,000 a year, yet the Minister is asking the Parliament to ratify an agreement secretly entered into with this one company. I want to emphasise that. The whole of this inquiry was surrounded with a shroud of secrecy. There was no openness about it at all. I repeat that the Minister said that he took particular steps to see that no information about what might be going on and about what was in the Government's mind would pass between the various companies. The Minister himself goes along and says the Phillips Oil Co. should be encouraged here—they were supposed to

have taken over the "Dim Sim" organisation! What a howl of protest there was! I disagreed with some aspects of that legislation, of which hon. members may be well aware. But there was no price incentive given to that company when it came here. Although I was a dissenting member, if I might say so without betraying any trust, the records of the Assembly will reveal that there was no price inducement given to that company. It was certainly given some power to place its product in the service station of its competitors without compensation, which I did not approve of and which the present members of the Government did not approve of either for that matter. But here we have a 5 per cent. preference offer made to this company for its products. Is that going to be a blackmailing device which this company can use in a take-over offer for another company in Australia? According to information I read in the Press, the Gulf oil people—and they are a very important international oil organisation—on an estimate of the position came to the conclusion that it would cost approximately £20,000,000 to £25,000,000 to erect distributing outlets for their products if they came and established a refinery in Australia. The Total Company in New South Wales, backed very largely by the French Government, has had considerable difficulties in selling its product. What is the position say, compared with an Australian company with all Australian shareholders and the whole of the profits retained in this country? I am not barracking for Ampol particularly, except that they are specifically involved in this. The same applies to Shell, to Caltex, to Vacuum, to Atlantic, and to other organisations. But this is an Australian company. It is one of the 10 leading public companies in this country. It is the only oil company to my knowledge that has in operation at the present time a tanker built in this country. They did not go outside Australia to build their tankers; they built them in this country. They are manned by British crews whose rates of pay are higher than those paid to crews of tankers flying the Panamanian flag and other flags of convenience that are used by the oil-carrying companies. In addition to that, they have spent £18,000,000 in oil exploration in this country. Is that a company of no significance, of no importance?

I find in "Fortune" magazine that the Standard Oil Company of Indiana was one of a number of companies named in anti-trust action instituted by the Republican Party in America against a number of oil companies. Admittedly the company was acquitted, but no-one can say that the Government of the United States is a Labour Government or a poor man's Government. It represents the big business institutions. Is it fair to put other companies at a 5 per cent. disadvantage with this company when those other companies were prepared to come here?

This thing reeks of political rottenness, and I say that no words are too strong to condemn this Government for the furtive and secret

way in which they have conducted these negotiations. Their actions destroy confidence in this State. How are we to attract new industries here when the Government are taking away at the expiration of this agreement half the output of Queensland Oil Refineries? What is going to happen? Does it not become uneconomic? If it became uneconomic at the expiration of the agreement, there would be no justification for further capital expenditure. Every "t" has been crossed and every "i" dotted in regard to their obligations. Is any company likely to come here on a similar basis knowing that this Government, behind its back, is not even honourable enough to go to them and say, "We are keen to have, and desirous of having, an oil refinery here, and we are giving you a deadline on this matter"? If it has taken three years for the Minister to negotiate this agreement, why the haste and why the speed now? Why the desire to rush it through today? The Premier has intimated that it must go through today so that the Bill can be printed.

Mr. Nicklin: We wanted to give everybody the opportunity of seeing the agreement.

Mr. DUGGAN: It would have given us an opportunity of looking at some of the facts, too, and marshalling our arguments. I think the Premier is on a spot in regard to this particular matter. If he is not on a spot, then he ought to be. If he is not on a spot, he has not got much political conscience. (Government laughter.)

It is all right for hon. members opposite to laugh, but it has aroused 7,000 people up in the North. The Government are always talking about what they are going to do up in the North. What about the roads? We will get them in 1962. Bob Menzies will put money into the Channel Country and the North in 1962 to try to make the Gregory seat safe and the Flinders seat safe. The Prime Minister has said that these things will happen in 1962. It will be getting close to the State elections then.

The people are seeing behind this facade of the Government's and their talk of these astute businessmen, these men of great integrity, and their talk of no more Labour agitators, no more uncouth people going to Canberra to put Queensland's case. They have sent down suave gentlemen, doctors, lawyers, and so on, to get money from the Federal Government, yet they have been turned down. The Government come here and talk about bold plans for development. The Premier yesterday said, "We are doing wonderful things to meet all this unemployment. Out of a budget of £100,000,000 the Government have made available £50,000—about eight weeks' work for 300 men. We find here evidence of gross moral repudiation. Hon. members opposite can talk and protest as much as they like, but those are the facts.

Are the Government saying that there is justification for two refineries here at the

present time? Are hon. members opposite the only wise people about the place? The Deputy Premier said, "These men know what they are doing with their own money." If they felt that there was not justification for only one refinery, how on earth, on the Deputy Premier's own statement, can there now be justification for two? He cannot have it both ways. The Minister has said that each one of these oil companies has shown a disinclination to invest capital in an oil refinery in Queensland at the present time, despite the efforts of his own officers and the officers of the Department of Harbours and Marine. The Government are carrying on in a very disgraceful way in regard to this particular matter.

(Time expired.)

Mr. PILBEAM (Rockhampton South) (2.35 p.m.): I am placed in a somewhat difficult position on this occasion because I have to assume a role that I am quite sure not many members of the Opposition would take up. I realise that if I can I must speak for the people of Rockhampton and Central Queensland without any parliamentary or party influence whatever. It is very difficult.

Mr. Thackeray interjected.

Mr. PILBEAM: The hon. member will have his chance later on. When his party is in power we shall see him run.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. PILBEAM: It is significant that as I have agreed to speak without any political influence whatever I am being attacked before I even say a word.

Mr. Mann: We know what happened at your Caucus meeting.

Mr. PILBEAM: I shall tell the Committee what happened. I am not in the habit of telling lies. In Caucus I informed the Premier and the Leader of my Party that I was going to speak on this occasion without reference to them. I told them that.

There has been quite a deal of upset in Rockhampton and Central Queensland over the recent decision on this oil refinery. I always choose to lead from in front rather than from behind. I would rather have people drawn together instead of having them running all over the place and making independent decisions. I make no excuse for calling them together to see what they had to say about the matter. Everyone had a chance to speak on that platform, and everything was brought out into the open.

This afternoon I am going to represent the people present at that meeting, and if I can I have to represent the people of Rockhampton and Central Queensland. I have roles other than as a member of Parliament. I have been mayor of Rockhampton for the last nine years, and I am the chairman of the Central Queensland Local Government

Association. As such I must speak in their interests. Their interests must be placed first. I think first loyalties must come first. My first loyalty is to the people in my area—the people to whom I owe so much.

The upset was not the result of anything that happened in Central Queensland recently, or even in the past few years, but it was the culmination of a long period of neglect of Central Queensland. If anyone tries to contradict that I say, "Show me industries that have been built up in Central Queensland. Show me the bitumen highways that have been built through Central Queensland." There has been neglect in the past, and there is a fear that that trend will be continued. I must give the Committee some idea of the background of the people's thoughts in this direction. They have recently seen some movement to place Central Queensland in No. 3 position in relation to various parts of Queensland. I must be truthful and say that they have noticed such a trend in several ways and have spoken about it. In the recent re-shuffle of Main Roads positions, for instance, there was a Main Roads Commissioner at Brisbane, a Deputy Commissioner at Townsville, and only an additional engineer at Rockhampton. We do not ask for any more than our due in Central Queensland so we think we should be treated on the same level as Southern and Northern Queensland.

If the Committee want any further evidence of that trend, there has been a developmental officer appointed to North Queensland and none to Central Queensland. At the present time, although we have hopes in that direction, there is a University in North Queensland and we are still battling for one in Central Queensland. At the moment we are looking with fear at Toowoomba because we feel they might be placed up against us. I am telling hon. members what was discussed at this meeting. I am telling what the people told me to tell the Committee. I am not bothering to tell what the Opposition are trying to get me to say. I will speak for all sections of the people, including many represented by hon. members of the Opposition.

In regard to the appointment of road safety officers in country areas of Queensland, one such officer has been appointed at Townsville but there is no road safety officer at Rockhampton. The reason given to us was that there were more people killed in North Queensland than in Central Queensland. Generally, the trend will be seen. It is a strong trend, we think, to place us in third position. That is one of the reasons at the back of the people's minds in calling for this meeting.

We were most disturbed when we saw this decision in the Press. It appeared without any reference to me, and that is one of the things to which the people took exception and to which I must take exception. I express my objection to it—that this decision made in regard to the people in my

electorate should be made without any reference whatsoever to me, although this area which I represent was the site of a possible refinery.

In order to show hon. members that this picture was not just something created in our minds, I have here the "Rockhampton Bulletin" of Thursday, 11 August, in which the Premier stated as follows:—

"Possibility of Oil Refinery at Port Alma.

Ampol Granted 400-acre Option.

The Premier, Mr. Nicklin, announced tonight that the Government had granted Ampol an option over 400 acres of land at Port Alma. The option would be effective until March 31 next year. Mr. Nicklin said the option would give the company time to decide whether it would establish a refinery on the site."

I do not think it altogether unreasonable to assume from that that Ampol would get the opportunity to formulate their plans and submit a case at any time up to 31 March.

Mr. Graham: They can still exercise their option up to the end of March.

Mr. PILBEAM: My discussion this afternoon is somewhat tempered by the fact that they still have that right and they naturally are anxious to pursue their business unhampered by any political interference. They will make their decision and approach the Government by 31 March. So, although I give hon. members some detail of discussions that have taken place, I have no authority to quote from correspondence that took place between Ampol and the Government. It somewhat hamstrings me.

I can speak of affairs in regard to the port, and I think it would be as well to go back to the time when we started to rehabilitate Port Alma. It was some three years ago. It is fair for the Government to say it was rehabilitated with their co-operation and support and, I say, with the support of the people of Rockhampton and the Rockhampton City Council. In their efforts to rehabilitate the port the Rockhampton City Council asked the citizens of Rockhampton to contribute 40 per cent. towards the cost of the £250,000 road. They guaranteed the Harbour Board's finances for the next 40 years, contemplating a new wharf being constructed and paid for at a cost of £500,000 to £600,000. Up to that point we received support from the Government and moved ahead further than we had at any time during the past half-century at Port Alma. We no sooner commenced construction of the road than we received news that Ampol were prepared to erect an oil terminal at Port Alma. That was very good news, and I can see nothing that has gone on up to the present to lead me to think we will lose the terminal. Despite the distress and dismay in the public mind, we are still making forward steps. The new road to Port Alma, the new port and the oil terminal would be a

substantial step forward, but it would have been a miracle to have secured an oil refinery.

It is only fair to state that Ampol has acted in full co-operation with the Rockhampton Harbour Board. It has undertaken quite a deal of investigation on the site and has expended approximately £60,000 or £70,000 in reclaiming an area sufficient to house the terminal. Construction of the terminal has been delayed until some decision is reached with the Government regarding the refinery. It would not have been advisable to commence construction of a lesser project if there was any prospect of construction of the greater project.

We think and still think that Port Alma would have been a good site. With the depth of water available, the cost of dredging would not have been great. That has been borne out by discussions we have had with the Government and with the Department of Harbours and Marine. The depth was quite in order.

It was never envisaged that the filling of the land would be done at Government cost. In all the negotiations we have had with Ampol, it has always been understood that Ampol would pay for the cost of the reclamation of the land. I must say, therefore, that it is disturbing to me to hear that the Government were prepared to go to such great lengths to induce another oil company to come to Brisbane.

Mr. Lloyd: Has any estimate been made of the costs?

Mr. PILBEAM: I could not state the cost of reclaiming 500 acres. From personal experience I can state that it costs about £4,000 an acre. In some other ports it has been done at £15,000 an acre. It would cost anything from £2,000,000 upwards. There is no doubt in my mind that that would be the figure. No-one can say what the cost of dredging would be, but it certainly would be tremendously high.

Distribution of the product and the cost of distribution must be taken into consideration. The market in Brisbane is better than in Rockhampton, but we think that one could have been offset against the other, and should have been before the decision was arrived at. It is the opinion of the people of Rockhampton that the various economies of both propositions were not considered, one with the other. We think that some partiality or some priority was given to the undertaking which is coming to Brisbane. We are upset. Naturally we would like to see an oil refinery established in Central Queensland. It would be the greatest step forward in decentralisation in the history of the State.

We realise, just as everyone in Parliament must realise, the tremendous results that would flow from it. That is why we are very sad about it. Of course, I could not have any idea of the Ampol negotiations with the

Government, but I feel sure that the inducements offered them were not of the order indicated in the agreement made between the Government and Amoco. I do not think for a moment that a 10-year franchise was sought. I do not think that any undertaking was sought for a tremendous amount of dredging to be done by the Government.

Mr. Burrows: You don't think that?

Mr. PILBEAM: No, I will be quite frank. I do not think that for a moment.

Mr. Bennett: Can you give me reasons for that?

Mr. PILBEAM: I have just given the reasons. I am not able to state what the Ampol negotiations were, but I know quite well they were not of this order. I know quite well that the same amount was not sought for reclamation.

Mr. Bennett: Can you give me any reason why a special privilege was given to Amoco and not to Ampol?

Mr. PILBEAM: No. We feel this trend has been going on no matter what Government are in office. We feel that Brisbane is growing all the time and this is another reflection of that growth. We feel that the prize is too great; we could have got the terminal, but the prize at stake was too great and it has been taken from our grasp. I feel sure the Deputy Premier will be able to give us further information.

Mr. Burrows: You are satisfied that this Government are no better than any previous Government when dealing with Central Queensland?

Mr. PILBEAM: I am not prepared to say that. I have intimated that we have made more progress since the present harbour board came into office than we did in the past 40 years. When it took over, the wharf was falling into the river; we did not have any road to the port and we did not look like getting one. We had no plan for a new wharf and there was no possibility of getting a terminal. If the members of the Opposition had been successful in their efforts against me concerning Port Alma there would not have been a road there and there would not have been any discussion about a terminal. The opposition was against the development of Port Alma.

Mr. Thackeray: On the method of financing it.

Mr. PILBEAM: It was through this Government in co-operation with the people of Rockhampton that Port Alma was able to enter the picture. Without those negotiations I would not have been making a plea today. I must object firstly because we were not brought into the picture, and secondly because we feel that consideration should have been given to Ampol when they had an option till 31 March. They should have

been given consideration and been allowed to put their case and then we may have had a chance to look at both propositions. Thirdly, we object because some negotiations were going on with one company, and there was no secrecy given to them. It was published in the Press as soon as negotiations started. We feel that undue preference was given to one company and I must emphasise that point if I am to advance the opinions of the people in Rockhampton and Central Queensland.

I am quite sure the Government have answers to the criticism that has been levelled, and I am equally sure that the people of Central Queensland will be interested to hear them. I will not speak at any great length because I want to see the Bill before I make any further comments.

There is one further thing we discussed at the progress meeting, and with all due deference to a member of the Opposition I must raise it here. It was the fear that is held that this was just one step in a general deterioration of Central Queensland. They in Central Queensland fear that something that is just as important to the development of Central Queensland might go the same way. They think it is all part of the same picture. That is why this action was taken. I appeal to the Government to give consideration to the claims of Central Queensland on the establishment of a super-powerhouse at Callide. We make no excuse for making the claim. We think our claims are thoroughly justified by the opinion of the experts and that will be proved when the Merz McLellan report is brought down.

Mr. Houston: Have you seen the report?

Mr. PILBEAM: Yes, I have seen it. Certainly the costs are overwhelmingly in favour of Callide. We feel that it presents another wonderful opportunity for the Government to carry out its policy of decentralisation. We feel sure that the construction of the super-powerhouse at Callide will lead to the establishment of big industries in Central Queensland. In our view Comalco can still be induced to set up in Queensland and so keep the business away from New Zealand. If the super-powerhouse were set up in Callide and we were able to offer power at the price Comalco want before they set up their works—if Comalco were offered as much inducement as this company—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have allowed the hon. member some latitude but I must ask him to keep to the subject of the Bill.

Mr. PILBEAM: I have been challenged to produce the opinions expressed at the meeting in Rockhampton. I have not gone behind anybody's back to do so. I have tried to do it without rancour and without personal malice against any of the Ministers concerned. I make the charges and I make the pleas to the Government of the day, not to any particular party. I urge that consideration be given, if it is at all possible, to Port

Alma's claim to have a refinery. I do not know what Ampol intend to do. I know they are going to pursue their business without regard to those on this side of the Chamber or those on the other side. I know they are not finished with their negotiations and I certainly do not intend to give away anybody who has not yet given us away. If it is in any way possible to save anything and if it is at all possible to help with the development of Port Alma, particularly with this refinery, which would be of so much value to Central Queensland, I urge the Government to do it and to give every consideration not only to this project but also to every other project that will hold the population in this part of Queensland and bring about its development.

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North, (2.58 p.m.): This afternoon we have seen the fall of an idol in Rockhampton, a man with clay feet, as the people of Rockhampton will realise when they read "The Morning Bulletin" tomorrow. After all, the statements made by him about the attack he was going to launch upon his own Cabinet and upon his own Liberal Party, of how the Liberal Party in Rockhampton was upset about it and was going to take action with the Liberal Party in Brisbane, of how he told the hon. member for Port Curtis coming down in the train how he was going to sail into the Government over this raw deal on the Ampol business, this afternoon in the Chamber we have seen his downfall. I had sincerely hoped that I could rise and join with him in a combined fight for Central Queensland on the raw deal it is getting. Unfortunately, you cannot change your colour and political kin as much as the hon. member for Rockhampton South does and still be loyal to the people. You cannot be Independent one day and Liberal the next; you cannot tell the people of Rockhampton how you are going to fight and be the saviour and idol of 40,000 people. What do you find? You find the man has clay feet. That is exactly what we have learned this afternoon. This Ampol question is one of political treachery and I say that if the Government were sincere, they should have been quite open with Ampol and said, "These are the terms we are prepared to give to any oil refining company that comes into Queensland." Why did not they do that? The Minister said they were secret negotiations, and that is all we know about them—like these other secret heresy hunts they have at times, too.

The people of Central Queensland were misled. When the Bill relating to the Rockhampton-Port Alma road came before the House, under which the people of Rockhampton were to pay 40 per cent. of the cost, I opposed it only from the point of view of finance because I thought the State Government or the Commonwealth Government should meet the cost, not the ratepayers of Rockhampton. The people of Rockhampton took up a petition and that was defeated, and I accepted the decision. I did not get up

in this Chamber and say it was a waste of public money.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the question before the Committee.

Mr. THACKERAY: The Ampol company has an option until 31 March on land at Port Alma for an oil refinery. No doubt Ampol has not exercised its rights under that option as it should have. If it had any plans for a refinery at Port Alma, I believe it should have moved before this date. I believe that Ampol should have put something concrete before the Government and that the Government should have said quite openly, "There are the terms on which we are prepared to assist industry in Central Queensland."

Let us compare the figures for the statistical divisions of Queensland. In South Queensland we have 1,042,501 people, in Central Queensland 120,287, and in North Queensland 248,830. Central Queensland is obviously well behind, and the establishment of an oil refinery in that area would be a great advantage to us. The Government have talked of many plans for Central Queensland, including the establishment of a fertiliser works, pineapple factories, and so on, and we have not seen the establishment of any of them yet.

I hope that Ampol will still go ahead with its oil terminal, but if they did, pressure could be brought to bear on the Government to reduce freight rates from Gladstone to Rockhampton and Shell, Caltex and Vacuum would still be able to retail their products at the same price as Ampol. How sincere are the Government in relation to the company's proposal to build an oil terminal at Port Alma? Will the Government give a guarantee that the freight rates will not be altered if Ampol does build its terminal?

I honestly believed that the hon. member for Rockhampton South would not submit to the dictation of the Liberal Party today. He was probably told, "If you buck us today, remember what we told you in Rockhampton when you won the seat. Either you play ball with us or you know what will happen to you, Rex. You know what happened to the former member for Kurilpa, Mr. Connolly. If you disobey the orders of the Liberal Party, you will be decapitated." That is what has happened. He came in here this afternoon a very subdued man and put up a pitiful case for Rockhampton. He has fallen down on the job, and the people of Rockhampton will be his judge at the mayoral elections this year and at the next State elections in 1963. The Liberal Party is at the lowest ebb of any political party in Queensland today.

Mr. DEWAR (Wavell) (3.5 p.m.): The Bill seeks to make an agreement between the Queensland Government and Amoco Australia Pty. Ltd., an organisation that desires

to establish an oil refinery in this State. I could waste time talking about the speech of the hon. member who just sat down, but what he said could hardly be called a speech. I do not disagree with a great deal of what the hon. member for Rockhampton South had to say, particularly his reference to the neglect of Central Queensland by previous Governments. I do not think anyone on this side would disagree with at least 85 per cent. of his remarks. The hon. member has every right to state a case for the area he represents, and every right to battle for that area. While he is in the Liberal Party he will get every encouragement to battle for his area and to say what he wants to say without any fear.

I know nothing about the agreement, nor do I know anything about the alleged history leading up to the agreement. I know nothing about the establishment of oil refineries in Queensland except what I have read in the Press. I am not alone in that, because I would say that no hon. member opposite knows anything about it, either. If the speech of the Leader of the Opposition was any guide I am convinced that hon. members opposite know nothing about it. What is the history? As I understand it the whole development of industry in Queensland has been accompanied by the constant sneers and jibes of members of the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. Lloyd: You would not know, because you are never in the Chamber.

Mr. DEWAR: The hon. member may be right. It may be that my contribution by not being here is much better than the hon. member's by his being here.

In 1957 we became the Government of Queensland.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. DEWAR: You are wet! Why not dry yourself?

In keeping with our 1957 policy speech the Government immediately set about attracting industry to Queensland.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. DEWAR: They call him "Moses." Every time he opens his mouth the "bull" rushes.

Within 12 months of our becoming the Government, in response to a request by responsible organisations an overseas trade mission was set up, and at their invitation the Premier appointed the Minister for Labour and Industry to head it.

The Minister said today that having obtained information from those who would know what was required to give Queensland a balanced economy, and having learned that an oil refinery was essential in Queensland for the purpose, he made investigations throughout Australia to see whether or not there was an oil company prepared to come to Queensland to establish an oil refinery. I

think he said that four major companies were approached with this end in view, but to his disappointment there was not one oil company in Australia that was prepared to discuss the possibility of establishing an oil refinery here. Armed with that information the Minister and the trade delegation went overseas with one specific purpose—to attract industry to Queensland. They went with the sneers and jibes of the Australian Labour Party. All the time they were away we, on this side of the Chamber, listened to the inane comments of the hon. member for Mackay, the Leader of the Opposition, and other hon. members on that side, who did nothing but sneer "at this jaunt of Morris's around the world." That was the atmosphere of co-operation that was forthcoming from the Australian Labour Party towards any attempt to bring industry to Queensland. Because he was alert to the need to get an oil refinery in Queensland, and armed with the information that no Australian oil company was interested in establishing an oil refinery here, surely to goodness the Minister did the right and proper thing when he went overseas for the specific purpose of seeking industry, to endeavour to find an organisation that was prepared to come to Queensland with new capital to provide what the State required.

Mr. Hanlon: What do you say about Ampol?

Mr. DEWAR: I am prepared to believe the Minister rather than the meanderings of the Australian Labour Party. The Minister stated that in 1958, before he went overseas, he got in touch with Australian oil companies and was not able to find one company interested in establishing an oil refinery in Queensland. I am prepared to believe the Minister when he says that and until honourable members of the Opposition can prove the contrary I will continue to believe him.

Mr. Duggan: The Minister said on 27 July 1960 that they gave an option to Ampol and he then goes and gives one to this new company in September.

Mr. DEWAR: When was that?

Mr. Duggan: Last year.

Mr. DEWAR: I am talking about 1958, before the Minister went overseas. The Minister went overseas knowing that he could not get any industry of this nature in Australia to establish a refinery in Queensland. Knowing that, he would have been remiss in his duty, and showing great lack of responsibility as a Minister of the Crown, and leader of a trade mission, had he not done what he could, particularly as those responsible for these things claim that an oil refinery is essential to Queensland's industrial development. Knowing that no oil company in Australia was prepared to establish a refinery here, if he had not endeavoured to do everything in his power to establish contact with any company that was prepared to come to this State he would not have been

doing his duty. That is all the Minister did. He went overseas to get industry and, as a result of his efforts, and £11,000,000 industry is coming to Queensland.

Yet, what do we find? Hon. members of the Opposition who sneered and jibed at the time he went away and spent 12 months after his return, asking stupid and ridiculous questions about his holiday trip around the world, asking for the number of factories established in Queensland in the current month, always endeavouring to highlight the fact that his trip overseas had been a calamitous failure, today, when the same Parliament is asked to pass a Bill to enable an agreement to be entered into to permit an organisation to bring an £11,000,000 industry into the State, are endeavouring to "knock" the idea. In other words, they are always on side—a two-bob-each-way party and two bob is about all they are worth.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. DEWAR: I would be content to listen if the Leader of the Opposition or any other member of the rabble over there could produce any evidence that any other organisation in Australia was prepared—

Mr. WALSH: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member for Wavell in order in referring to hon. members on this side of the Chamber as a "rabble."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member referred to any hon. members in the Chamber as "rabble," his reference is disorderly and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. DEWAR: I gladly withdraw it. If Opposition members can produce any vestige of proof that any organisation in Australia or any other country of the world has approached the Government with a proposal that could be said to be tangible, then I believe they may have a case, but they have no case for knocking the work of the trade mission of 1958 which left this country aware of the need to get an oil refinery in Queensland. Today we see the result of the work of that trade mission. It has produced a refinery.

There is always much talk about the fact that Governments should do this and Governments should do that, that Governments should establish industry here and that Governments should do all sorts and manner of things. The plain fact is that Governments initiate virtually nothing. Governments are groups of people who gather taxes from the people and then spend the money in certain directions such as the supply of essential services, health, transport, education and others of that nature. Governments initiate virtually nothing, having regard to productivity. They do such things as building dams that help farmers to produce something, and building roads that may help an industry to become established, but in a free enterprise system, a non-socialist system, Governments do not establish industries

or tell industrialists where they should establish industries. I do not care what Government are in power; they cannot do it. No industrialist would establish an industry in any part of the State or any part of Australia simply because a Government had asked him to do so. He will go exactly where he pleases. The money is his and he will spend it where he desires to spend it, and he will do so only after a proper analysis of the availability of raw materials and, if raw materials are not available locally, the availability and standard of transport facilities to bring them to the place where he desires to establish an industry. He will examine the markets and see whether he will have an opportunity to sell his goods in the locality where he desires to manufacture them. Neither this Government nor any other Government could say to Amoco or any other company, "You must establish your industry at Bowen, Townsville, Port Alma, or Brisbane."

Mr. Hanlon: They should all be given the same concessions, which the Government have not given in this instance.

Mr. DEWAR: The hon. member does not know. I have challenged hon. members opposite to produce evidence that the Government have received any tangible proposal or any approach from any other oil organisation in this country or overseas, that is, a concrete proposal to establish an oil refinery.

Mr. Duggan: We have told you about six times that the evidence is available in your own records.

Mr. DEWAR: I do not know of it. The Leader of the Opposition seems to know more about it than I do, but I challenge him to produce evidence of a tangible, concrete proposal made to the Government.

Mr. Duggan: I challenged the Premier to lay all the papers on the table of the House.

Mr. DEWAR: The hon. member can say that to the Premier.

Mr. Duggan: I have done so already.

Mr. DEWAR: I challenge the hon. member to produce any evidence.

Mr. Duggan: We have not got the papers.

Mr. DEWAR: I do not know of their existence. I know of no approach to the Government by any oil company that could be put in the same category as the one made by Amoco. The Government would be failing in their duty if, having received a concrete proposal from any organisation to do something of the nature envisaged in this proposal, they set it aside on the ground that they may get a proposal from somebody else. I know what I would do if I was an industrialist seeking to establish an industry and received that sort of treatment. If I went along to the proper authorities and said, "I am prepared to do so-and-so," and the person to whom I spoke prevaricated,

although having nothing to counter it. I would simply say, "I will take my money elsewhere." That would be the logical attitude for anybody to adopt.

Having no knowledge of any other organisation's having made a concrete proposal to the Government that could be compared with the proposal made by Amoco, I am bound to say that the Government have acted in the only way they could act in relation to the matter. Private enterprise will go where it chooses after examining every facet of the deal. It will not go where the Government sends it; it will simply go elsewhere.

It is often quite interesting to listen to the arguments advanced by the Leader of the Opposition and hear him "shoot himself down in flames" in the same speech. At 2.25 p.m. he claimed that this refinery that is to be built at Bulwer Island was not big enough. He said, "You should have built a bigger one." Then, at 2.35 p.m., he claimed the State could not stand two refineries; that was just 10 minutes later. At 2.25 p.m. it was not big enough and then, at 2.35 p.m., the State could not stand two refineries. That is typical of the whole argument put up by him.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (3.21 p.m.): I am particularly interested in this proposal to establish an oil refinery in Brisbane because the site lies within the boundaries of my electorate. However, seeing that Bulwer Island is the site that has been selected, I must emphasise that a tremendous amount of preparatory work will be necessary. As the Minister pointed out, a great deal of the land is under water, and what is not under water is mud and mangroves. If a 12-ft. low-water datum is to be built up they will have an enormous job on their hands and a very costly one. I will deal with that later in greater detail.

We on this side of the Chamber consider that the establishment of this refinery is eminently desirable.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MELLOY: We do. There is no question about that. However, we heartily disagree with the circumstances surrounding its establishment. My Leader has gone very fully into that, but it is passing strange for these disciples of free enterprise and free competition to set up this monument to monopoly. The Government have acted secretly on this, ignoring other oil companies throughout Australia, and putting up favourable conditions for Amoco, expecting them to establish a refinery, at considerable advantage to themselves.

It has been said by "Mr. Australia"—I beg your pardon, sir, the hon. member for Wavell—that no other company is interested. That is entirely wrong. We know that Ampol was very interested in the establishment of a refinery in Queensland. The hon. member for Wavell also stated that when Ampol was

given its option, negotiations were under way with Amoco for the establishment of their refinery at Pinkenba. That is not so.

Mr. Dewar: I did not say that.

Mr. MELLOY: The green light was not given to Amoco until January. The establishment of a refinery at Pinkenba will be of great assistance to me and to the State. We are not "knocking" it in that way. We believe it will be of great advantage to the State if it is established, but we regret the surrounding circumstances. I hope it will enable me to place in employment at some later stage some hundreds of railwaymen in my electorate who have been dismissed by this Government.

The hon. member for Wavell also challenged our leader's statements about the capacity of the oil refinery and claimed that at one time he said its capacity was not great enough while at a later stage he denied Queensland's capacity to carry two refineries. That is quite so. What our leader said was that the capacity stipulated for this refinery—I think it is 14,000,000 gallons—would not serve the requirements of the State in 10 years time. He said that no allowance was made for the development of the State over the next 10 years.

There are several other matters to which I wish to direct the Minister's attention. The first is the reclamation of the area at Pinkenba. He said that some of the land has already been reclaimed but that about 250 acres have yet to be reclaimed. That is a tremendous burden for any industry and I should like to know from the Minister whether it is the Government's intention to pay the costs of the further reclamation work on Bulwer Island. It will be a tremendous project and a very costly one. Will that cost be borne by Amoco or by the Government? That would be interesting information. I suppose it would be very interesting to Ampol. It would be interesting to know, too, whether the Government were going to offer such generous concessions to Ampol. I fancy they were not.

Much of the land on Bulwer Island may be described as undesirable, but there is a good deal of land on the river-bank nearby that is desirable, and I should like to know from the Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to use any land apart from the area on Bulwer Island. It will affect the residents of adjacent areas. I am sure they will be interested to learn whether there is any intention to resume some of that good farming land that can be put to good use.

Mr. Hiley: No resumptions are contemplated.

Mr. MELLOY: I am pleased to hear that.

Mr. Low: If you were on the ball you would have had all that information before you made this speech.

Mr. MELLOY: I should like to inform the hon. member for Cooroora that although

this project lies within my electorate, I can assure him that at no time did the Minister come to me and say, "Melloy, this is in your area. I know you will be interested. Would you like to know something about it?"

Mr. Hanlon: He did not even tell the member for Rockhampton South.

Mr. MELLOY: As has been pointed out, the Minister did not even inform the hon. member for Rockhampton South, who was greatly interested in the establishment of an oil refinery in Queensland. How could he possibly inform the member representing the area in which the project was to be established?

Mr. Low: It is your place to get in touch with him.

Mr. MELLOY: It was done in secret. That is what we are complaining about. As nobody knew anything about it, how could we approach the Minister? No oil company in Australia knew anything about it. They were not given a fair go.

On the question of the method of financing this project, the people of Queensland will be interested to know whether Australian capital is to be allowed into it or whether it is to be another General Motors-Holden's project. The Government makes a great story of the finance that is being brought into this country for the establishment of industry. But what about the dividends that go out? That will happen in this case if the Australian people are not allowed to invest their money in it.

Mr. Hiley: They will be so allowed.

Mr. MELLOY: That may be so. They are also allowed to invest in General Motors-Holden's, but the amount which Australian public is allowed to invest in that company is of no consequence.

I should also like the Minister to enlighten me on the assurances that have been given to this company. Surely no company will establish an industry in a State unless it is assured of a satisfactory financial return, particularly in a highly competitive industry such as the distribution of petrol and oil. I can only assume that it must have been given some concrete assurances by the Government that it would receive favourable treatment in the disposal of its products. I doubt whether the other oil companies in Australia would have any information on that score. These are things that will become clear, I hope, when we have an opportunity of perusing the Bill. I sincerely hope that we are able to satisfy ourselves that when this oil refinery is established the rights of everyone will be protected, including the rights of the trading community in Queensland.

Like the two hon. members from Central Queensland, I feel that that area has been unjustly treated. If we are to develop Queensland, we must not confine the development to the south-eastern corner. Where

there are opportunities and where companies are willing to establish industry in Central Queensland, they should be given the same gold-carpet treatment that has been given to Amoco. I feel sure that had Ampol been given the same consideration in Rockhampton as this company has been given in Brisbane it would have made much greater strides and taken much more positive action for the establishment of a refinery in Central Queensland.

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer and Minister for Housing) (3.34 p.m.) I am grateful to the last speaker for clearing up something that I had commenced to doubt. Before listening to what he said, I had begun to doubt whether the Opposition favoured the establishment of an oil refinery in Queensland. The hon. member for Nudgee has made it abundantly clear that he applauds the establishment of a refinery but doubts whether it should be this refinery or another one.

I shall give some details later, but I make this initial comment: that I never cease to marvel at the way in which the Australian Labour Party finds itself jockeyed into a position of acting as the defender of an existing limited field. On this occasion hon. members opposite are voicing their resentment of the intrusion of a new independent competitor for the existing oil companies.

Mr. Melloy: We did not do that.

Mr. HILEY: Your Leader did.

Mr. Melloy: No, he did not. He said it should have been open for any competitor to come into it.

Mr. HILEY: It is perfectly clear that any newcomer in the field has to battle for a market. To get it, he has to take it from the sales of the existing field. If hon. members opposite imagine that the existing oil companies do not resent and resist the advent of a new competitor, they do not know what they are talking about. Let me make our attitude clear. We wanted a refinery in Queensland. We have not been able to come to Parliament and tell hon. members of all the approaches we have had from almost every existing oil company in Australia. With the exception of Ampol—and in their case only in a very limited locality (Rockhampton)—no company publicly said what they were doing. Ampol never told the public of Queensland that they had also made approaches in another place. They did not tell the public of Queensland that after they had been to Rockhampton and got an option there they went to the Mackay Harbour Board and told them that Rockhampton was out, and asked the Mackay Harbour Board to prepare a full submission on the refinery for Mackay. Having read all about it in the paper that the refinery was to go to Rockhampton the Mackay Harbour Board asked my advice. I said, "Look, the Government's attitude is

that we want a refinery in Queensland. We want it wherever anyone is prepared to put it. There is no restriction on your getting it in Mackay if you can." On my advice the Mackay Harbour Board prepared a very extensive submission and spent a great deal of money on its preparation. They were kind enough to send me a copy of their representations to Ampol, which I still have on my files. This is later than their discussions with Rockhampton.

Mr. Duggan: Do you suggest that Ampol never spent anything on investigations?

Mr. HILEY: Of course I do not. This raised a query in my mind. Ampol put their sales boys in Rockhampton and signed up the Rockhampton City Council and several of the big consumers on the strength of the fact that they were going into Rockhampton. And that is true, is it not?

Mr. Thackeray: That is true.

Mr. HILEY: That is true.

Mr. Duggan: Would there have been anything wrong with that?

Mr. HILEY: Oh, no, there is nothing wrong with sharp commercial practices in doing a thing like that!

Mr. Duggan: Do you say this was a sharp commercial practice?

Mr. HILEY: In my judgment, if they represented to consumers in Rockhampton that they were going to establish a refinery there but subsequently decided to go to Mackay, and told the Mackay Harbour Board, "We have given Rockhampton away, now we want a proposition from you," they should go back to the people—

Mr. Graham interjected.

Mr. HILEY: This is what the Mackay Harbour Board told me.

Mr. Graham: The Mackay Harbour Board presented a case.

Mr. HILEY: At Ampol's invitation, after they had made a deal and taken up all the business they could get in the Rockhampton area.

Mr. Duggan: But this company came here at your invitation.

Mr. HILEY: That was three years ago. We invited every company. We have made it perfectly clear to them that in our judgment there was room for an oil refinery in Queensland. We offered them common advantages. In fact we offered Ampol something more than Amoco have asked for. We offered Ampol £750,000 worth of housing.

Mr. Duggan: Why didn't you give them until 31 March to exercise their option?

Mr. HILEY: They all knew it was a case of first up best dressed.

Mr. Duggan: Nonsense!

Mr. HILEY: Every one of them knew that quite clearly. Not one of them was given a restrictive opportunity. Every company that has come to me has been told right at the outset, "We want a refinery here. There are other people interested. As far as we are concerned the first who comes along with a decent proposition, that is it."

Mr. Duggan: Did you tell all the other companies you would give them a 5 per cent. price advantage?

Mr. HILEY: Where did you get that from?

Mr. Duggan: Your Minister.

Mr. HILEY: The trouble is the hon. gentleman does not listen carefully. Let me make it clear because that is the next fallacy I want to explode—that 5 per cent. rot. Amoco will get no marketing advantage whatever apart from the State's own purchases, which are a tiny trifle of the State's total consumption. All that they get is 5 per cent. for 10 years only, and then they get no advantage whatever. Ampol asked for an enduring preference. They wanted preference for all time. That was their request.

Mr. Duggan: You have the right to say "Yes" or "No".

Mr. HILEY: Exactly.

I have told the story about how Ampol came to Rockhampton. They asked for a proposition; they asked for land to be tied up and reserved for them for the purpose. The Rockhampton Harbour Board gladly did that and that land is tied up and available to them and nobody else will be allowed to have it before 31 March.

Mr. Duggan: You say you are encouraging them and yet the Minister for Labour and Industry said it was no concern of his what they did and where they went.

Mr. HILEY: I will encourage Mackay or any harbour board to get an attractive industry to come here. Why would I not? In exactly the same way we encouraged a company to put an oil terminal at Maryborough and one at Bundaberg. It is our duty to serve every port in the State and I will defy anyone to show that we have ever set out to discourage the development of any port and encourage development of another.

This reclamation will be carried out without any additional cost to the Crown. We have to dispose of our dredge tailings and all we will do is put them into this area instead of another area we are reclaiming. The Amoco Company will be called upon to pay, with some concessions, because we have not the 500 acres available immediately, a stepped-up rental until it is fully reclaimed and then the full rental determined on the advice of the Land Administration Commission as to what the land is worth.

Mr. Duggan: Did you tell any of the other companies that these arrangements would be available to them if they went to Bulwer Island?

Mr. HILEY: So far as I know Amoco was the only company told that.

Mr. Hanlon: You should have encouraged other companies to Bulwer Island.

Mr. HILEY: We cannot get a big tanker into the river and we will not get a big tanker into the river now. I had a discussion with the other people as Minister in charge of ports. I had here the chief engineer for the South Pacific for one company. He stepped off a plane and into a harbour board launch and we showed him the two sites we thought best—one at the end of Moreton Island with 60-odd ft. of water, 200 to 300 ft. off shore, and the other at St. Helena where there is a fair area with 45 ft. of water within one-third of a mile of the shore. They were the two propositions that, on the advice of my harbour board officers, we thought were the answer.

Amoco's proposal was different. They said, "We do not want a site where we can bring a super-tanker right alongside. We will establish a floating terminal in the Bay, put in miles of pipeline and pump from that site into a handier refinery from our point of view." I must confess that until Amoco raised Bulwer Island, that site had never crossed the minds of my officers or myself. As a matter of fact, Mr. Young, the Director of Secondary Industry, showed Mr. Hack, one of the executives of Ampol, Bulwer Island and he said he would not consider it. That answers the question of whether Bulwer Island was shown to others.

Mr. Duggan: Your own Government would not consider it either until these people brought it up.

Mr. HILEY: Exactly. And that shows the sort of enterprise you get when you get people of experience to evaluate a site that other people overlook. I thought the answer lay on Moreton Island or St. Helena. The two companies mentioned previously were two of the most powerful in Australia. The chief engineer for the Pacific area of one of the companies said, "In the Philippines we have our refinery at Bataan on the peninsula, 28 miles from Manila and we do not like it. We have to transport our staff, reticulate water to the site; we like one where we draw our labour requirement from an existing city and where there is no special need to create a refinery township."

Mr. Duggan: That was as equally experienced and intelligent an opinion as the one from the other company.

Mr. HILEY: The other company was prepared to lay miles of pipeline.

Mr. Houston: Where would the terminal be?

Mr. HILEY: On Mud Island.

Mr. Duggan: Are you willing to indicate whether any Minister in your Government encouraged Ampol to go to Port Alma at any stage?

Mr. HILEY: The first I heard of a refinery for Ampol was when we had that discussion earlier about a terminal. The next thing I heard was from the chairman of the Rockhampton Harbour Board, Mr. Mark Hinchcliffe. He told me they had started to discuss the question of an oil refinery. When he told me that I said, "That would be a good thing for you, Mark. I hope you get it." And I still hope they get it; it is still open.

Mr. Duggan: You do not think Ampol will still go ahead with it.

Mr. HILEY: No, I do not, in view of the fact that they have gone to the Mackay Harbour Board and have said that Rockhampton is out.

Mr. Morris: They told me so.

Mr. Duggan (to Mr. Morris): What did you say they told you?

Mr. Morris: I will tell you later.

Mr. Duggan: I appreciate your courtesy and your help, Mr. Treasurer. Your attitude is in marked contrast to that of the Deputy Premier.

Mr. HILEY: On the side of reclamation I think I have told the full story. The Mayor of Rockhampton knows the problems associated with reclamation. He has said it would cost £2,000,000 to reclaim the site at Port Alma.

Mr. Burrows: What will it cost at Bulwer Island?

Mr. HILEY: There will be no extra cost. We will be dumping these tailings out of the river. The moment I took office I stopped the dumping of dredge tailings in Moreton Bay. I was determined to reclaim all the land we could and overcome the mosquito curse by filling in mangrove swamps.

Mr. Walsh: Do you say they were not being used in that direction before you took office?

Mr. HILEY: Very little. More than half the tailings were being dumped into the sea and they were coming back again. It was merely a game of ring-a-rosy. The hon. member can verify that by looking at the reports of the Department of Harbours and Marine.

Mr. Walsh: I went down and had a look at that personally.

Mr. HILEY: The hon. member saw the little that was being used for reclamation. He did not see the amount that was being dumped into Moreton Bay. We are reclaiming land with all the sludge and not putting

any of it into Moreton Bay. We estimate that by a 12 months' dredging programme we can increase the 50 acres which presently exists, to the 250 acres required at the commencement. We will then proceed with reclamation work for the balance of the term until we give the company the full area required by it.

Mr. Houston: What period must elapse after silt has been dumped before it can be built on?

Mr. HILEY: That depends entirely on the class of silt. Our chief engineer has conducted investigations. At this moment the areas adjacent to it on Pinkenba Road and Hamilton Road where the silt has a considerable sand content are drying out and firming up very quickly.

Mr. Houston: What do you mean by that? "Very quickly" is a loose term. What time will it take?

Mr. HILEY: The position is entirely different when mud is being deposited. It dries out exceedingly slowly. It takes years and years to dry.

Mr. Houston: Would you say it would dry out in 12 months?

Mr. HILEY: Yes.

Mr. Houston: In 12 months?

Mr. HILEY: In 12 months of depositing. Sand is self-compacting. Anyone with knowledge of the matter knows that sand is one of the best foundations.

Mr. Lloyd: What are the existing doubts about Bulwer Island or the suitability of the island?

Mr. HILEY: The company is carrying out deep boring tests. For some of the refinery units they require high construction capable of bearing heavy loads. They are conducting tests to determine whether it is feasible to put down the type of foundations that would be needed to carry fractionalising units and things of that nature.

Mr. Lloyd: It strikes me as strange that they want to sign an immediate agreement when all of that could have been done before signing the agreement.

Mr. Hanlon: Shopping around somewhere else in the meantime, and holding you tied.

Mr. HILEY: They have already put £2,000,000 into the Australian company and that is a fair pipe-opener.

I think I have given the reclamation picture. There will be no concessions. The company will pay the full rent as assessed by the Department of Lands, and after 15 years the lease will be considered by the Land Court in the same way as any other lease. The Land Court will determine the level of rental to be paid by the company.

Mr. Walsh: You say there will be no cost to the Crown in this reclamation?

Mr. HILEY: No extra cost. In other words, we will simply be doing what we are doing with the Hamilton land. We will be reclaiming land, and we will get the full rental value for the land.

In relation to dredging, we are committed to deepening the north-west channel to 45 ft., and the approaches across the bay, to 42 ft. 6 ins.

Mr. Houston: What are they at present?

Mr. HILEY: About 34 ft. in the North-West channel, and with the exception of a little hump, about the same, or better, across the bay. We will have quite a bit of dredging to do. We have not an exact programme mapped out yet, but our present estimate is that it will cost at least £1,000,000 or maybe £1,500,000. Mr. Fison advised me that the north-west channel for 50 years had proved a self-maintaining channel and when we deepen it, in his judgment, it will be equally self-maintaining. He does not expect any heavy maintenance commitments.

Mr. Duggan: It will cost an extra £1,000,000?

Mr. HILEY: Yes. Our estimate is that the additional harbour dues that flow into the port because of the refinery should be sufficient to pay the interest and redemption on that additional dredging. The Treasury officers, and the Harbours and Marine officers had a good look at it, and we think from a Government point of view that it is a fair commercial risk. We estimate we have a chance to recover to a reasonable degree. If oil were discovered in the hinterland of Brisbane and the inflow of oil ceased to the port of Brisbane, that would upset our calculations, but we have even safeguarded against that, because we have made it clear that the minute oil becomes available from Tara or Roma, and we lose the inflow of oil traffic, we immediately cancel the present approach to harbour dues and we re-negotiate an approach that will bring revenue to the port on levying charges on the outgoing traffic, which at the present time we are prepared to lose. If we get it coming in we charge nothing on the way out. If we find oil locally, the procedure will be reversed, and we would then seek to recover revenue by charging the outbound traffic because there would be no incoming traffic of oil.

Mr. Duggan: If the existing oil companies should take petrol from this proposed refinery, you lose the existing harbour dues from the present inflow of petrol.

Mr. HILEY: I will give the hon. gentleman a clear picture of that when we come to the second reading.

Mr. Houston: Where would that £1,000,000 come from? Would it be a separate loan?

Mr. HILEY: I should think we may be able to finance a proportion of it from the Harbour Dues Fund, which is quite buoyant at present. For some time I have been able to avoid drawing on the Loan Fund to carry out port improvements, and because this can be spread over five years we may be able to carry out that dredging out of the existing revenues of the Harbour Dues Fund and so avoid going into debt. It is my expectation that even if we did that, out of the current revenue of the port we would still have a chance of recovering enough extra harbour dues to pay interest and redemption, if we had to borrow the lot, but I do not think we will have to borrow much.

Mr. Houston: What will be the position if you cannot finance it from harbour dues?

Mr. HILEY: It will have to come out of our State loan programme. However, it is my belief at the moment that with any sort of good fortune we will pay for this out of the existing harbour dues.

I have made it clear that these matters were secret because of the insistence, not only of Amoco, but of every other company. That is the only reason why I cannot name the companies. Some are the best-known names in oil companies in this State. Every one of them laid it down as an absolute prerequisite to any question of examining a refinery that it must be absolutely secret. In two cases where I personally had to make the arrangement, I am glad to say that the officers of the Harbour and Marine Department kept faith perfectly. In one case the visitor was an American who was in charge of the whole of the construction for his organisation in the Pacific area, and in the other case it was the Chairman of Directors of one of the companies who came out from London. In each case they never even came into the city and stopped. I met them. I met one man at the Big Game wharf near where he came off the aeroplane: That was the nearest point of pick-up and I delivered him back there. He went straight away in an aeroplane so that nobody would know that he was here. That is the way these oil companies want to operate.

Mr. Duggan: Apparently this oil game is a hide-and-seek business.

Mr. HILEY: It really is. Do not forget, though, that it was the case of a particular company that was wanting to break in as a new competitor. The man was fearful that the people who had the existing trade would put every impediment and every argument and every obstruction in his company's way.

Mr. Burrows: That is why they all tender the one price to the City Council for the supply of their products.

Mr. HILEY: Exactly, and it is all the better reason to suppose that a new competitor coming in, who has to battle to get his market, might break this monopoly and

might give them a shake. At least we cannot be worse off. We could be better off because a new and vigorous competitor has to fight for a place in the sun.

Mr. Duggan: Yet the very company you mentioned was indicted with several others for rigging the price during the Suez crisis.

Mr. HILEY: The hon. gentleman could be indicted for murder or slander tomorrow, but if the jury acquitted him he would resent anyone suggesting that he was guilty of murder. That is what he is doing.

Mr. Duggan: And you would very much regret it if your Government failed in their action, just as the Americans resented it.

Mr. HILEY: That is understandable. No prosecutor likes to be beaten. The fact of the matter is that they were charged with it and they escaped.

Mr. Duggan: They did have a uniform price, whether they were convicted or not.

Mr. HILEY: Let me explain what happened. Previously this particular company had no part of the business of the State of Florida. Florida was looked upon just as Queensland is looked upon—as a close preserve for a group of existing producers. They determined to get into the oil business in Florida and they went in and battled from the bottom up. They had no sites, no distribution facilities. Now, after only a few years, they handle 60 per cent. of the oil business in Florida. Do not tell me that they got 60 per cent. of the oil business in Florida in competition with already existing people by joining a price cartel! They battled and got that in open competition against established people.

Mr. Duggan: And do not tell me that Ampol did not do very much the same thing here in Australia.

Mr. HILEY: Exactly.

Mr. Duggan: Then what are you growing about?

Mr. HILEY: I believe the establishment of an oil refinery in Queensland will be one of the finest things to happen in the history of the State. I do not think this will be the be-all and end-all of refinery development in Queensland. I hope we will get more and I hope Ampol go ahead. As evidence of our bona fides, we have offered Ampol some things that Amoco did not ask for. We offered them £750,000 of housing.

Mr. Duggan: And gave them until 31 March to exercise their right, and you have taken that away now.

Mr. HILEY: No, they still have that. They can exercise it now if they wish.

Mr. Duggan: What is the use of it now?

Mr. HILEY: That leaves out of the question the fact that they said Mackay was out

and that they told my colleague that Rockhampton was out. We still treat that as open for them. They can come in tomorrow and exercise their right. We will carry out our part of the bargain and we will build those houses and do the other things we undertook to do. We will build them; do not worry about that.

Mr. Burrows: You are taking a long time.

Mr. HILEY: I see nothing improper and nothing undesirable in the matter. It was open competition. Naturally the people who missed out are disappointed. The only thing they are successful in is in finding loud voices to be raised in support of their disappointment.

Mr. DUGGAN: I rise to a point of order. The Treasurer said that the disappointed people have used the Opposition to express their objections. They have not come to the Opposition at all with any proposition on this matter, and if the Treasurer implied that they did, I ask that it be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I did not hear the hon. gentleman suggest that.

Mr. Duggan: He said they were using us as their mouthpiece.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. The Treasurer has exhausted his time.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (3.59 p.m.): Like my Leader—and I reiterate his quite distinct remarks—we are happy to see that an oil refinery is being introduced to Queensland because obviously any new industry and any big industrial undertaking must provide more employment and a better turnover of money and, generally speaking, greater buoyancy for the State. For those reasons we are glad to see that arrangements have been made for the establishment of this new industry. However, we wholeheartedly deplore the snide methods and tactics that have been adopted to gain privileges for one particular oil company that has no stake in this country and which, up until this agreement was entered into, had no capital or money invested in the country.

It is pleasing that the Treasurer has elucidated some of the complexities that were raised by the Minister for Labour and Industry in his introductory speech. Quite frankly, the Minister left grave doubts in the minds of many hon. members about the arrangements that were actually made with the company. We deplore, and all fair-minded people should deplore, any secret arrangements that are made at any time. The Treasurer has clearly given us to understand that at least in this matter, and no doubt in many other matters, the private oil companies dictate the method of business of the present Government. He said they insisted on secret arrangements, on terms being discussed privately, and an oil company representative

had the audacity to demand that the Treasurer of Queensland subject himself to the indignity of discussing terms with him at the Game Fishermen's Wharf, virtually down at Breakfast Creek, instead of coming, as he should, and as any other citizen, whether rich or poor, would who had business to do with the Treasurer of the State, to the Treasurer's own office. It is a fundamental principle of British justice that justice should not only be done but should also appear to be done, and when one finds somebody skulking down in one of these side alleys at Breakfast Creek, or somewhere else, one tends to wonder what illegality is being committed. Any normal man who has an honest approach to make to any Government is prepared to see the Government under the right circumstances and in the normal way. I was very disappointed to find that the Treasurer, who is one of the influential members of Cabinet, saw fit to dishonour his own position by subjecting himself to the dictates of these oil companies and meeting their representatives where they demanded that he should meet them.

That makes me all the more suspicious about the sinister arrangements that have been made. I was very suspicious after I heard the introductory speech of the Minister for Labour and Industry. I do not care whether it was Amoco that initiated the investigations into Bulwer Island. That does not entitle them to hold the Government to ransom, and it does not entitle them to get undue inducements and extraordinary privileges through the Government from the taxpayers of Queensland. The rent that is being demanded and the terms that are being given to this particular oil company are extraordinarily generous. It has never seen fit to operate in Australia before and has not bothered to enter into competition with the other companies that have invested some of their money in this country, but it is now prepared to come to Queensland under conditions that are certainly loaded with privileges for it. When the Government made arrangements with Amoco they should have said to its representatives, "We will advertise the conditions under which we are prepared to allow an oil refinery to commence business operations in Queensland, and we will accept the best offer that is available throughout the world from any oil company that wishes to establish an undertaking in Queensland." I am not one of those people who believe for one moment that any industry, any big business, or any company, whether from interstate or overseas, comes here to help the Queensland Government or the taxpayers of this State. They come here for one reason and one reason only—to make money and improve their business. Let us be quite frank about that. If one company sees fit to come here under certain conditions, which are, as I say, very welcome conditions for any business undertaking, surely there would be many other similar companies and organisations in the world that would be prepared to come here under the

same conditions. As a Government, and as a Parliament, it is our fundamental and bounden duty to ensure that we get the best possible terms from the companies who want to come to Queensland to take fat profits overseas. I am not prepared to subscribe to the idea that we should wet-nurse any company that wants to come here. I am not prepared to subscribe to the principle that a Minister of the Crown should negotiate for three years, and run over to America and enter into secret and private arrangements in order to exhort them to come to Queensland. We should put our cards on the table. We should say quite sincerely that we do require the industry, and state the terms under which we are prepared to introduce them to the State. We should say to world-wide competition, "We will let into the State on these terms and conditions the company that makes us the best offer." It would appear that we have treated this company as a mendicant company that were just putting their tentacles into the State and that we had to carefully nurture them lest they fade away. I think that they are pulling the leg of the Minister for Labour and Industry. They are taking him cheaply. They can see that he is not a shrewd business man, and they have played him for a sucker.

The Minister has told us that he has been negotiating with the company for three years. They were secret and private negotiations. I say that no self-respecting democratic Government should have to pander to any private company for three years to get them to bring their industry to the State so that they can take more money away from the State. From what the Minister has told us it is perfectly obvious that although the venture certainly will create employment it undoubtedly is going to be substantially subsidised by the taxpayers of Queensland. We are entitled to know more details of the arrangements that have been made. After all, it has been said that we are up for £1,000,000 to begin with. It could well be that after investigating the proposal more closely the Government would be better advised to establish their own oil refinery rather than pander to the dictates of private companies who want to see Ministers down at Breakfast Creek at any time that it suits them.

From what the Treasurer has told us it appears that in any case, at this stage, discussion is rather futile because the Government, through two Ministers, have so far committed themselves to this private company that if Parliament does not agree to accept the contract, the company would be justly entitled to sue for breach of contract, as already there has been part-performance of it. So, in effect, two Cabinet Ministers at least have thumbed their noses at the will of Parliament. In effect they tell us today that they have entered into what, in my opinion, is a most unsatisfactory one-sided agreement, and that unless we accept the agreement they have made, the Government

will be subject to a heavy claim for damages for breach of contract because there has been part-performance.

I see the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt going over to give some legal advice to the Minister for Labour and Industry. Too often before has he acted on the advice of the hon. member. I do not think that he will accept it on this occasion.

The agreement apparently includes an option to purchase the freehold of the whole island after the Government have completed all the necessary works. From a question that I directed to the Minister it appears that there has been no price agreed upon for the actual purchase of the freehold. Incidentally, this particular island, although it may seem to be useless at the moment—low-lying mud-flats—in years to come, by virtue of its position, may be of strategic importance to this city and State and might have much more value to the Government than its mere money value. But, we have committed ourselves. According to the agreement made by the Minister we have committed ourselves to the sale of this island. In 10, 15, or 30 years' time, if some future Government deem it to be of vital importance for the protection of this city and the welfare of Queensland, they will have been committed, by the agreement the Minister has made with this firm, to sell it, no doubt at the firm's price.

The contract apparently does not include any particular figure for the sale and it could well be that the price will be the subject of legal argument but, if an option to purchase is included in the agreement, there will be no way in which we can protect the land of the taxpayers from purchase by this company. I think there should at least be some formula, if not a fixed price, to determine by what means and at what figure the island will be sold, if it is to be sold.

I feel, at the same time, that it is very important for the Government and Parliament to preserve islands in the mouth of the river and in close proximity to the city. They should be Crown lands and not sold to some overseas oil company concerning whose loyalty in the future we will have no guarantee.

It has also been suggested that they will be given the privilege of a 5 per cent. bonus. That is what it is when it is all boiled down. Apparently the Government have committed themselves to purchase all their products. This company will have the privilege of the protection extended to a Queensland undertaking. A 5 per cent. margin will be granted to this overseas company and hon. members should bear in mind that it is an overseas company, not a Queensland one. All the shareholders' dividends will be going out of Australia and this company will be getting a 5 per cent. dividend on its sales to the Queensland Government, in competition with other Australian companies who have had their interests sunk in Australia's soil for the past half-century.

I am not suggesting that we should protect companies already existing in Australia, but

I am strongly urging that this Government should have given all companies, both Australian and overseas, equal rights to tender for the generous privileges that have been handed out on this occasion.

The Minister has not given details of possible contamination of the bay and river waters by an oil refinery in that particular locality and I sincerely hope that he has, in some regard, dealt with that particular—

Mr. Nicklin: That is all covered in the agreement.

Mr. BENNETT: There have been certain sanctions or impositions placed on the company itself, according to the agreement, and there was a somnolent silence when I asked about the penalty clauses. It is not much use imposing conditions on a company unless you have some penalty clauses to enforce such conditions. It will be interesting to see—with this millionaire company that can put £2,000,000 into the bank here without blinking an eyelid—what value the penalty clauses have, if any are contained in the contract.

The activities of the company apparently have been followed for three years by the Minister. If the Minister was doing his job he could have used his time more usefully in considering the affairs of this State rather than the affairs of a particular, private oil company. In any case, if he has closely followed the affairs of this particular company for three years, as he said, it is to be hoped, if he adopts a fair and impartial attitude, that he has followed closely the affairs of other oil companies and other prospective tenderers. If he has been doing that, of course, he has not been carrying out his duties as Minister for Labour and Industry in Queensland. If he has been dabbling in the affairs of private oil companies, he would have been fully occupied in that work, and I can only conclude that he has concentrated on the affairs of Amoco and has completely disregarded the affairs of other oil companies.

I do not adopt any partisan or partial attitude on the location of the undertaking, but I reiterate the sentiment expressed by the hon. member for Nudgee that as parliamentarians we should not be parochial or narrow-minded, that in considering the future and the welfare of the State we should come to a decision having regard to the welfare of the whole State and not any isolated locality. I disagree wholeheartedly with the dishonest and hypocritical submissions of the Minister for Labour and Industry who claimed that the oil company is entitled to demand the locality in which it will establish its industry. I submit that that is purely an insincere and hypocritical argument. If the company was in fact coming here in open competition with others and without any assistance or provision from the Government, I certainly would agree that it, as a private operator, and a private undertaking, would be entitled to choose the locality it thought most suitable, but when we as a Parliament are deciding

to give generous hand-outs fortuitously I can see no real reason why that should be so. When we are deciding to help a company with taxpayers' money, it is our bounden duty equally to insist that it should engage in its activities, which are being subsidised by the Government, in the locality where the Government think its activities are best suited.

I was disappointed in the arguments put forward by the hon. member for Rockhampton South, the Mayor of Rockhampton in support of his claim for the establishment of an oil refinery at Rockhampton. Having read from time to time the protestations that appeared in the Press, I thought the hon. member would have given in this Chamber a vigorous, convincing and logical argument, and reasons why he had called a public meeting and why Port Alma is a more suitable locality for the undertaking than any other locality in Queensland. Having listened to his week-kneed argument, I cannot blame the Government for ignoring his demands. On the representations and submissions made by him, we could conclude that Port Alma was not deserving of the undertaking. It is unfortunate for Rockhampton that the hon. member for Rockhampton North was not able to make representations as a Government member. His arguments and submissions were such that he would have had much better prospects of persuading the Government that an oil refinery should be located at Port Alma, than the Mayor of Rockhampton with his idle protestations. The hon. member for Rockhampton North would have much more to say if he had been speaking to a Cabinet that was of his political persuasion. No doubt he will return to Rockhampton a very sorry and disappointed man, feeling that his parliamentary colleague from Rockhampton, who was in a more advantageous position than he—due to natural circumstances—to prevail upon the Government, was too interested and too afraid to press vigorously the claims of the Rockhampton area.

Mr. Walsh: They put pressure on him.

Mr. BENNETT: I have been reliably informed that that was the reason for the joint party meeting last night. They feared what might come out of this discussion, so the Mayor of Rockhampton had to be suitably conditioned for his appearance in Parliament today. As you well know, Mr. Taylor, joint party meetings very rarely take place on Tuesday night. As a matter of fact, Parliament had to be specially adjourned yesterday so that the Mayor of Rockhampton could be conditioned for his appearance in Parliament today. That supports my contention that there have been many sinister moves made on the introduction of this industry to Queensland.

The Treasurer claimed that it is not going to put any further burden on the Budget. In the first place, they are up for £1,000,000 more. It has been argued that the silt that is dredged out of the river has to be taken

away somewhere. That is perfectly true, but instead of developing this island, we could be developing some other island and improving its real estate value and the surrounding islands, and helping to exterminate the mosquitoes. It will cost a large extra amount of money to broadcast the silt on the island. The barges will not just move up to the island and discharge their loads. Suitable arrangements will have to be made for the unloading of the barges and the broadcasting of the silt. Bulldozers, tractors, and a work force will be necessary to spread the silt. This will cost the Treasurer money, yet he suggests it will be done at no extra cost because the mud has to be taken away from the river. I have no doubt that overtime will have to be worked, and week-end work will have to be undertaken, to comply with the terms of the contract as outlined by the Minister.

It has been argued that there is a cartel among the oil companies. If the same legislation applied in Queensland as applies in America, all the directors of the local oil companies would be in gaol for what they do to the Brisbane City Council because of the price ring. It has been argued that it is well worth while to introduce some competitive oil company. Knowing the history of oil companies as I do, and how they are inter-related, I have no doubt that we will find it will not be long before Amoco are toeing the line with all the other major companies in Australia. I go a step further. It would not surprise me if some existing oil company in Australia took over Amoco at considerable profit to Amoco, and enjoyed all the privileges given by this Government.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (4.24 p.m.): When I was listening to the Minister introduce this measure, I was reminded of an article that appeared in "The Sunday Mail" under the signature of Joyce Stirling referring to an ordinance that was to be introduced by the Dalby Town Council banning the flying of kites. From the way the Minister outlined the proposal it appeared to me to be another of the kites he has so frequently flown. When I read this article, I had a certain amount of sympathy for the Minister. I thought how bad it would be for him if every local authority in Queensland introduced a similar ordinance to prevent the flying of kites anywhere. He would surely be in a bad way.

In case there is any doubt about my attitude, let me say that I wholeheartedly support the establishment of an oil refinery anywhere in Queensland.

Mr. Coburn: Preferably away from the city.

Mr. WALSH: I will come to that. At the same time, I am not going to accept the statement that the Minister or this Government have been able to influence a rich monopoly such as the Standard Oil Company, which, on the Minister's say-so, has assets to

the value of 2,000-odd billions and an income of £900,000,000 a year. He has the hide to come here and tell intelligent members of this Assembly that he has been able to influence this great undertaking to come here and spend £11,000,000. It is too fantastic. I would say the Standard Oil Company has determined to put an oil refinery here in Queensland simply because the oil companies have sufficient data to know that oil has been found in Australia and has been found in Queensland. I commend them for their long-range view and for their foresight. They will have their refinery built first so that as and when supplies are held up from other parts—the Middle East, Borneo, and so on—when someone like Nasser or Castro takes control—they will be able to produce their oil and refine it in Australia without hindrance.

I am not setting out to criticise anything in the agreement because I have had the experience in this Assembly before of the Minister and other Ministers, too, who have tabled or outlined agreements. When you get the agreement and read it you find that all sorts of constructions can be placed on the terms and conditions in it. So we wait till we see the agreement to analyse it carefully and see if it has some of the faults that were contained in the agreement providing for the handing over of the huge bauxite deposits in the Far North of Queensland. I hope that in this agreement there will be some provision that will not allow in any way, this interest or equity to be transferred to some other dummy company only for the purpose of holding up and tying up the venture here to prevent anybody else from establishing a refinery in Queensland. Frankly, if I am to accept the Minister's outline, I do not know why the Bill has been brought down. There is nothing in the outline given by him, or in the Treasurer's speech for that matter, that would justify the introduction of legislation. The very things he is talking about here that require an agreement between the big monopoly and the Government of Queensland have been done every day in Queensland without any legislation. Why all this humbug about bringing in an agreement if it does not contain some provision that could be suspect and that could eventually have the effect of tying up the prospects of some genuine company in establishing a refinery in Queensland? Oil companies are very smart people and they are very ruthless people. They even found their way into the structure of the trade-union movement here to destroy legislation that sought to challenge the oil companies at the time.

I was interested to hear the Treasurer talk about the so-called independent oil companies. When the previous Government sought to challenge this cartel and monopoly built up among several companies on one-brand petrol, where was the Treasurer and where was the Minister for Labour and Industry? They were not attacking the independent oil companies then. They took action here, with the support of the then

Opposition and the Official Opposition, to repeal that legislation. When I read in the Press that the Labour Government in Tasmania are about to introduce legislation somewhat similar to that which was put before the House by a former Labour Government in Queensland and that the House of Commons has already accepted it, I am amazed that the Minister should attempt at this stage to come here and argue the point about independent oil companies. Which oil company is independent? I have yet to read of one. There are no more than about eight oil companies throughout the world, and even though there may be eight companies operating here, that does not say that they are independent companies.

The Minister knows that the power already exists for the Government to freehold land if they wish. He knows that the Government can enter into agreements with particular firms, as they have done over a substantial area in Queensland, to develop land on certain conditions and the rental that has to be paid, the roads they have to build, and so forth.

There can be no complaint from this side of the Chamber about the 5 per cent. preference. Even that does not require any legislation, because a former Labour Government introduced that principle and gave encouragement and support to various industries in Queensland to enable them to compete with southern industries. For example, take Monteiths, a firm in the electorate of the hon. member for South Brisbane. They were manufacturing pipes, and to build up that industry and to encourage them to expand here, the Government of the day laid down that there would be a preference of 5 per cent. in all contracts between the Local Government Department and this firm. This is nothing new, and I am not complaining about the Government's entering into an agreement to give some preference to a product, provided that it is of equal quality with other similar products and that the price is the same.

Mr. Burrows: If any other company wishes to start, would you give them the same terms?

Mr. WALSH: I do not—

Mr. Nicklin: If you give your requirements to one, you cannot give them to another.

Mr. WALSH: I suppose you could. I suppose there is nothing to stop a big manufacturing firm from giving agencies to several firms on the same conditions. I am not arguing that point because I cannot see another refinery being established here. The companies work these things out for themselves. An oil company would have a very efficient and competent organisation on the technical and scientific sides and on the constructional side. They would have personnel attached to their organisation equal to anyone employed in this country. Naturally, they would be dependent on their technical

advisers for advice in respect of many of these matters. No doubt they showed the Government a few points when they conferred with Government representatives while visiting Queensland. They have to consider the engineering and technical problems and the economic side of it. It amazed me that the Premier should have identified himself with a transaction of this nature when it was publicly announced that Ampol had been given an option to establish a refinery at Port Alma.

Mr. Nicklin: An option over land.

Mr. WALSH: Is not that sufficient? To give them an option over the land is no different from what the Government are doing with Amoco.

Mr. Nicklin: Amoco are going to build a refinery.

Mr. WALSH: Yes, they are going to build a refinery, but the Government gave Ampol an option with the intention that they would make an investigation and finally decide where they were going to establish a refinery.

Mr. Nicklin: That was the intention.

Mr. WALSH: That was the intention. Quite sound. It appears from what the Treasurer has told us, of course, that Ampol was hawking this thing from one harbour board to the other. The hon. member for Rockhampton South has a letter about that. Although I may be parochial at times I would not attempt to argue for a refinery at Bundaberg because I realise the difficulties there in the way of port facilities. I realise the depth of water and all that sort of thing that is required. That argument cannot be put up against Rockhampton. At least Port Alma has what is required.

Ampol no doubt acted with their cunning oil strategy. In Rockhampton they have a lovely site for a service station right across from the bridge where the Royal Hotel used to be. No doubt they influenced the mayor, particularly in that respect and in other respects too. No doubt by offering these concessions they led him up the garden path. They probably did the same thing with the Mackay Harbour Board. The oil companies are smart and ruthless people. I should not be surprised if somewhere along the line they did not run the Government up a dark lane. That is why I want to have a very careful look at the agreement. I had enough of the Weipa agreement when the Government deliberately rushed the Bill through at 2 a.m. after they had been in office only a brief period. At least the Premier has taken the precaution on this occasion to give hon. members an opportunity to study the agreement carefully and intelligently.

We heard so much about Dim Sim petrol, and that is why I was anxious to know from the Treasurer whether this proposal was going to cost the Government any money. I take it that the Premier will confirm what the Treasurer has said, that there will be no

additional cost to the Government in the acceptance of this transaction between Amoco and the Government?

Mr. Nicklin: Yes.

Mr. WALSH: The Premier confirms it. Very good. I interpret it that any additional cost has been the cost incurred in dredging. Therefore we shall have to watch carefully from now on to see whether the Government are tied up in some way with this agreement. They may have had their legal men have a look at it, but I bet my bottom dollar that the oil company have had some of the best legal men in Australia looking at any of the terms they want written into the agreement. If there is a way out that they want they will have it in the agreement.

So much depends on what the Minister has told us. If the reclamation work is not completed by a given date, I understand that there is power in the agreement to rescind.

Mr. Morris: Defer.

Mr. WALSH: Defer it?

Mr. Morris: For an equal period.

Mr. WALSH: That is true. I stand corrected. If the reclamation is not completed then the contract is extended accordingly. If you are three years behind—

Mr. Morris: Do you want me to tell you?

Mr. WALSH: No, I have got it. If the schedule of work is behind—

Mr. Morris: By Amoco.

Mr. WALSH: By Amoco, then the Government have the authority to rescind the agreement.

Mr. Morris: That is right.

Mr. WALSH: Therefore, if the same tactics are going to be adopted as were adopted in the case of the Weipa agreement, where do we get then? I hope there is something in the agreement that will enable Parliament to undertake the approval of any variation of the parties to the agreement rather than leave it to the Governor in Council as was the case with Weipa.

Mr. Morris: Anything left to the Governor in Council this Parliament has the right to debate.

Mr. WALSH: That might be so but the Minister has exercised authority here whereby he has signed an agreement that was not to be tabled in the House. He signed an agreement with different conditions in a different way simply because there was power entrusted to the Governor in Council.

Mr. Morris: I do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. WALSH: The Minister knows what I am talking about.

Mr. Morris: I do not.

Mr. WALSH: I am sorry he does not.

Mr. Morris: I do not think you do yourself.

Mr. WALSH: The Minister knows because he picked me up about it in the first place. He knows full well. There were certain parties mentioned in the agreement on the bauxite proposal, but, side by side with them, there was another company mentioned which was not a party to the agreement at all. They did not have to sign the agreement and the manoeuvring that has gone on since has been, of course, one of the excuses that eventually enabled the Government to explain why this great production of alumina and aluminium is to be shifted to New Zealand or somewhere else rather than give employment to the people of this State. The Government boasts about these things—Kianga and this bauxite business—but finally what we are doing is handing over assets that, in effect, are wasting assets, and when the time comes for this country to build up its great industries, where will we go for coal and bauxite? I suppose to Japan and import them back here again. So, we are digging holes in the ground to sell products to countries overseas to build up employment in those countries, and we will end up with worthless areas. The hon. member for Bowen appreciates that and there will be no agitation on his part to enter into an agreement with Japan or any other country to export coal from the great deposits at Collinsville.

Dr. Delamonth: I would today.

Mr. WALSH: He would today, but the hon. member appreciates the dangers ahead. It destroys any argument put forward for building up the industries in those northern towns. We have to watch this matter very carefully. The Minister might boast that he has been successful in encouraging this company to come here. I have stated quite freely that I do not believe that he convinced these people they should come here. Big business people know where to launch their capital—where they can get the best return—and I say that the big companies throughout Australia now know where the oil deposits are. In the Tara area particularly, if it was necessary to bring 600 tons of mud all the way from Adelaide to seal up one of the bores, it must be a fairly decent hole. I suppose they could have come to Parliament House and got enough mud without going to Adelaide. Their actions are significant. Of course they know and, as and when their interests are threatened or challenged in those other areas where the huge deposits of oil are at present, they will be able to meet the challenge. I repeat that they know and have their long-range policies and the Government should not delude themselves that the oil companies are considering this Government. If it becomes necessary to corrupt this Government, they will corrupt it.

If it becomes necessary for them to corrupt any other Government, they will do that. That is their history the world over. They do not allow Governments to stand in their way any more than they allow individuals, and if they can make their mouthpiece a political source or an individual source they will use any influence they have either to make or break Governments. Again that is their history; just as they were parties in this State to the downfall of the Labour Government. I do not delude myself so far as these oil interests are concerned because I know how they stick together. These so-called independent oil companies! When Ampol was getting a raw deal in the selection of sites in the Brisbane area they actually complained to the Government of the day about the treatment that was meted out to them. But what did we find when it came to a decision? Which side were they on? They were not on the side of the Government who were trying to protect them as a so-called independent oil company. They merged in with the other great interests, and I should not be a bit surprised if somewhere along the line Ampol is one of the shareholders in Amoco. Much has been said about Australian companies. Where are the Australian companies in the oil business? There may be a few Australian shareholders in Ampol, as there may be in other companies, but the real influence emanates a long way from Australia.

Then we heard the story about the Phillips Company coming to buy the terminal at Pinkenba, the one about which we had all the hullabaloo about Dim Sim petrol. It cost the Government not a penny in those days to encourage that particular oil company to come here, and it proceeded to hawk the equity it had, just as I have no doubt this company will hawk its equity. I shall read with a great deal of interest the terms and conditions of the agreement, and I emphasise that every hon. member should study every line of the agreement because there will be a hook somewhere that will certainly catch the Government.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (4.47 p.m.): I realise that other hon. members have covered the various aspects of the Bill. I have only one or two comments to make. The negotiations referred to have torn the last shred of respectability from the Government. As a matter of fact, although Government back benchers have made a valiant attempt to defend the decisions of their Ministers, they have admitted that they did not know anything about the negotiations. There are differences of opinion among them as evidenced by the arguments put forward by the hon. member for Rockhampton North. I speak at this stage of the Bill mainly because of one illuminating feature of it. The Government are prepared to offer this company £750,000 worth of housing. That fact will make good reading for those people who have striven desperately to get houses, and who have been told that no

finance is available for the building of homes. This provision has been included as a bait, a further attraction to get this company to come to Queensland. I have no quarrel with the provision of houses, but why has this money not been available before this time? Why has it not been used to provide accommodation for the 6,000 applicants to the Housing Commission for rental homes? I am dealing with this matter now, as I know I could not deal with it during the second reading of the Bill. This is a further pointer to the many untruths that have been told by the Government during their term of office. Daily we get refusals of homes by the Queensland Housing Commission. We are told that no money is available, yet we find that the Government, as a further attraction to the Company, are prepared to make £750,000 available for housing for it.

I do not want to weary the House by repeating what has already been said. I have spoken in order to bring to the notice of the people of Queensland the untruths in which this Government have indulged.

Hon. K. J. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Labour and Industry) (4.59 p.m.), in reply: The first thing I want to do is to apologise to hon. members.

Mr. Sherrington: You ought to.

Mr. MORRIS: I always do when I should. I apologise. I am wearing a hearing aid. During the early part of my speech my voice sounded so loud to me that I kept it down, and I did not realise that hon. members could not hear me. I am sorry. I will not do that again.

Having got that off my chest, let me deal with a few of the matters raised during the debate. I do not want to talk about individual companies. I try to avoid it, and I tried today, but unfortunately some things that have been said require an answer, and I propose to answer them. I say firstly that every oil company in Australia, and at least two of the overseas companies with whom we have had negotiations, knew that the negotiations were also proceeding with Standard Oil, the parent company of Amoco.

My next point is that every oil company in Australia, plus those companies overseas that I mentioned a moment ago, knew that the Government would be prepared to consider a proposition for the development of an oil refinery in Queensland based broadly on the same type of concessions that were granted previously by other States to establish oil refineries in those States.

My next point is that the agreement that we have negotiated is no less favourable to the Government—and I believe more favourable—than the agreements negotiated by other States for refineries.

Mr. Hanlon: This would be the smallest refinery of any State, would it not?

Mr. MORRIS: I will deal with that now. A 15,000-barrel refinery is small. The hon.

member for Nudgee made some reference to this. I can tell hon. members, without breaking any confidence, that the 15,000-barrel capacity is the plant on which they are working at present, but it is so constructed that it will be possible to build on it in exactly the same way as it is being done in the other States. I do not propose to forecast what the size of this refinery will be in the long run. It would be quite wrong to do that, but the capacity of the refinery is—and I am not making a pun—very fluid, by which I mean it is possible, and very often desirable, to build on the initial installation, and I should think that most refineries are built on that pattern.

Because it is very important, I repeat that every oil company knew and insisted, before discussing this matter at all, that in every case the discussions would be on a confidential basis. They have all known the conditions; they have all known the basis, and they have all been operating on exactly the same basic foundations throughout the dealings.

I now repeat what I said earlier today, because I consider it should be repeated that the only way in which I told one organisation of the activities of another was in the latter months when I told every organisation that in my belief, time was running out and that I believed we, as a Government, would receive a concrete proposal in the very near future. They were all told that. They started and carried right through on even conditions, and finally, as the Treasurer informed the chamber, they were all told that the first proposition in line with these various aspects would receive serious consideration.

Mr. Hanlon: You don't think you just accepted this because you were desperate to show some results from your American visit a few years ago?

Mr. MORRIS: Let us have a look at that but let us defer it for a few minutes. I will deal with it all right. Suppose I were desperately anxious to show some results. I have shown them every year, but, by God, I would say this: if at the expense of sending a Minister overseas for three months every three years we got an industry the size of a refinery, plus the high likelihood of a petrochemical industry, it is darned good business.

Having dealt with those basic points, I want to refer now to a few of the statements made by hon. members. As I look at my notes I think to myself, "Well, to have an oil refinery established in Queensland this Government have been branded today with four phrases I think are a disgrace to the Parliament—'political dishonesty', 'political breach of trust', 'gross act of injustice', and 'political betrayal'." That is what has been fired at us for getting a refinery for the State.

The hon. member for Bundaberg quite rightly asked why we have brought the

agreement into legislation when we did not need to do it? It would have been possible for us as a Government to conclude the agreement and that would have been the end of it, as it has been in years gone by. But we did not do that. We deliberately brought the matter to the Parliament so that two very important purposes could be served. Firstly, we should be taking the whole of the Parliament into the same confidence as those people who ordinarily would see the agreement.

Mr. Bromley: It is a bit belated, though, to take us into your confidence.

Mr. MORRIS: It is not belated.

Mr. Bennett: It is completed now.

Mr. MORRIS: It is not completed.

Mr. Bennett: They will sue you if you don't go ahead with it.

Mr. MORRIS: They will not sue us. Surely the hon. member does not think we are as silly as to prepare legislation in the way that his mind runs! I can assure him that when he gets his copy of the Bill and looks at clause 11 he will see that the agreement is not concluded until this Parliament ratifies it. We are not as silly as he seems to think.

Mr. Bennett: They will sue you for specific performance if you do not conclude it; make no bones about it.

Mr. MORRIS: I repeat that it is a pretty poor show for a State when a Government working together co-operatively bring to a State an industry the size of this and they are branded with those wretched words.

Mr. Hanlon: As long as you have not thrown away the substance for the shadow; that is all we are concerned with.

Mr. MORRIS: They were words I used when I introduced the Bill. Had we not accepted this proposal we should have thrown away the substance for the shadow, because many here have talked about what Ampol was going to do and what Ampol had promised to do. I had no intention of traversing this subject but I will. The Treasurer has given the Committee some of it already and I will give a bit more. Listen to the dates. On 13 October, 1960, a representative of Ampol went to Rockhampton and wanted to discuss certain matters about transport and made an appointment to see me here on 25 October.

Mr. Bennett: At Rockhampton?

Mr. MORRIS: Here in Brisbane. If the hon. member would listen, I said he went to Rockhampton on 13 October and then made an appointment to see me here on 25 October.

Mr. Thackeray: Your are forbidden in Rockhampton.

Mr. MORRIS: I can go to Rockhampton and hold my head up. But having heard the hon. member only this afternoon say that the people in Rockhampton and Ampol have entered into an agreement for the purchase of oil from a non-existent refinery, I think he ought to hang his head in shame.

On 25 October, the date for which that appointment was fixed, the representative of Ampol did not arrive. A further appointment was made, and I saw a representative of Ampol with Alderman Pilbeam and Mr. Hinchcliffe and we discussed many aspects of the projected refinery. Again at that stage I offered Ampol all fair co-operation that I could give and that the Government could give.

This proceeds right through for some time, and on 3 November I again saw a representative of Ampol here. On 2 December I saw the same representative of Ampol.

Mr. Houston: At the same time you were negotiating with this other company.

Mr. MORRIS: Certainly I was.

Mr. Houston: Did you tell Ampol?

Mr. MORRIS: Yes, of course I told Ampol. If the hon. member will only wait for a moment, I will read the transcript of what I told them. In effect, my words were these, "Unless you make up your mind one way or the other soon, you will be too late. Time is running against you."

Mr. Houston: Why didn't you wait till the 31st of the month? Why did you threaten them before that?

Mr. MORRIS: On 2 December they came and said, "We have changed our whole plan." This time they did not come with the Rockhampton representatives but with Mackay representatives, and they told me that Mackay had many advantages not present at Port Alma. I said to them, as I said to every other company, "Time is running out." They said to me, "You will know our intentions by 15 or 16 December." Two of their principals who were in America were leaving to return to Australia, and they said they would be in a position to make an announcement to me on that date. I heard no more from them directly until the middle of January, but—and here we really get to the crux of it—in the interim the annual meeting of Ampol was held. At that meeting there was considerable opposition to the building of a refinery at Port Alma.

Mr. Bennett: Were you at the meeting?

Mr. MORRIS: No, I was not, but I can read and I read the report of the meeting. The hon. member could have read it too, if he had been interested enough. It was stated at the annual meeting—if the hon. member wishes to see the Press report, I have it here—that the credit restrictions were making the development of the refinery

a very difficult proposition. Towards the end of January my office received a message from Ampol that the State Transport Bill that had been introduced in the House was causing grave problems in connection with the possibility of the development of a refinery in Rockhampton, notwithstanding that they told me I could expect an answer on the 14th, 15th, or at the very latest, 16th of December.

Mr. Houston: You would say that the Transport Bill was one factor that stopped them going ahead with it?

Mr. MORRIS: I am saying that they claimed that that was one factor. Previously at an annual meeting they claimed the credit restrictions were one factor. At that stage I said to myself, "Who of these people are sincere, and who are not?"

I was not going to make a public statement in December or early in January that I suspected the motives of Ampol. What a fool I would be! But I was very wary. About that time I came into possession of an American magazine called "Forbes". I receive many American magazines.

It is a trade journal of the highest repute. The heading on an article reads—

"Australia's biggest oil company owns neither producing oil wells nor refineries." There are a couple of photographs here but they do not come out very well in the photostatic copy. One is entitled "Ampol's Walkey: he tilted with giants." I quote from page 23 of the magazine "Forbes" of 1 September, 1960. The writer having referred previously to various prizes for journalism and all sorts of things said—

"As if all that were not enough, Walkey also set off the current Australian oil rush by forming an exploration company and by bringing in California Standard, Texaco, and Royal Dutch Shell, as partners. The only thing that doesn't interest Walkey is building refineries. 'Why should we build refineries?', says he. 'If we build refineries, we should have to go out and sell their products and that would be hard work.' Far better, Walkey feels, to stay Australia's biggest independent oil salesman and leave the costly refining to others."

That is the sort of thing that comes to our hands. Would hon. members opposite think that I was going to say to the people of Rockhampton at any meeting at all, "I don't think that Ampol is sincere about building this refinery"?

Mr. Bennett: Why wouldn't you say that if you believed it?

Mr. MORRIS: As one who prides himself on his legal ability, I should think that the hon. member would recognise that very clearly.

Mr. Bennett: Defence of truth and public benefit.

Mr. MORRIS: That is all very well. I am doing it my way. Having all this background, quite frankly I did not think that there was a ghost of a chance of Ampol's building their refinery. But I am not infallible and I was not going to make anything of it. I wanted a concrete proposal for a refinery, and so there the matter stood. We received a concrete proposal. The Government worked on the proposal and today the Bill is being presented to the Committee. I could talk a great deal more about it, but there is the background to the legislation. There are the things I wanted hon. members to know. Do not make any mistake about it, when I tell the Committee what happens at interviews, that is what has happened. This is what I do when I have interviews; I make sure I have a record of that interview and I do not quote anything unless I know what I am talking about.

Mr. Houston: Does the chap you interview sign those notes?

Mr. Bennett: Do you cut out some expressions of your own before he signs it?

Mr. MORRIS: Don't be silly. I intended to get a deal satisfactory to Queensland and that is what we got. I will enlarge on some of the other matters at the second reading stage. The hon. member for Maryborough asked me a question. I have the letter here. It is a one-and-a-half page letter. He asked me did we get from the company why it was more profitable to establish a refinery at Port Alma than in Brisbane. We did. I do not want to burn up the time of the Committee by reading it.

Mr. Davies: We are willing to listen.

Mr. MORRIS: All right, here it is. This letter is written by the company investigating the establishment of a refinery, to Mr. Young, the Director of Secondary Industry. It reads—

"Dear Mr. Young,

During the past few days we have observed the number of Press reports concerning statements made by the Rockhampton and Port Alma local authorities referring to the recent agreement executed between the Queensland Government and Amoco (Australia) Pty. Limited.

As you are aware, representatives of Standard Oil "Indiana" at the suggestion of the Queensland Government, personally visited the major ports along the Queensland coast in order to assess the suitability of such ports as a possible refinery site."

Incidentally, I was asked this morning did they go to Townsville and I did not know. I have asked and been informed that they did go to Townsville.

Mr. Bennett: Did you ask them to write this letter?

Mr. MORRIS: I certainly asked them to write to the Director of Secondary Industries. And by the way, they went to Cairns also. The letter continues—

"The appropriate local authorities at each port were given an opportunity to present to our representatives the particular attractions or advantages of their respective port.

Our decision to locate the proposed refinery at Brisbane was based primarily upon the fact that the major market for the consumption of petroleum products in Queensland, is located in the Brisbane area. It is the policy of most oil companies to either orient refining facilities to the source of production, or the source of consumption. Refineries located at an intermediate point between production operations and the market are rare. The few intermediate refineries that have been established are along the direct supply route to the market. In the case of supplying Brisbane or Port Alma, it would be necessary to route super tankers, originating in the Persian Gulf and with a draft of 40 feet or more, around the south of Australia, due to the limited depth of water of approximately 36 feet through the Torres Strait. Thus if a refinery is located at Port Alma, we estimate that, on the basis of a refinery capacity of 15,000 b/d it would cost approximately £300,000 annually in freight charges to transport crude requirements beyond Brisbane to Port Alma.

Another £500,000 annually would be incurred backhauling refined products to the major market area of Brisbane. Finally, additional evaporation losses valued in the proximity of £100,000 annually would be incurred due to the additional handling and transport. In summary, total additional freight and evaporation losses would amount to almost £1,000,000 annually if we were to locate at Port Alma in preference to Brisbane—"

That is the story and that is the answer to hon. members opposite. A refinery with a capacity of 15,000 barrels a day is a small refinery. If, as I firmly believe, this refinery develops into a much bigger refinery than one with a capacity of 15,000 barrels a day, the loss would be greater; instead of being £1,000,000, it would be £2,000,000. There is much more I could say and probably will at a later stage, but I shall deal now with a few other points.

I am getting a bit weary—indeed, very weary—of hearing the persistent use of certain words by the Leader of the Opposition. I am glad he has entered the Chamber. Almost daily he refers to me as the peregrinating Minister."

Mr. Duggan: That is right.

Mr. MORRIS: If news is announced about an industry, he condemns it. If he has any opportunity of showing that for a week or two there are no results, he condemns the

proposal. I realise abundantly the truth of the words, "A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country." I cannot do anything to please the hon. gentleman. His words disturbed me at one time, but I am getting thicker in the hide. I remind him that I do not like being personal, but I also remind him that at one time he was a peregrinating Minister. He once went overseas with a certain objective. He went over with the authority of Cabinet to recruit certain tradesmen for the railways, and he recruited not one man.

Mr. Duggan: I did not sack them like you are doing.

Mr. MORRIS: The hon. gentleman is not going to twist my statement. I have stood his silly nonsense about "peregrinating Minister" for the last two and a-half years and I have said nothing about it. From now on, whenever he talks about what I do overseas, I will remind hon. members that he went overseas to do a job and spent many, many hundreds of pounds of the State's money and failed dismally. He did nothing of any good at all for the State of Queensland.

Mr. Duggan: The difference between us is that I can take it and you cannot. (Government laughter.)

Mr. MORRIS: Well, well! For two and a-half years I have been taking it and, as I had a personal regard for the hon. gentleman, I did not make the statement I have made now, but at last he has forced me to make it, and from now on I will make it at every opportunity.

I thought that the hon. gentleman had a good deal of personal generosity in his make-up. Yesterday I made an announcement that had nothing to do with an oil refinery. I made an announcement that as a result of very successful negotiations an organisation with five factories, four in Sydney and one here, was closing the four in Sydney and coming to Queensland. The hon. gentleman did not even have sufficient generosity to acknowledge the value of that to Queensland. But I do not want his generosity. All I want to do at this stage is to remind him that sometimes chickens come home to roost.

Mr. Duggan: I did not do what you have done, that is, pay Mr. Gair £2,500 to do your work.

Mr. MORRIS: I would not pay the hon. member even £500.

Mr. Duggan: You would not get the opportunity.

Mr. MORRIS: I had the opportunity of exercising some influence in offering the hon. gentleman a car as a result of his pleadings, did I not?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Duggan: I do not know that you did. When I asked you, you said you were not at the Cabinet meeting, so I do not know what you did.

Mr. MORRIS: Do not say that.

Mr. Duggan: Yes.

Mr. MORRIS: That is not true.

Mr. Duggan: You told me you were not at the Cabinet meeting.

Mr. MORRIS: From now on I will mix it with you as much as you want.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORRIS: I heard the Leader of the Opposition being somewhat critical of the Government for giving 5 per cent preference to Queensland industries. He asked whether other people knew about it. I would have him know, as everybody else knows, that there are thousands of companies that are aware of the 5 per cent. preference because it is a practice of the Government. I want him to know also that we do these things, because they will increase our industrial development.

I turn now to Alderman Pilbeam, the hon. member for Rockhampton South. I was very sad that I was unable to tell him of these developments before the agreement was signed, but I have a duty to perform. I have signed a very serious declaration on oath that I will not reveal Cabinet discussions, and to tell the hon. member a little would have been unsatisfactory; to tell him the whole story I would have had to reveal Cabinet matters, and I could not do that. I was dreadfully sorry that I had to leave him in that situation. I thought he was a man when he rose today and said what he did, and I do not mind telling hon. members, I was proud of him. At the party meeting last night I said, "I am delighted to know that he is the type of man who says what he thinks." That is the principle that applies in this Chamber and it is a long-standing principle.

Mr. Duggan: You said that in Caucus last night? You said that was not discussed.

Mr. MORRIS: I am telling hon members. They can believe it or not.

Many other matters were mentioned by members of the Opposition, but if they were all put together I am afraid they would not be worth a paragraph. I leave the matter quite confidently in the hands of the Committee.

Motion (Mr. Morris) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Morris, read a first time.

The House adjourned at 5.25 p.m.