

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 20 SEPTEMBER 1962**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**THURSDAY, 20 SEPTEMBER, 1962**

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

**ADDRESS IN REPLY**

**PRESENTATION**

**Mr. SPEAKER:** I have to inform the House that I propose to present to His Excellency the Governor, at Government House, next Tuesday morning at 10 o'clock, the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech agreed to on 11 September, and I shall be glad to be accompanied by the mover and the seconder and such other hon. members as care to be present.

**QUESTIONS**

**FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLUDEN-  
JULAGO ROAD**

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

"(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article in 'The Townsville Daily Bulletin' of July 18 last headed 'Council Building Section of new By-pass Highway' in which it was stated, inter alia, that the bulk of the Townsville City Council's road-making plant was employed on the construction of a section of the new main road between Cluden and Julago for a distance of 3.95 miles, involving the laying of box culverts and drainage pipes with 70,000 cubic yards of filling?"

"(2) If so, did the Council do the work, as reported and was the whole or portion of the cost borne by the Main Roads Department?"

"(3) If all or any part of the cost was borne by the Main Roads Department, will he ensure that in future such information is conveyed to the public?"

**Hon. E. EVANS** (Mirani) replied—

"(1) Yes."

"(2) The road concerned is a gazetted highway and consequently the full cost is a charge on the Main Roads Trust Fund."

"(3) Such information is always published with the Order in Council."

**REGISTRATION OF CONVALESCENT HOMES**

**Mr. DAVIES** (Maryborough), for **Mr. LLOYD** (Kedron), asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"(1) What is the number of privately-owned convalescent homes, accommodating aged and invalid people, at present established in Queensland?"

"(2) What Government subsidy, Commonwealth and/or State, is received by these establishments?"

"(3) Considering the recent rapid growth in the number of old homes being converted to convalescent homes for the aged and invalids by people using the investment for profit, why has the Government not insisted on their registration so that standards of nursing, accommodation and protection generally of the patients can be more adequately supervised?"

**Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga) replied—

"(1 and 2) Convalescent Homes and Nursing Homes are registered by the Local Authority, in accordance with the Ordinance of such Authority, and therefore no information as to the total number of these homes is available in my department. The Commonwealth has approved of the payment to 65 of these institutions of Hospital Benefits. Subsidies are not paid by the State."

"(3) I refer the Honourable Member to my reply to him yesterday on this matter."

**RIGHT-OF-WAY TO FIRE BRIGADE VEHICLES**

**Mr. DEWAR** (Wavell) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"In view of the answer to my Question by the Minister for Mines on September 19, 1962, will he confer with his colleagues, the Minister for Labour and Industry and the Minister for Mines, with the view to having action taken as requested in my Question on that date?"

**Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga) replied—

"I will take this up with my Ministerial colleague."

**DENTAL HYGIENISTS IN SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICES**

**Mr. DAVIES** (Maryborough), for **Mr. MELLOY** (Nudgee), asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"(1) Further to his answer to my Question on September 18, regarding the use of dental hygienists in the school dental services, is it to be understood that the Government is prepared to condone the practice of dentistry in any degree by persons, who are not registered dentists, in contravention of the Dental Acts?"

"(2) Is the Government prepared to extend this concession or privilege to private dentists who would wish to use the services of hygienists?"

"(3) Is the Government contemplating any legislation to cover this situation?"

"(4) What is his definition of a simple extraction and a simple filling?"

"(5) Will these hygienists at all times work under the supervision of a registered dentist?"

**Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga) replied—

"(1 to 5) The detailed policy of the service will be explained to the House if and when an enabling Bill is introduced."

## INMATES, EVENTIDE HOMES

**Mr. DAVIES** (Maryborough), for **Mr. MELLOY** (Nudgee), asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

“What is the number of inmates in (a) Eventide Homes in Queensland and (b) institutions for the aged, subsidised by the State Government?”

**Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga) replied—

“(a) 1,465. (b) Institutions for the aged are not required to furnish information as to the number of inmates resident at any particular date.”

## INTERNAL PAINTING OF HOUSING COMMISSION RENTAL HOMES

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

“How many State rental homes have been interiorly painted by the Housing Commission in the following projects:—Seville Road, Mount Gravatt East, Carina and Manly West during the years ended June 30, 1957-1958, 1958-1959, 1959-1960, 1960-1961 and 1961-1962?”

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

“This information is not conveniently available. With external painting, the Commission has developed a repainting cycle in which tenders are let for repainting in batches. There has been tremendous activity on external repainting over the last two years and that is a steady feature in present Commission practice. Internal painting does not present the same problem. The need is influenced by the cleanliness and care of the tenant and, in many cases, arises unevenly within a dwelling. That is to say, some rooms in a house might call for repainting whilst others remain in splendid condition. Whenever a rental house becomes vacant there is an immediate inspection, and, where the condition warrants it, the opportunity is taken to quickly carry out internal repainting whilst the house is empty and where there will be no disturbance to the tenant. Other internal repainting while the tenant is in occupation is based on need which is judged by inspection. These inspections follow upon requests made by the tenant. The cost of internal repainting is recorded on individual maintenance house cards and to extract the information sought by the Honourable Member would involve time and expense which is not warranted.”

## ALLOCATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF FUNDS TO IRRIGATION PROJECTS

**Mr. TUCKER** (Townsville North) asked the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation—

“(1) Of the £3 million given to Queensland in the last financial year for unemployment relief, what amount was allocated to the Irrigation and Water Supply Department?”

“(2) What amount of that allocation was spent by that Department (a) in the Mareeba district, (b) on the Leslie Dam, Warwick, (c) in the Burdekin River district and (d) on the Lakes Plain project, Home Hill?”

“(3) Is any provision to be made in this financial year for construction work on the last-named project?”

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

“(1) £300,000.”

“(2) (a) £200,000 was expended in the Mareeba district; (b) £100,000 was expended on Leslie Dam; (c) No allocation was made to the Burdekin River district, but at that time additional funds amounting to £24,000 resulting from savings on other projects, was allotted to work in the Burdekin Irrigation Area; (d) The Irrigation Commission has no project known as the Lakes Plain Project, but as part of the investigation of availability of water supply in the Burdekin Delta and the possibility of recharging the water beds in periods of shortage, it has undertaken to investigate a proposal by the Ayr Shire Council for possible conservation of local runoff on the Lakes Plain with a view to utilising such conserved runoff in the recharge of the underground beds if required.”

“(3) As investigations have not been finalised and no scheme formulated, no expenditure is proposed on the Lakes Plains Project for the current year, but an amount of £12,000 has been allocated for continuation of investigations of underground water supplies in the Burdekin Delta.”

## TOOWOOMBA TOWN PLANNING SCHEME

**Mr. ANDERSON** (Toowoomba East) asked the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—

“In view of the fact that the Toowoomba City Council forwarded a town planning scheme to the Department of Local Government for approval on June 6, 1962, and that the delay in receiving approval is causing concern to many people in Toowoomba—

(1) Is the town planning scheme so unacceptable to the Department of Local Government that it might eventually have to be ‘scrapped’, as publicly claimed by the Mayor of Toowoomba?

(2) If not, would certain amendments to the draft ordinance, where necessary, enable the scheme to be approved?

(3) Upon receipt of these amendments will the town planning scheme receive expeditious examination by the Department of Local Government?

(4) Is the delay caused by the Toowoomba City Council?”

**Hon. H. RICHTER** (Somerset) replied—

“(1 to 4) On May 29, 1962, a Planning Scheme Ordinance and other documents were delivered to the Department of Local Government by officers of the Toowoomba City Council. A preliminary examination of these documents has been made by officers of my Department and, as a result of this examination, the Toowoomba City Council’s attention was drawn on August 2, 1962, to certain matters relative to the provisions of the Local Government Acts pursuant to which a Local Authority is empowered to make a Town Planning Scheme. To date a reply has not been received from the Toowoomba City Council and there the matter rests.”

ESTABLISHMENT OF HOSPITAL AT WYNNUM

**Mr. GUNN** (Wynnum) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

“Has the committee appointed by the Department for the purpose of investigating and making recommendations on hospital requirements throughout the State submitted a report? If so, what are the recommendations regarding the establishment of a hospital at Wynnum?”

**Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga) replied—

“This is a continuing Committee. No recommendation has as yet been made for the establishment of a Hospital at Wynnum.”

OUT-PATIENTS AND BEDS, BRISBANE GENERAL AND PRINCESS ALEXANDRA HOSPITALS

**Mr. GUNN** (Wynnum) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

“(1) What is the number of patients who received treatment at the out-patients section of the Brisbane General and Princess Alexandra Hospitals for the years 1960-1961 and 1961-1962, respectively?”

“(2) What is the number of beds contained in the Brisbane General and Princess Alexandra Hospitals, including intermediate, sub-intermediate and public sections, respectively?”

“(3) What is the number of patients who received treatment at the Turbot Street Dental Hospital, South Brisbane Dental Hospital and Wynnum Dental Clinic for the years 1960-1961 and 1961-1962 respectively?”

**Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga) replied—

“(1) The number of patients who received treatment at the out-patients section of the Brisbane General and Princess Alexandra Hospitals was as follows:—

	1960-1961	1961-1962
Brisbane General . .	86,880	92,205
Princess Alexandra	66,426	69,258”

“(2) The number of beds contained in the Brisbane General and Princess Alexandra Hospitals is as follows:—

Type of Bed	Brisbane General	Princess Alexandra
Public . . . . .	1,256	1,043
Intermediate and Private . . . . .	64	168
	<u>1,320</u>	<u>1,211”</u>

“(3) The number of patients who received treatment at the Turbot Street Dental Hospital, South Brisbane Dental Hospital, and Wynnum Dental Clinic for the years 1960-1961 and 1961-1962 was as follows:—

	1960-1961	1961-1962
Brisbane Dental Hospital . . . . .	206,994	210,119
South Brisbane Dental Hospital	86,847	87,980
Wynnum Dental Clinic . . . . .	7,939	8,101”

MANLY BOAT HARBOUR

**Mr. GUNN** (Wynnum) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

“(1) What is the total expenditure to date on the construction of the Manly Boat Harbour?”

“(2) Is it the intention of the Government to provide additional mooring pens to meet the requirements of boat owners awaiting mooring accommodation?”

“(3) Has the Department placed a time limit for the completion of the reclamation work now being undertaken on the southern side of the Harbour?”

“(4) What is the weekly revenue received from the mooring pens on lease to boat owners?”

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

“(1) £142,706 13s. 2d.”

“(2) Yes—but not in the immediate future. The Commonwealth Aid Marine Works Fund has limited resources and I endeavour to ensure a fair share of expenditure along our long coast-line. Thus priorities have to be created and many desirable works have to be postponed until funds are available. There is at present a waiting list of 12 for pens. It is proposed to do some further dredging this year to enable more craft to moor at anchor in the sheltered waters of the harbour.”

“(3) The contract time for completion was November 6, 1962. The work has lagged and, in response to an order from the Department of Harbours and Marine, the contractor has recently improved his equipment with a new cutter head. He has asked for an extension of time until December 21, 1962, for completion of the work. This extension is being granted.”

“(4) £16 13s. 6d.”

FREE BUS SERVICE, MACHAN'S BEACH  
SCHOOL

**Mr. ADAIR** (Cook) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"(1) With reference to a recent request by me for a free bus service to be granted to Machan's Beach school children to enable them to attend swimming lessons at the Cairns Baths, will he advise if the request has been granted?"

"(2) If the request has been granted, when will the free bus service commence?"

**Hon. H. RICHTER** (Somerset—Minister for Public Works and Local Government), for **Hon. J. C. A. PIZZHEY** (Isis), replied—

"(1) The request has been granted."

"(2) From the beginning of October, 1962."

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIMSMEAD ROAD

**Mr. ADAIR** (Cook) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

"When can it be expected that work will be commenced by the Main Roads Department on the construction of the Brimsmead Road?"

**Hon. E. EVANS** (Mirani) replied—

"The scheme has been released to the Council and its approval is expected at an early date. Work can then be commenced as soon as the Order in Council is obtained."

SALE OF FIREWORKS

**Mr. DEAN** (Sandgate) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"(1) Is he aware of the distress in the community caused by certain irresponsible teenagers who without any apparent respect for the feelings of the aged, the sick and workers who do shift work, also small children and animal pets, who become terrified when these teenagers throw fire crackers over fences into homes and into motor cars?"

"(2) If so, what action has he taken either to place a complete ban on the sale of fire crackers or restrict their sale to one day in each year?"

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

"(1 and 2) I am sure that most Honourable Members will agree that fireworks provide an innocent source of amusement to most of those who are young in heart and spirit. Unfortunately, there are those irresponsible persons who constitute an unmitigated nuisance and cause needless distress by abusing the use of fireworks. However, I am not convinced that the abuses of the minority constitute a sound ground to support the drastic action sought by the Honourable Member. I would draw his attention to Regulation 63 of the Regulations under the Explosives Act."

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under the State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1962.

Balance Sheet of the Coal Mine Workers' Pensions Fund for the year 1961-1962.

Orders in Council under the Forestry Act of 1959."

COMMONWEALTH AID TO STATE  
GOVERNMENT IN DEVELOPMENT OF  
QUEENSLAND

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 13 September (see p. 418) on Mr. Gilmore's motion—

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

**Mr. PILBEAM** (Rockhampton South) (11.23 a.m.): In continuance of my speech in seconding the motion, I should like to deal with two matters that clearly indicate the enthusiastic co-operation now existing between the Commonwealth and State Governments in the development of Queensland. I refer to the provision of boat harbours and the assistance given to construct aged people's homes.

No-one can fail to recognise the great progress that is being made in the construction of boat harbours along the Queensland coastline. They have two main uses, namely, the development of the tourist industry, which has a great potential in Queensland, and the development of the fishing industry, which could be very important to this State.

I must recognise what has been done by the Department of Harbours and Marine in my own electorate in allocating portion of the Commonwealth grant to provide a boat slip on the north side of the Fitzroy River. It will be of great assistance to people in Rockhampton who own private motor boats. Far more important, however, is the assistance that will allow us to construct a fishermen's wharf on the south bank of the Fitzroy River. Until now we have not had a fishermen's wharf of adequate size. There has been provision only for the tying up of one boat at the foot of the steps at the bottom of Denham Street. Approval has been given for the renovation and general reconstruction of a concrete wharf, which will provide adequate anchorage for all fishermen, and adequate facilities to handle their catch. We must recognise the

co-operation between the two Governments on this worth-while project. At Port Alma, too, a fishermen's wharf will be constructed from finance made available under the same heading.

The construction of aged people's homes is a subject very dear to my heart, and it is very much the concern of all who interest themselves in the welfare of the aged. I do not know of any better example of co-operation than this, in that the Commonwealth Government provides 50 per cent. of the cost of constructing old people's homes, and the State Government 25 per cent., leaving only 25 per cent. to be raised by societies created for that purpose. That gives the best possible opportunity for people to help themselves, and it gives them the best support in the form of these tremendous subsidies, which are the strongest in any field in the Commonwealth.

We must realise that the main requirement of aged people is housing. People who have been reasonably prudent throughout their lives and reach pensionable age owning their own homes, and possibly their own cars, are reasonably well off, despite the cries that are often heard in regard to pensions, but, people who, through improvidence or misfortune, reach pensionable age and do not own their own homes, find themselves in straitened circumstances. This is a way in which housing can be provided for them. In Rockhampton, following the tremendous financial support given by both Governments, we are rapidly constructing a first-class old people's housing settlement. We do not have to do it on a charitable basis when we have that sort of financial assistance. We are able to provide a first-class furnished cottage with all amenities, including hot water, electric stove, and washing machine, for £1 a week. That completely covers the costs of the project. The co-operation of the Commonwealth and State Governments in this field is apparent from the large number of localities that are establishing housing settlements for the aged.

Since I last spoke on this subject in the House, more than 20 centres have been in touch with me and I have been able to help them all, to some degree, by making available to them information about this scheme, for which great credit must go to the Commonwealth Government for providing 50 per cent. of the cost of the homes, and to the State Government for providing 25 per cent. On Friday of this week I will be going to Gladstone to help in the establishment of an aged people's housing settlement there. That clearly indicates that, except on the part of a few small-minded people, there is no animosity between Rockhampton and Gladstone.

There is only one aspect of aged people's housing that I should like to criticise, namely, the requirement that these schemes be provided en bloc, as it were. It would be more practicable if a certain type of house could be decided upon, and individual houses

erected immediately, leaving the matter of subsidy until the end of the financial year. It is not a very good circumstance, when people requiring housing have to wait until there are six or eight applications and then have the houses built en bloc. I think some arrangement could be made with the Department of Health and Home Affairs to build houses of an approved type as the necessity arises. Then the scheme would be indeed a wonderful one.

It is not my intention to prolong this debate unduly. I sought this opportunity to speak on those two subjects, which are important in my area. This time was made available to me through the courtesy of the Leader of the Opposition. I thank him, and repeat that in my electorate in particular we are most grateful to the Commonwealth and State Governments for their co-operation in making money available which, under the various headings I have discussed, will help us to develop this part of the State. I am quite sure that the present development and progress will continue so long as our two Governments retain their present political identity.

**Mr. DUGGAN** (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.30 a.m.): It has been customary in this State over a number of years for hon. members to take the advantage of the opportunity afforded under the Standing Orders of moving what are known as private members' motions. Over the years, irrespective of which party has been in control of the Treasury benches, it would not be unfair to say that, in the main, private members' motions have been designed to achieve some propaganda value for the Government in power. I have no particular quarrel with that—it might be regarded as being party tactics—but this year we have two examples of the most blatant attempts being made in the House to use them as a further vehicle to pave the way for enhancing the prospects of this Government at the next election.

The first motion, standing in the name of the hon. member for Tablelands, speaks of the great measure of co-operation existing between the Commonwealth and State Governments; the second, in the name of the hon. member for Ashgrove, is, I think, in very poor taste indeed. Might I say in a sentence that we ally ourselves in this work of carrying out the great obligation imposed in the democratic countries to resist the tide of Communism, but it mentions in the motion that—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The second motion is not before the House. The hon gentleman must deal with the motion before us.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I accept that direction, Mr. Speaker. I am just saying that both these motions have been designed specifically, in the first place, to give credit to the Government and to speak about things that, in the view of the Opposition, are not true,

and, in the second instance, to try to discredit the Opposition. Because I feel this, and feel it very strongly, I move the following amendment—

“Omit the words—

‘appreciates the co-operative help and assistance which the Commonwealth Government is rendering to this State’s Government in its efforts to promote the development of Queensland’s vast resources and the well-being of its citizens in the national interest’

and insert in lieu thereof the words—

‘requests that more positive and generous action be taken by the Federal Government to meet the needs of this State than has been provided to date and, in particular, the House desires that early consultations take place on a Governmental level for the purpose of discussing the desirability of securing financial aid from the Commonwealth Government for the establishment of a coal-fired power house in Central Queensland to serve the complete processing and refining requirements of Comalco’s production of our bauxite deposits and also to serve the needs of secondary industry generally.’”

**Opposition Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. DUGGAN:** If the House agrees to the amendment it will put some teeth into the motion and will test the sincerity of both the Queensland Government and the Federal Government as well as testing the bona fides of the Commonwealth as to the degree to which they are prepared to help Queensland develop more quickly. It may be argued, if this debate continues and other Government members participate, that we have not received in the years that have gone that measure of Commonwealth assistance that the State deserves. That general charge might have some truth in it because Queensland, I think, has been shamefully neglected by the Menzies administration for about 11 years. They have shown no real concern for the development of this State, and the recent evidence of some activity on their part has not been occasioned by a desire to help Queensland but by the electoral reverse that they suffered in Queensland in the Federal election in December last year. We have seen coming to Queensland since that time more Ministers in a matter of five months than we saw in the previous five or six years, and they came expressing concern about Queensland. We had the Rt. Hon. J. McEwen, Minister for Trade, on “Meet the Press” about three times.

**Mr. Ewan:** A good man, too.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. member for Gregory did not think so.

**Mr. Ewan:** I am entitled to my opinion.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Exactly, but I am trying to balance what the hon. member for Roma is saying now against the opinion of another Government member from a western electorate who did not share that opinion but who, in the debate on another private member’s motion, referred to the Federal Minister as “Black Jack”. He attacked very strongly the inactivity of the Commonwealth Government and spoke about what they were not prepared to do for Queensland. He spoke about these short stop-overs of half-an-hour, and how they could not get out of the place quickly enough. They are not my words, but those of the hon. member for Gregory.

This motion has, of course, been designed to sell outside the false story of close co-operation between the Commonwealth and State Governments. If we endorse it, the impression will be conveyed that this House believes that members of both Governments are all palsy-walsy. We had evidence in the last few days of just how palsy-walsy they are when the Treasurer attacked, in most violent terms, Sir Roland Wilson, who is the chief executive officer of the Commonwealth Treasury at Canberra and the person allegedly responsible for the formulation of monetary policy in this country, a policy that has been accepted, with disastrous results in recent times, by the Commonwealth Government. The Treasurer’s outburst earned the rebuke of a former Federal Minister and, what is more, the present President of the Liberal Party in this State. Could anyone in his wildest dreams imagine the hon. member for Aspley, an ex-president of the Liberal Party, realising the implications of a statement of that kind and getting up and making a public declaration against a Minister in the reigning Government of this State? Of course, if it is said that Mr. Hulme is irresponsible, that is a reflection on the Liberal Party for putting him there. Did they not also push Mr. Murray, the nominee for the Clayfield seat, into the presidency—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! Neither Mr. Murray nor Mr. Hulme is mentioned in the amendment.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I should be the last to question your ruling in this matter, Mr. Speaker, but, if it is a question of irrelevancy, what have washing-machines and references to the Archer Road by the hon. member for Rockhampton South to do with national development? Are references to all of these tiddly-winking little things in the Rockhampton electorate justified on a private member’s motion dealing with economic policy of the Commonwealth as a whole? And are references to the division in this coalition Government and its lack of co-operation with the Federal authorities irrelevant? If they are said to be irrelevant, I regret that I have to differ from that view.

There are very good reasons for my amendment, and that is why I condemn the motion. There is no evidence of any close

collaboration between the State and Federal Governments. The Liberal Party has put into office a man who condemned the Deputy Leader of part of the coalition Government. That was not an isolated outburst. Senator Paltridge, who occupies a very high position as Acting Treasurer in the Federal Government, also publicly rebuked the State Treasurer for his intemperate remarks. It is not a matter of only Mr. Hulme coming into the picture, but the very responsible Senator Paltridge. He also rebuked the State Treasurer for his alleged unwarranted, unfair, and impudent attack upon Sir Roland Wilson, a public servant. This matter echoed in the Federal Parliament and strong condemnation was expressed in that place at the Treasurer's attitude.

When development in Queensland is spoken about, let us see what has happened in their own ranks. Difficulty and embarrassment have been suffered frequently through members of their parties being involved in public brawling about what the Commonwealth Government is or is not doing. The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity was sufficiently moved to say that Queensland should secede from the Commonwealth because of lack of consideration from the Commonwealth Government. The hon. gentleman made some very pregnant observations on that matter. We know, too, of the unseemly incident in this House only two or three days ago, concerning the development of coal resources. The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity read to the House a statement by Mr. Les Thiess, the governing director of Thiess Bros. Ltd., extolling his work in the development of the coal deposits. It is common knowledge outside this Chamber that there was almost a brawl in Cabinet because of the conflicting claims that were made by the Minister and a person in a very high position, and doubt existed in the minds of the public about who was responsible for getting the Japanese coal contract. Mr. Thiess claimed that the Minister was responsible, but the defeated Federal member for Capricornia, Mr. Pearce, claimed that he was responsible. I have a photostat of a newspaper article appearing under the heading "State on verge of £3 million coal deal". It was not just an isolated instance of a man going to Japan and working as a salesman. The article was published under the name of Leo McDonnell, who is not given to making extravagant statements. It said—

"One of the Federal Government's leading 'carpet bag' men, Mr. George Pearce, is expected back from Japan next week with a multi-million pound contract in his pocket for the Queensland coal industry.

"Mr. Pearce is the Liberal member for Capricornia and Assistant Government Whip in the House of Representatives."

This is the important part—

"His mission is considered so important that the Commonwealth Government has given him special leave of absence from his Parliamentary duties."

So this is not like Mr. Killen going off under his own steam, without the authority of the Prime Minister, and contradicting the Prime Minister overseas and causing a considerable amount of embarrassment to the Federal authorities. I think the action of a private member of Parliament in leaving his own country and going overseas and attempting to dictate the economic and financial policy of the British Government is unprecedented, and Mr. Killen did exactly that. Hon. members opposite talk of the amity and harmonious relations existing between the State and Federal Governments! In the particular instance to which I am referring, Mr. Pearce was given special leave of absence by the Government to go to Japan. The public brawling that took place led even "The Courier-Mail", which is perhaps the most useful defender that the Government has of its policies, a newspaper that tries to sell the public the idea that we are fortunate to have the Government in power in Queensland, to say—

"Who got the contract that is promising a big market for Queensland's Kianga-Moura coal in Japan? This is not an issue of the Federal election. But the Minister for Supply (Mr. Hulme), a senior Queensland Minister in the Menzies Government, has drawn upon himself the wrath of the State Minister for Mines (Mr. Evans) because he gave large credit to the Federal Liberal member for Capricornia (Mr. G. Pearce).

"A barbed question from an Opposition member in the State Parliament raised Mr. Evans' gorge and provoked him to make an unfair attack on Mr. Hulme. After all, the main credit for getting Japanese ships to come to Gladstone for Queensland coal must be given to the enterprise of Thiess Brothers."

Yet we heard the Minister telling us yesterday how the Government took this action. The cold fact is that, on the Minister's own declaration, he went to Japan not because he was greatly interested at the time but because the Gladstone Harbour Board asked him to go and Cabinet approved of his going. We hear talk from hon. members opposite about these big men all wanting to develop Queensland and other things of this sort, but we find that the Minister went only because he was asked by the Gladstone Harbour Board to go.

**Mr. Armstrong:** But you cannot deny that the Government has done it.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** As a matter of fact, without all this blowing of trumpets, the New South Wales authorities have sold twice as much coal without all this business of sending Ministers overseas. I do not want

to be misunderstood. I welcome the arrangements that have been made, but I am trying to establish that hon. members on the Government benches are not a happy family.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Then there was the disagreement that occurred over a major matter of policy, namely, what Australia should do to defend its interests in the event of Britain's entering the European Common Market. Mr. Bury was regarded by people who analysed the situation fairly closely as perhaps one of the most level-headed, logical men in the Federal Parliament. He was a member of the World Bank and was a trained economist. He earned about £10,000 a year as a member of the World Bank—far more than he was ever likely to get in Parliament—and he sacrificed that to enter Federal Parliament. Because he made some comments that were at variance with those of the Country Party Leader he was asked to withdraw from the Ministry—and the reluctance of it all! Hon. members will remember the letter that passed from Mr. Menzies to Mr. Bury. I forget his Christian name, but it was along these lines, "My dear Alan, I am sorry, but you compel me to reluctantly ask you to tender your resignation . . ." They were close personal friends and expressed mutual regrets about the matter, but the cold, hard fact was that Mr. McEwen approached Mr. Menzies and said, "I have made certain declarations on behalf of the Country Party in my responsibility for negotiating trade overseas and I am being sabotaged not by the Labour Party but by one of my own Ministerial colleagues."

**Mr. Dewar:** How do you know he said that? Did you read that letter?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** It has been acknowledged in every quarter. If the hon. member can get some satisfaction out of the events, he is entitled to it. The important point is that when our own State Treasurer was addressing an accountants' convention here a few weeks ago he said almost the same thing as Mr. Bury said, showing that in these matters there is a conflict of views and opinions in this State between the Country Party on the one hand and the Liberals on the other.

Queensland is a primary-producing State and the Country Party claims to be a sectional party. Its members admit without hesitation that the reason for their functioning is to serve the interests of the country man.

**Mr. Gilmore** interjected.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. member is interjecting quite consistently, which I think is a bit unreasonable. I do not mind interjectors in ordinary circumstances but, after all, under the Standing Orders the permissible time to speak on a motion such as

this is 40 minutes, and he got an extension of time as did the seconder of the motion. It is unprecedented for both the mover and the seconder of a motion to be given extensions of time. We do not mind the mover of the motion getting an extension but it is unusual for the seconder to get one, although in this case it was with our co-operation. I took the trouble to read the proof of the speech of the hon. member for Tablelands and I am quite sure it could not be taken by any impartial critic to be one that is likely either to move the Federal Government to do anything more or, put in an abstract way, to be a reasonable presentation of some of the problems of this State. Anyone who thinks it could have a wrong understanding of what constitutes logic or a reasonable statement.

Without going into all the sordid details of the behind-the-scenes moves going on in Queensland, the realities of the political situation seem to have been at last rammed home so far as this Government is concerned. If hon. members want any further clarification of the point I am making—that there has not been this harmony—I ask them to cast their minds back to 1957 when the Premier and the then Deputy Premier, the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, presented their policy speeches. They said, "Away with all these old Labour Parliamentarians who, when they go to Canberra, do not speak a language that is understood there. We want to get smooth, silky, suave business men—doctors and accountants—who speak a language that is understood down there, to go down."

**Mr. Ramsden** interjected.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** It is there for everybody who needs to be satisfied to read. I intend to quote it again next year.

**Mr. Dewar:** They did not use those terms at all.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** If they did not use them it was only out of consideration for the hon. member, who could not be regarded as being smooth, silky, or suave. They certainly said that the men employed in negotiations down there had not produced results, yet we find, after almost 4½ or five years in office, Mr. Morris going down to Canberra every month, as liaison officer because he felt that the negotiations that are customary between the State and the Commonwealth at Premier-Prime Minister level, should be abandoned as they were getting Queensland nowhere.

The Treasurer and the Premier had been going down to Canberra to consummate these deals to benefit Queensland but the Liberal Party virtually moved a motion of no-confidence in those two hon. gentlemen. They said, "Despite what you are doing down there we do not think it is good enough. We want to send Mr. Morris down to Canberra. He is an ambitious, energetic, globe-trotting man who is able to convince our

friends down there to a degree that is not possible by Mr. Nicklin or Mr. Hiley." It is well known that Mr. Hiley and Mr. Menzies do not get on well together. I hope I may be pardoned for referring to this matter, but it is rather interesting to those people sitting on the sidelines that Mr. Hiley believes that Sir Roland Wilson considers that he is in such a high and upper strata that everyone has to bow to him. Many people think the same as Mr. Hiley, but it is a matter of Sir Roland Wilson refusing to bow to Mr. Hiley and Mr. Hiley refusing to bow to Sir Roland Wilson, with the result that there is that incompatibility of temperament between them. The only way the matter could be satisfactorily resolved was to get Mr. Morris to go to Canberra monthly. To avoid the political implications and the criticism that would attach to that arrangement if it could be shown that the taxpayers were paying for his monthly visits, he made a public declaration that the Liberal Party was defraying the cost of his peregrinations to Canberra every month. What further evidence do we need of the incompatibility between the coalition parties in Queensland and the coalition parties in Canberra? We have the evidence by their own actions that they were displeased with the results they were obtaining.

I think I have said enough to establish the fact that the motion is only so much political eyewash. It will fool nobody. It could well become a political boomerang because people realise that hon. members opposite are merely trying to win votes. The motion is not designed to serve Queensland; it has been moved in the expectation that it will help the Government to get back into power.

Mr. Dewar interjected.

Mr. DUGGAN: If the hon. member for Wavell wants any further evidence, let me remind him that the Australian Institute of Management asked the Prime Minister to come up to Queensland to open its conference. He agreed, but as he had to leave for London it was necessary to find a substitute. A Country Party conference was being held at the same time. Would it not have been logical to ask the Deputy Prime Minister to come to Queensland to address the Institute? But members of the Liberal Party said, "No, Mr. Menzies is a Liberal. We are not going to give credit to the Country Party for speaking to these top-level business men. We don't want to see this country bumpkin coming up here and talking to the business men who contribute to our funds. We want Mr. Holt here." The telegrams between them were very hot and frequent.

Mr. Dewar: Did you get copies of the telegrams?

Mr. DUGGAN: No, but I can tell the hon. member, with considerable accuracy, what went on. A Country Party conference was being held. Mr. McEwen indicated his willingness to attend but after all this shuffling

to and fro and great pressure being applied, Mr. McEwen had to say that Mr. Holt was coming. I was at the meeting and it was one of the milkiest speeches I have ever heard. There was not one word in his address that could indicate any hope for the development of Queensland. I stood near the entrance after the meeting talking to people as they came out. It is no exaggeration at all when I say that I could number on the fingers of my hand, going round twice, business men whom Government members know who expressed strong criticism of the address given by Mr. Holt because it did not offer any promise of benefit to Queensland. They felt so irate that they organised a special luncheon for him the following day, at which they said, "It is not good enough. If you want our continued financial help, if you expect to win a majority of seats in Queensland, you will have to do something more." As a result, he agreed to have a look at the brigalow scheme. As I said on a previous occasion, he was asked at a civic reception if he had had an enjoyable trip. He replied, "Very enjoyable. I was able to sleep part of the way."

At the south-east zone graziers' conference the other day it was said that developmental schemes in the brigalow belt cannot be resolved merely by a politician flying over the country and looking down at the silvery leaves. That was reported in "The Toowoomba Chronicle" a fortnight ago.

Contrast that attitude—being asleep for some of the journey flying over the tops of the brigalow—with the action of the hon. member for Fassifern when he was asked to go to the North Coast to make an investigation. There were photographs in the Press of him with his trousers rolled up above his knees, and the hon. member for Cooroora said he was like a leader leading men to the promised land. At least he did get his feet wet going through some of the sand and mud to investigate personally the problems of North Coast development.

Let me finish the story. The Liberal Party got the Federal Treasurer up here. Was the State Treasurer with him? No. Was the Minister for Public Lands with him? No. Did he, like the hon. member for Fassifern, make his inspection of the brigalow belt with his trousers rolled up above his knees? He may have done, but not with the State Treasurer, who was away shooting ducks with a high personage of this State, and the Minister for Public Lands was shooting crocodiles with Sir Reginald Groom, a former Lord Mayor of Brisbane. Yet hon. members opposite, with colossal political affrontry, come here and say they are interested in Commonwealth-State relations, and give a public acknowledgement of the Commonwealth Government's assistance to this Government! As I said, it is only so much political eye-wash.

No-one could deny the fact that Queensland is in need of assistance, and assistance on a tremendous scale. The Australian

Labour Party is all in favour of the programmes that are being developed in this direction. I have here a copy of the report of the State Electricity Commission of Queensland on the proposed electrical development of the State. It was obtained through the services of Messrs. Merz and McLellan, the noted English consultants. They furnished that report at a cost of £60,000, and, if I can find the quotation, it will disclose that when the report was introduced, the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity said that the Government did not intend to act on the recommendations that were made.

Of course, we had the other consultants from overseas, Messrs. Ford, Bacon and Davis. Their report cost £110,000, plus some continuing costs which I hope we will ascertain in due course. Their report could not be implemented by this Government, despite the fact that this Government said, "Elect us, because within our ranks we have a successful dairy farmer, a successful canegrower, a man who amassed a small fortune from sheep, a leading Q.C., an ex-bank officer, a school teacher of some note, an earth-moving contractor of some prominence, and so on. Put business men in these jobs, and you will find that Queensland will be developed".

**Mr. Armstrong:** It cannot be denied that they are doing a useful job.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** If the hon. member, by his interjection, suggests that they possess all those qualities, it is passing strange that he has not been able to transmit himself to the front bench.

**Mr. Armstrong** interjected.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I got back with a record majority. I am here.

**Mr. Armstrong:** You tried several times.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I am sorry that the Minister concerned is not in the Chamber. It is rather interesting to contrast what people say of you when you are out of Parliament with what they say when you are in. When I was out of Parliament I was offered a part-time position which involved presenting certain submissions to the Government. I accepted it. I did not receive any remuneration. I was forwarded a cheque in advance but I returned it because I entered this Parliament a fortnight later. A gentleman told me this afterwards: "Just as a matter of interest," he said, "you will quite appreciate that I did not want to embarrass our company. You will quite appreciate a possible embarrassment to us through having a former Labour member representing us in Queensland, without first checking, so I rang each Minister individually to see whether you would be acceptable." And he said, "I do not know what you have done to them but every one of them says that you are an extremely able fellow and we are lucky to get you." That sort of thing is said about

you outside but the moment you are back in the House you are no good at all. One of the present Ministers said on one occasion—I suppose it is some embarrassment to him now—that I was the best Minister for Transport we ever had. I do not mind paying the present Minister the same compliment.

**Mr. Evans:** He was only pulling your leg.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. gentleman should be the last one to talk about leg-pulling. He is the greatest leg-puller in the whole place, and he has been doing more leg-pulling about the vacancy in the Senate than the rest of them put together.

**Mr. Evans** interjected.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** That is a matter for Parliament's decision. The Minister talks about Parliament's having to do this but in his individual capacity he tries to negate the wishes of Parliament by carrying on all sorts of little activities on the side-lines.

**Mr. Evans:** The Q.C.E. is telling you what to do, wise or unwise, right or wrong, and you accept it.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I thought the hon. gentleman had more sense. If you go down to a dairy farm and throw a stone into a pig-sty you can bet your socks the pig will squeal if it is hit. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman's interjecting so vigorously. It shows that my attack must be getting home.

**Mr. Evans:** I am only repeating what you said.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I am not ashamed of anything I said.

**Mr. Evans:** "Wise or unwise, right or wrong."

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. gentleman can repeat it thousands of times. He will not ruffle me, and he is not ruffling people outside.

**Mr. Evans:** The Q.C.E. make the decisions and you accept them.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. gentleman bounces these people by all sorts of activities. He has lost, too. He does not always win. Rightly or wrongly, wisely or unwisely, he got behind Mr. Hewitt for the Cabinet vacancy and he lost.

**Mr. Evans:** I am a good loser.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I do not know that the Minister is.

**Mr. Aikens:** Rightly or wrongly, you got behind 'Orrible 'Orrie to keep Billy Baxter from the Whip's job.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Fancy the hon. member for Townsville South making an interjection like that. He is a man who established a certain reputation some time back. I can remember that when I came into this House as a young member we had two Ministers

representing Townsville electorates—the late Mr. Dash and the late Mr. Hynes. I must give the hon. member credit for his attitude in those days. I suppose there was no-one who defended the A.L.P. more vigorously and more eloquently than he.

**Mr. Aikens:** It was a decent A.L.P. then; it did not stink.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I can remember when I came into the House men like the hon. member for Townsville South, but with a little more character than he has, saying the same sort of thing about the party earlier. When I came into the House in 1935 they said the Labour Party was not as good as it had been in 1914. The only time we hear the Labour Party or Labour members spoken well of is when they are paid tributes in the House after they die. How many hon. members opposite stand up today and say that J. B. Chifley was the greatest Labour leader ever! When he was Prime Minister, attacks on him of a scurrilous nature and of a very strong condemnatory character were uttered by people on the other side of the House and through the newspapers throughout the length and breadth of the country. The moment he dies they say he was the best Prime Minister in the history of Australia. Unfortunately the hon. member for Townsville South has departed from a role that was to his credit in those days and has turned a political somersault. From being one of the most fearless and outspoken members attacking both the Government and the Opposition, he has now become the mealy-mouthed vehicle of the Liberal Party. I do not know anyone who is more servile to this Government. He stood up and said, "The present Minister for Education is the best we have ever had." Last week it was the Minister for Mines. Next week he will be saying this is the best Government we have ever had. I do not mind Government back-benchers standing up and saying it is the best Government or the best Minister or the best collection of Ministers, but for the hon. member for Townsville South to do so and to talk about being a Labour man—the sooner he forgets he was ever associated with the Labour movement the better it will be for everybody.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. DUGGAN:** It is true. The hon. member for Townsville South has been nothing but a sycophant in the last 12 months or two years. He goes back to Townsville and talks to these fellows and says, "If I go back to the Labour Party, I cannot win my seat." He can win if the Liberals do not run a candidate against him.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! Will the hon. gentleman please get back to his amendment?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** No objection was taken when you were—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. DUGGAN:** If it was disorderly or irrelevant to—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition was given some latitude to allow him to answer the hon. member for Townsville South, but I trust that he will now confine his remarks to his amendment and not engage in personalities. Hon. members on my right can take that warning, too.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** It will be appreciated that sometimes we get a bit heated, but I think you know, Mr. Speaker, that I have a high respect for your impartiality and your desire to be fair. You have been fair and tolerant and, having been so, I shall get back to the point.

It is true that we believe there should be governmental aid, and we think that it should be on a scale comparable with that provided in other States.

**Mr. Coburn:** Are you sure that aluminium can be produced economically with thermal power?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. member for Burdekin is a courteous man and I should like to take time to answer him. I shall be happy to have a discussion with him on that matter. I disagree with his politics, but I accept that he is a courteous man and does not engage in cheap interjections. I shall be happy to discuss the matter with him at another time.

It is interesting to note that when Mr. Chifley laid the foundation stone, or erected the plaque, or did whatever was done when work began on the Snowy Mountains scheme, the Liberal Party and the Country Party boycotted that ceremony. Not one of their members went to it. After spending £180,000,000 on it, which we have helped to pay, they now hail it as one of the greatest developmental projects of all time. Yet they boycotted the opening ceremony.

The Commonwealth Government has already provided for that scheme a sum of money from revenue, in the main, or from the taxpayers, which some people think is an unwise decision, and it benefits principally Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia. A measure of assistance has been given to these States for a long period, and there is only now belated recognition of the need to do something in Queensland. This is the reason for the granting of aid for the construction of beef roads, and the making of a special grant of over £3,000,000 to alleviate unemployment. This stinks politically because the submission that was made at the time was that Queensland had the highest percentage of unemployment of all the States of the Commonwealth. And it still has. Provision was made to relieve the position here by a special grant, not on what the position might be in September or December 1962 or March 1963, but on what it was at the date when the submissions were made. The announcement by the Prime

Minister was that his Government was convinced on the representations and submissions made from Queensland and, because of the high proportion of unemployment here, a special fund of over £3,000,000 was to be made available. Then what happened here?

**Mr. Ewan:** The Commonwealth Government made money available to your Government for beef roads, but you repudiated the conditions. You repudiated £1,300,000.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The whole point is that the Treasurer stated publicly that the Government was not going to do anything now, but was going to wait until the third and fourth quarters of the financial year.

**Mr. Ewan:** That is not true.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** He did say that.

**Mr. Ewan:** You have a look and see what is being done.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I am telling the hon. member that the Treasurer made a public statement.

**Mr. Ewan:** Never mind what the Treasurer said. They are working on the roads.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I am dealing with the Treasurer at the moment. The hon. member might occupy that position some day. If he plays his hand a little more carefully, he may be able to put the skids under a couple of the front-benchers and become a member of Cabinet.

The Treasurer stated publicly that action will be taken to spend this money in the latter period of the financial year. In other words, although the Government sacked men from the Forestry Department last week and the week before, the Treasurer intends to defer spending this money till the elections come a little closer.

**Dr. Delamothe:** Or would it be when seasonal unemployment is at its height?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** That presupposes that the hon. member is suggesting that it will rise above its present level.

(Time, on motion of Mr. Tucker, extended.)

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I am grateful to the hon. member for Townsville North for moving that my time be extended and to the House for granting me the privilege. I assure the House that I will not ask for a second extension, as did a Government member—I am not commenting on the value of the contribution that he made.

The Commonwealth Government gave £180,000,000 for the implementation of the Snowy River scheme, and it has not been slow in providing a measure of assistance for other parts of Australia while work has been in progress on that scheme. I think I can show shortly the extent to which this assistance has been provided. Hon. members opposite claim that, because of improved

relations between the Commonwealth Government and the State Government, a great deal of money is being spent in Queensland by the Commonwealth. The Mt. Isa rail project has been mentioned. Let us be quite clear on this matter. I do not give the Commonwealth Government very great credit for making the money available for that project. We heard the Treasurer say yesterday in defence of the Government that the terms offered by the Commonwealth Government were more advantageous than those offered by the World Bank. Why did he go to New York to try to obtain the money at that time if the Government could get better terms and conditions from the Commonwealth Government? We have mentioned that point previously. The Treasurer went to New York, but his mission was a failure. It was described by Mr. Hulme as an "abject" failure, a "dismal" failure—and he used even stronger words.

**Mr. Ramsden** interjected.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. member should be careful not to attack Mr. Hulme.

**Mr. Ramsden:** He has not talked as Mr. Egerton did.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** He is not the president of a party; Mr. Hulme is.

We can thank the Commonwealth Government for nothing. The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity would be the first to admit, I think, that everybody approves of the Mt. Isa rail rehabilitation project. We all hope for increased production at Mt. Isa. I think it should be put on record—the hon. member for Maryborough referred to this in a speech, and put the point very devastatingly—that many years ago when a Labour Government wanted to attract industry to Mt. Isa, it introduced a Bill to provide for certain guarantees to Mount Isa Mines Limited, and that the then Opposition, which was composed of persons of similar political thought to members of the present Government, voted against the measure. They said that we could not afford to speculate on a hole in the ground, and the reports in "Hansard" indicate clearly what they did say. When I was Minister for Transport, I frequently had to defend the concessional freight rates conceded to Mount Isa Mines Limited and point out that we were trying to assist an industry. I had to do that because unions and other bodies in the community considered that the company should stand entirely on its own feet. We introduced a formula providing that as the fortunes of the company improved or worsened the freight rate would be adjusted accordingly. Mr. Fisher came to see me when I was Minister for Transport—he also saw the Treasurer, the Premier, and other members of the then Government—and was able to show us convincingly that if this phase of development took place there would be an increase in our overseas earnings of about

£35,000,000 a year. That is a good thing for the State and the Commonwealth, and no-one would go against the proposal at that time. The Labour Government did not go against the proposal for Mt. Isa. We placed it before the Commonwealth and it received the endorsement of Sir Arthur Fadden, the then Country Party Federal Treasurer. One hears all this talk about our not going along with this thing, yet Sir Arthur Fadden, in the Cabinet room here—

**Mr. Ewan:** A good Queenslander.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Yes, he is a good Queenslander. I have a high regard for Sir Arthur. He indicated very definitely that, subject to the ironing out of a few details, the project had their blessing. I feel quite confident that, had Sir Arthur Fadden had the opportunity of going further with the matter then, we would have received terms probably more favourable, certainly not less favourable, than those we ultimately received.

**Mr. Ewan:** But it didn't happen.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. member interjects, and says, "It didn't happen." It didn't happen with the Harristown State School, which, although it has been in use for seven years, bears a plaque stating that it was built by a Tory Government and opened by the present Minister for Education. It was started by a Labour Government. You will see such plaques on many undertakings that were started by Labour Governments. The other day the hon. member for Roma talked about getting schools built, and enumerated a long list of them. Frankly, I was a bit depressed when I heard the recital, but the hon. member for Aubigny was able to show that, with two exceptions, every one of those schools mentioned had been started or approved by a Labour Government. All this talk about the Labour Government not being anxious to see development in this State is so much nonsense.

Hon. members opposite talk about co-operation between the State and Federal Governments. I remind them of the declaration by their own Premier to the effect that he was disappointed and disgusted with the Federal Government and that this State would go it alone. Do they remember that? That shows how much co-operation he was getting from the Commonwealth authorities.

In addition, the money for the Mt. Isa railway line is not a grant at all; it is a loan and is granted for only 20 years, whereas all the major loans given for developmental purposes in any of the other States have been for periods of 40 and 50 years. The present generation in Queensland will be paying this loan off whereas in the other States posterity will be doing so. In addition, we are paying a higher rate of interest than the other States. Again, we will be paying on a loan basis, whereas the other States receive substantial proportions as free grants. Western Australia received

£41.2 million for railway work to help B.H.P. Ltd. That is why I advanced the proposal this morning that there should be consultation at top level.

I am not going to knock the Minister for what he is trying to do in these matters. He will get my backing and the backing of my party, but if Western Australia can get £42 million to help B.H.P. there is nothing wrong with putting the proposal into this motion that there should be consultation at Governmental level on the building of a powerhouse in Central Queensland to do what the Minister himself wanted to do.

No doubt I will be told that the Merz-McLellan report disclosed that it was uneconomic for Comalco to operate a smelting works or refinery in Queensland. I am fair enough to admit that the company is engaged in selling products against very powerful international competition, Consolidated Zinc and Rio Tinto, a tremendously powerful international combination that, if one reads their balance sheet, can afford from their earnings, to lose £1,000,000 a year in this country in order to wipe Comalco out if they want to, or at least to make it difficult for Comalco to operate profitably. They are able, under the laws of the U.S.A. and other places, to do many things in foreign countries that earn them taxation rebates. Despite that, the Victorian Government is giving them £900,000 to encourage them to use Yallourn coal. That has been criticised in some quarters, but Mr. Bolte, the Premier of Victoria, said that the establishment of that industry was so important that the State should subsidise it to the extent of £900,000 so that it will be economic to do processing work in Victoria.

I have discussed this matter with the Federal leader of the Australian Labour Party, who has indicated quite frankly, as indeed has Mr. Whitlam, that the A.L.P. policy would be to seek to help in every possible way to have a powerhouse established in Central Queensland, and to have an examination made of the possibilities of carrying out work of this kind. I think that the Minister would agree with an approach of that kind. If £41,000,000 can be given to Western Australia, what is wrong with giving a grant to Queensland in the national interest for the development of mineral resources in the North? It would mean £35,000,000 additional revenue every year towards a greater safety margin in our balance of payments. Of that £41,000,000, £14,400,000 was a straight-out gift to Western Australia, but not £1 was given to the Mt. Isa project.

South Australia was allowed £1,325,000 for diesel rolling-stock. That has nothing to do with development. When we have purchased diesel locomotives or diesel rolling-stock the money has had to come out of loan funds or consolidated revenue funds derived from the State's resources. We have never received one penny for that purpose.

In the difficult post-war period when we imported locomotives the Commonwealth Government threatened to apply a tariff barrier against us, despite the fact that we had approached every known locomotive-builder in the Commonwealth. Walkers Ltd. had a delay of four and a-half years; there was a similar lag in deliveries from Clyde Industries Ltd. in the South. When we imported locomotives from Great Britain the Commonwealth Government threatened to apply a tariff barrier against us. It has proved itself to be very unsympathetic.

All the assistance given to the other States for rolling-stock, for the Leigh Creek project, for the Bell Bay project in Tasmania, for water supply schemes in Western Australia, and so on, has been given as a matter of routine. I welcome the injection of those funds. Do not think that I am against it. I do not mind if somebody makes a profit, as long as it provides work and development. All we ask is that we be treated fairly and not be mere political pawns, as we have been.

I have indicated that Queensland has not been treated over-generously. We hear a lot about assistance with the beef roads, but the Commonwealth Government is doing the same in Western Australia. In a previous speech I pointed out that the special unemployment grant to Queensland was given in spite of opposition from the Liberal Premier of Victoria, who said that he did not think it was fair that Victoria should be discriminated against because of political mismanagement in Queensland. Mr. Bolte said that publicly at the conference, and released a Press statement along those lines. He did not see why Victoria should be penalised because Queensland was mis-handling its affairs.

**Mr. Armstrong:** He was taking his mind back a few years.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** He dealt with the grant of £3,000,000 this year. The hon. member should examine his mind, not Mr. Bolte's. The hon. member for Bowen might be able to give him some helpful advice or treatment.

The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity was able to show that Comalco has spent more than £3,000,000, which is in excess of the total requirements during the term of the agreement. New Zealand's Labour Prime Minister signed the agreement under which the company decided to take advantage of that country's thermal power for smelting. I think we should do everything we possibly can for Queensland. No doubt the Minister will agree with me when I say that matters such as this should transcend party-political motives, and that we should have a united front. If the Minister puts up a practical proposition, I can assure him that the Opposition will be happy to give him every support.

**Mr. Aikens:** Every time you open your mouth you put your foot in it.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Although the hon. member is capable of making his own speeches, he is completely irresponsible. I do not want him to advise me how I should make my speech. I do not need help or advice from him. Whether he interjects or keeps quiet does not worry me in the slightest, because his interjections fall on deaf ears.

**Mr. Aikens:** You are bleeding from every pore.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** There is a word in the dictionary spelt e-g-o, and it applies strongly to the hon. member.

I was developing the point—and the Minister would agree with me as he has made a statement to the same effect—that if we are to get a basis for successful industrial development, it will be the establishment of cheap power. The Minister and his officers have attempted to see whether we can get coal at a cost that will attract industry. We must have an abundance of cheap power, water, and transport, which are the basic requirements of secondary industry.

South Australia has shown us the pattern to follow, and that State has nothing like the natural advantages that Queensland has. I cannot go all the way with Sir Thomas Playford, but he has been successful in getting money from the Commonwealth for developmental projects. I would like to see the same thing happen here. When the General Motors works was established, because of the volume of orders, there were also established paint works, blacksmiths shops, and firms manufacturing accessories such as door-handles. Because of that, other industries grew. If we can establish a cheap power station—

**Mr. Evans:** You know that we have already taken steps to build a dam. We have called tenders.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** What for?

**Mr. Evans:** For a power station.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** It will not deal with the requirements of Comalco. The Minister knows that very well, and he well knows that these people cannot wait to find out what will happen in two, three, or four years' time. That is why we have been in trouble before. They have to make their arrangements according to what is happening now. They will go ahead with the New Zealand scheme if they do not know whether we will have a powerhouse on the central coalfield. If they wait two or three years, Alcan will steal a march on them.

**Mr. Evans:** You know the whole thing has been—

**Mr. DUGGAN:** They are not going to do that at all. I would not mind if the Minister did not get his back-benchers to be small and take advantage of a private member's motion to boost his success. If the Minister comes here and discusses it, we will go along with him.

My purpose in drawing attention to these matters is that I cannot support a motion such as this. It is virtually an endorsement of the programmes of this Government and the Federal Government. As Leader of the Opposition, can I do that? Does the Minister in his own heart, knowing all of these things that I spoke of before he came in, consider that we are not justified in bringing these things to the notice of the public?

**Mr. Evans:** You have been there for 40 years.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I have not been here for 40 years. The Minister should be a little more accurate in these sorts of things.

**Dr. Delamothe:** What did you get from the Chifley Government?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The Chifley Government offered us quite a measure of support in various directions. For the greater part of the Chifley regime, it was either a war period or a post-war period, with the attendant difficulties. I would be prepared to debate with the hon. member anywhere the record of the Chifley Government.

**Mr. Evans:** It was in New South Wales and South Australia.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** If the Minister cared to arrange with Mr. Speaker to give me an hour's extension I would deal with that; but I am not going to be diverted from my purpose. I think the hon. member would be fair enough to say that at least I am not dealing with a washing machine somewhere or some other tinpot matter, as the hon. member for Tablelands and the hon. member for Rockhampton South did. I am trying to deal with national issues, because the motion deals with national issues. If hon. members opposite did not try to make some cheap political capital out of the motion I would not be talking as I am. It is because they are trying to do that that we are compelled to point out the hollowness of their argument. The Commonwealth Government will do nothing and they know it. That is indicated by the fact that the Minister for Labour and Industry had to go down south to try to accelerate these matters.

The Government are very keen on sending missions overseas yet they did not send one man with the recent mission to South America. Of the 48 members, only one was from Queensland and that was in a private capacity, from Appleton Industries Ltd. There was not one man endorsed by the Queensland Government.

**Dr. Delamothe:** Thornton, of Dacon, it was.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Yes, I think Thornton was the one man in those 48. It is easy enough to talk about committees. Goodness knows, this Government has had more committees in five years than any other Government in Australia has had in 40 years. Then it does not even accept their recommendations.

This Government is side-tracking its own public servants. A dinner is to be held tonight. I suppose the Premier will attend and tell them what wonderful fellows they are, what assets to the State, while in actual fact, by appointing all these committees and so on the Government is taking away from its permanent public servants work that should largely be their responsibility. There is an implied reflection on their ability. The Government is running around corners all over the place appointing people in an effort to extricate itself from difficult situations. All in all, it stands indicted. It shows its ineptitude by its own public brawling, by its recriminations in public, to say nothing of what happens in private. If I cared to publish information that comes into my possession behind the scenes I could go on talking in this strain for a week. But I am dealing only with what has appeared in the newspapers, and that indicates very clearly that all this talk about a palsy-walsy relationship between the State and the Commonwealth is so much nonsense. I hope the public of Queensland realise that, unless we can get a more amicable relationship with the Commonwealth, and unless Queensland receives its just needs, we will have grave difficulty in competing in the very hard, cold, competitive world we live in today.

Hon. members opposite talk about what Chifley did. As they had so much to say on these matters, let me point out what happened when Mr. Hulme was Minister for Supply in the present Commonwealth Government. He had a golden opportunity to help Queensland when he was Minister in charge of a department that was spending very large sums of money, but he did not place very many orders in Queensland. I am sorry that just at the moment I cannot lay my hands on the actual figures—I have them in my notes—but they show very conclusively that of contracts to the value of something like £60,000,000 that the Minister for Supply placed during the time he was Minister, he allotted less than £1,000,000 worth to Queensland. What a shockingly small proportion! It is all very well to talk about what Chifley did. We could go back and talk about other things in the past. Sometimes it is as well to let the dead past bury its dead. It could well be applied by hon. members opposite to their colleagues' attitudes towards Queensland's needs.

**Mr. Evans:** You have gone back 40 years.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I have not gone back 40 years. I am dealing with current events; I have dealt with what happened from 1959 to 1962. It is easy enough to go farther back and find similar happenings. I have no doubt the Minister will go back and talk about cattle stations and State butcher shops, or something of the sort. He has the time.

**Mr. Evans:** I will talk about Comalco.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I hope he does. All I can say is that I should like to see it happen. So far, however, we have seen no evidence

of it. If the efforts of the Minister fail, all we can say is that he did his best, and we should back him up. I have no quarrel with that; all I want to do is to help in this matter if I can.

There has been no indication on the Liberal side that they want to assist in development. As a matter of fact, the Minister for National Development, Senator Spooner, said a few months ago, as Acting Prime Minister, that he believed all these things should be the result of private enterprise, and did not need any Government stimulation. Mr. Hasluck, Minister for Territories, said that he did not think the Commonwealth Government would interest itself in these proposals except in a restricted way with mining. He has been proved to be wrong in his own capital.

I thank the House for extending my time, and I appreciate the courtesy extended to me. I hope that I have said enough to dispose of the fallacy of the claims of the mover and seconder of the motion.

**Mr. WALLACE** (Cairns) (12.37 p.m.): I rise to second the amendment, which says—

“Omit the words—

‘appreciates the co-operative help and assistance which the Commonwealth Government is rendering to this State’s Government in its efforts to promote the development of Queensland’s vast resources and the well-being of its citizens in the national interest.’

and insert in lieu thereof the words—

‘requests that more positive and generous action be taken by the Federal Government to meet the needs of this State than has been provided to date and, in particular, the House desires that early consultations take place on a Governmental level for the purpose of discussing the desirability of securing financial aid from the Commonwealth Government for the establishment of a coal-fired power house in Central Queensland to serve the complete processing and refining requirements of Comalco’s production of our bauxite deposits and also to serve the needs of secondary industry generally.’”

I should like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on the manner in which he has put the amendment before the House. It directs the eye of public opinion to the failures of this Government. I was rather surprised that the hon. member for Tablelands had the temerity to move a motion such as this. It is all the more surprising in view of what has happened in the Far North of Queensland. It is a fact—and the hon. members for Tablelands and Mulgrave will know it—that there has been much loss of population in Far Northern Queensland. It is well known, too, that, with the closing of the railway line west of Cairns and of the workshops at Cairns, there will be a further decrease in the population of

that area. These are things that the people of Queensland and of Australia cannot afford to see happening.

In view of what these hon. members know, it has been amazing to me that they have not raised their voices in defence of that part of the State to which they belong and the people of which they represent in this House. On no occasion have I heard them deplore the deterioration in Far Northern Queensland, yet they know as well as I do that when the survival of the Commonwealth is considered, that is the most important part of Australia. There is a great need for the voices of the people of the Far North of Queensland to be heard, especially in this Parliament. Despite everything that has been said in the House by the Minister for Transport and other Ministers on the closing of the railway lines west of Cairns, I say that if the parties now in government are fortunate enough to be returned to power at the next election it is certain that the whole of that railway system will be closed, as is suggested in the recommendations of Ford, Bacon and Davis. I do not believe that the recommendation to close all those lines emanated purely and simply from Ford, Bacon and Davis. I believe that the Government had a great deal to do with it, and that it was included in the report at the request of some members of Cabinet. We know that the area west of Cairns in Far North Queensland was thriving some years ago, but, because of a serious decline in mining, it lost many of its industries and the population decreased. For some years the population in the area has been more or less constant, but with the closing of the railways people will be forced to leave and there will be no population left. Can any hon. member tell me of any country, or any area in any country, without railways, that has been developed or has attracted industries? Hon. members opposite cannot answer that question. Never has a country without railways been developed or attracted industries. I do not wish to speak about the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report today. I shall deal with it at some length later in the session.

**Mr. Gilmore:** You are right off the amendment now.

**Mr. WALLACE:** I am not off the amendment; I am right on it.

Many countries overseas have been in much the same position as Queensland now is in the matter of railways. Governments in those countries were prepared, as the present Government of Queensland is prepared, to substitute road transport for rail transport. But I point out that the World Bank, on being asked for loans by some of those countries, took a very dim view of the substitution of road transport for rail transport. Take the case of Cuba, which applied to the World Bank for a considerable sum of money to enable it to substitute road transport for rail transport. The Bank’s final

reply to the Government of Cuba was that it must retain the railways because the future of Cuba would be endangered if anything happened to them. I suggest that a similar situation could arise if the railways west of Cairns were closed. If that happens, that part of the State will be finished for all time, and Queensland and Australia will suffer as a result. Despite sniggers from hon. members opposite who are not prepared to defend their own area, let me say that actions in countries to the north of Australia are a very serious threat to this country. I have said in this House before that unless strong and positive action is taken now to develop population and to attract industry to that part of Queensland, the safety of the rest of the Commonwealth is very glaringly in danger.

In relation to the suggested closure of the railway workshops at Cairns—which I have no doubt will happen after the next election if the Government is lucky enough to defeat the Australian Labour Party—as a result of a threat and fear complex operating against railway men in this State, since January, 51 men in the Cairns workshops have either retired or been transferred to other parts of the State. Fear that their security was in danger forced a number of those men to retire from the railways. Others were offered transfers to other parts of the State at reduced status. Yet today in the workshops at Cairns, where there is work to be done, there are not enough men to do it and it has been transferred to other workshops.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member will confine his remarks to the amendment. I do not see that the Cairns workshops have anything to do with the building of a power-house in Central Queensland.

**Mr. WALLACE:** The amendment also mentions serving the needs of secondary industry generally. I hold that that covers anything in Queensland, or Far Northern Queensland. Much has been said by hon. members opposite about the development of Far Northern Queensland but I suggest that nothing has been done so far by them in that direction. Any project of importance that has been initiated was initiated by the Australian Labour Party when they were in office.

Some comment has been made on what is happening in Far Northern Queensland because of the Tinaroo Falls Dam and the Tully Falls hydro-electric scheme. Much has also been said about the tobacco industry, and the hon. member for Tablelands had the temerity to say that that is a classic example of what can be done with a sympathetic Federal Government. Let me say that that claim is completely off the beam, because the present Federal Government has never been sympathetic to Queensland. Hon. members opposite—and Ministers in particular—know that that is true. How much money has the Federal Government lent

the Queensland Government towards the creation of those great projects—the Tinaroo Falls Dam Scheme and the Tully Falls hydro-electric scheme—which have been of such tremendous advantage to Queensland? Not one penny! Those schemes were financed from State funds, and no consideration has been extended to this State by the colleagues of hon. members opposite in the Federal sphere.

The Australian Labour Party can claim a good deal of credit for the success of the tobacco industry. If it had not been for the activities of the A.L.P. in this State there would not have been any irrigation scheme and the tobacco industry would not have advanced to the stage it has reached today. You know, Mr. Speaker, as do all hon. members, that, prior to the advent of the Tinaroo Falls Dam scheme, the tobacco industry was stagnating and did not look as though it would ever prosper. With the advent of that scheme, of course, the industry has made great strides. The towns of Mareeba and Dimbulah are concrete evidence of the great strides that have been made as a result of the initiation of the Tinaroo Falls Dam scheme. There is no doubt that the Tully Falls hydro-electric scheme, too, has been of tremendous value to Far Northern Queensland and to Queensland as a whole.

The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition seeks financial aid from the Commonwealth Government for the establishment of a coal-fired power-house in Central Queensland to serve the complete processing and refining requirements of Comalco's production of the State's bauxite deposits, and also to serve the needs of secondary industry generally. I think we can go much farther than that in the field of secondary industry. The State's coal resources should be utilised not only for the purpose of creating secondary industries but also to electrify completely the State's railways. I think that will occur before many years have passed.

**Mr. Sullivan:** What do you think of the grazing industry in North Queensland?

**Mr. WALLACE:** The hon. member does not want to come in too strongly on that matter. Although I know a number of graziers in Queensland, many of whom are very fine people, I will not go back on the statement I made in the House the other day about the people who went in and scabbed on the meat-workers in North Queensland. In the main the people who work in those meatworks are very responsible citizens, as are also the people who work on the wharves for whom the hon. member for Tablelands has no time. I have been a member of the A.M.I.E.U. and I challenge anybody in the House to go outside and make the statements that have been made in this Chamber about me and some of my friends subscribing to the brand of politics with which those people seem to want to associate us. I

challenge any one of them. I am, and always have been, very proud of the actions of the members of that union.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. WALLACE:** I do not want hon. members opposite to come in on this. I do not want to be thrown out of the House again. Of necessity, that is what will happen if they come into this.

I was brought to heel the other night when I was speaking about Comalco and the development of the bauxite deposits, nevertheless I want to make the definite statement now that the members of the Australian Labour Party are greatly concerned about the development of the bauxite deposits. In view of what is happening and what has been stated in the Press, I had every right to say that there was a strong indication that Queensland's bauxite deposits, particularly those at Weipa, were to be developed purely on an export basis. We have the right to advise the people of Queensland that they should be gravely concerned with what is to happen there. I draw the attention of the House again to statements made here by the hon. member for Burdekin. He said—

"The Minister would be remiss if he was convinced that aluminium could be produced in Queensland and allowed it to be produced elsewhere."

I agree very strongly with that.

He went on to say—

"Nobody in this State can say that the Minister could insist that the alumina should be converted into aluminium in Queensland under existing conditions."

He also said—

"Can anyone else in Queensland show us how aluminium can be produced at a price that will enable it to be sold on world markets in competition with other companies selling it? Until they do we cannot insist upon the company doing something that would send it broke after the first year of operation.

"No-one has yet come forward, so far as I know, to prove that this aluminium could be produced in Queensland at a price to sell in competition on the world market."

They would simply say, "We will close down our operations altogether", and our bauxite and alumina would not be processed. I take that as an indication that the hon. member at least is another man who is of the opinion that these matters must be closely watched. As another State is interested in the processing of aluminium, I strongly support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition in stressing the need for a coal-fired powerhouse in Central Queensland.

I believe the aluminium should be processed in Queensland, for Queensland. I am not concerned about its export. I am concerned that the whole of the development of the bauxite fields could be made purely on an export basis to the great detriment of the people of Queensland and Queensland itself. It is useless and futile for anyone to suggest that we are not in total agreement on the development of Queensland. We are Queenslanders. I believe most of us were born in Queensland, and even if we were not, we are still prepared to fight for the development of the assets of this State. If we were not, we would not be in this House.

I am concerned about protecting this State of Queensland as far as possible, and especially am I concerned about protecting the people of Far Northern Queensland. It is true that the hon. member for Mourilyan and I knew for years what conditions were like in that part of the country. We had towns of some hundreds or thousands of people, with businesses equal to those in Brisbane today. However, when the bottom fell out of the mineral industries of Queensland, development declined and there was a serious drop in the population of Far Northern Queensland.

**Mr. Dewar:** Tell us about Mungana.

**Mr. WALLACE:** I suggest that the hon. member read some of the past "Hansards" and newspapers to enlighten himself on what happened with Mungana. Despite the fact that certain things were alleged to have happened at Mungana, the people who were alleged to have been implicated were found not guilty. Once a man is found not guilty in a court of law, he ceases to have any stigma attached to his character.

**Mr. Hanlon:** It was not a closed inquiry, such as this Government holds.

**Mr. WALLACE:** It was a completely open inquiry. Two of the people who were allegedly implicated in the Mungana scandal served this State, and Australia, well and truly. Ted Theodore, who had aspersions cast on his name, is considered to have been one of the greatest Treasurers that the Commonwealth has ever seen, so that it is no use throwing mud at people like him, and, in the process, throwing it at people like me in this House.

We will debate anything with hon. members opposite, and we will give them our support if they are doing something in the interests of Queensland. So far, however, this Government has proved to the people of Queensland, and to me, that it has done nothing of a worth-while nature. It has done nothing for North Queensland. It is killing that part of Australia by the legislation it is bringing down. It is definitely trying to kill the North by accepting the recommendations of an overseas company.

At 2.15 p.m.,

*In accordance with Sessional Order, the House proceeded with Government business.*

CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING SOCIETIES  
ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

**Hon. O. O. MADSEN** (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Forestry): 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 Co-operative Housing Societies Acts, 1958 to 1961, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

PROPOSAL TO REVOKE DECLARATION  
OF LAND AS NATIONAL PARK  
RESERVE

CAPE CONWAY NATIONAL PARK

Debate resumed from 19 September (see p. 512) on Mr. Madsen's motion—

“(1) That this House agrees that the proposal by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration as a National Park of so much of Reserve for National Park R. 227, Parishes of Conway and Molle as is comprised in all that piece or part thereof as described herein commencing at a point on high-water mark on Shute Bay, Parish of Conway, County of Herbert, about 1 chain 50 links south of the 32,100 foot centre line peg on the Airlie-Shute Harbour Road, thence by a line bearing north about 5 chains, by lines bearing generally easterly and about 5 chains distant from high-water mark, about 57 chains, thence by lines bearing north about 75 chains, 320 degrees about 20 chains, 270 degrees about 5 chains, 194 degrees about 20 chains, 265 degrees about 20 chains, 290 degrees about 20 chains, 330 degrees about 20 chains, and 57 degrees about 17 chains to high-water mark on Swamp Bay, thence by high-water mark easterly, southerly and westerly to the point of commencement, and containing an area of about 580 acres, be carried out.

“(2) That Mr. Speaker convey a copy of this resolution to the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry for submission to His Excellency the Governor in Council.”

**Mr. WALSH** (Bundaberg) (2.18 p.m.): Yesterday I said that during the debate some amazing comments had come from both sides of the House. I was somewhat startled at the frank admission by the hon. member for Mackay that the A.L.P.—the Parliamentary Labour Party—had decided to support the Minister's motion.

**Mr. Lloyd:** Did he say that?

**Mr. WALSH:** I suggest that the hon. gentleman look at the proof of “Hansard”.

**Mr. Lloyd:** He said it with a great deal of reservation.

**Mr. WALSH:** Only one principle is involved, that is, the excision of 580 acres of land. A.L.P. members said they had some

misgivings about it; nevertheless they supported the motion. They are either for it or against it. I hope I make it perfectly clear before I sit down that I am in complete opposition to the proposal as submitted.

The Minister has pointed out that it is proposed to excise 580 acres from an area of 48,640 acres. That does not seem large—if 1,000 acres were to be excised it would probably be said that it was not a great area having regard to the total area—but I am concerned about the principle. Since this Government has been in power the Minister has had to bring down proposals that have had for their objective the doing away with substantial national park areas. Knowing his interest in the preservation of flora and fauna, I cannot understand how he could have allowed members of his party, or outsiders, to persuade him that this would be beneficial and in the interests of national-park development in this State.

**Mr. Lloyd:** Don't you think it is important as to whether the Government holds control of this land—that it does not relinquish control?

**Mr. WALSH:** The Government has control of it now to the extent that an area of 48,000 acres has been declared a national park. No part of it can be alienated without the approval of Parliament. Of course, the Government has complete control of it, but we are getting to the position that we say we do not care if the Government comes in and takes 100 or 500 or 1,000 acres according to the finicky attitude of some people who want to settle themselves on the sides of hills overlooking the sea, and so on. If that attitude is being adopted in this case, I do not know what will become of the national parks policy. I remember the action of a Labour Government back in 1936, after very careful appraisal of the various scenic areas throughout the State and on the advice of qualified officers in the Department of Forestry, whose life has been given in service to the retention of State forests and so on, and their development by re-forestation. Now we have suddenly come to the position where the representative of a particular electorate can come in and push the Government, or the Minister, about and get him to agree to excise an area to make provision in the first place for 100 allotments.

**Mr. Gaven:** He would take a bit of pushing!

**Mr. WALSH:** I know that in certain circumstances the Minister would offer considerable physical resistance, and that, if the hon. member for South Coast endeavoured to push him about in those circumstances, he would come off worse.

This proposal gives some cause for concern. There could be no objection to the excision of any part of any national park area for the purpose of constructing roads and amenities for the public who may wish to visit it, bringing their families for picnics and outings at week-ends. I have no complaint about that and none about the excision

of certain areas in localities such as this for the building of boatsheds and similar facilities. They are all part of recreation amenities required for tourist development so that sightseers can come from Proserpine or elsewhere to enjoy themselves.

However, when we reach the stage of regarding any parts of these national parks as merely residential areas, we must take a more serious view of it. In justification of the proposal submitted, the Minister said, "Only 100 acres will be used, but because we do not want maps showing 5 acres here, 10 acres there, and 25 acres somewhere else, we want 580 acres." Does that not convey to all hon. members in this Chamber that this looks to be, as it were, a bits-and-pieces development, with a little settlement in one part of the 100 acres, another in another part, and yet another, different from the other two, in another part?

**Mr. Madsen:** That is all that is possible.

**Mr. WALSH:** I agree entirely with the Minister that that is all that is possible in the area, because of the terrain and the nature of the country. It will not be what might be called an orderly development of the area, but a series of small satellite residential areas. I do not suppose that it is our problem, but I do not see why we here should be put in the position of agreeing to a proposal that will place a local authority in the position of having to levy ratepayers to provide road access to each of those residential settlements. The Minister acknowledges that that access will be very difficult; he and I are not in disagreement on that. That, in itself, conveys to me that the area is so difficult that it does not lend itself to normal residential development.

I know that there may be a few people from Proserpine and Mackay who are interested, but I do not think that there will be very many people outside those places particularly keen on buying freehold allotments in this area. There was a suggestion by the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, in reply to an observation of an hon. member of the official Opposition, that this was an opportunity for the honest working man to get his allotment and live there. What stupidity! How many working-class people could, in the first place, find the money to buy an allotment—it is suggested that the competition for them will be keen—and, secondly, build a house there? The number would be very small indeed. The majority of them are more interested in getting security in their jobs, which will enable them to pay off the houses they have bought, or pay the rent of the houses in which they are living, and provide the wherewithal to keep their families alive. An argument of that type sounds silly when it is advanced by the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation in justifying the introduction of a proposal that lays the foundation of a more expansive Government policy of desecrating national parks throughout the State.

I think hon. members have reason to be concerned, also, with the views expressed by the hon. member for Whitsunday. Not for one moment would I suggest that he does not know the area. He knows it much better than I do, because he has lived there for many years. But at least I can say that I have seen it, and a friend of mine and of the hon. member for Cook, Bert Hallam, who called on me today, knows the area very well, as the hon. member for Whitsunday knows. Remembering the wide tract of country along the coastline that is suitable for residential subdivision and suitable for agriculture or other rural activities, it is difficult to understand the statement of the hon. member for Whitsunday that he did not care where it was, if 100 acres could be excised from any national park he would be quite satisfied as long as the timber was cleared and the land was growing something. I think the Premier should have a talk with the hon. member for Whitsunday, because if he is putting forward the Government's point of view there is little hope for the preservation of our national parks.

**Mr. Davies:** All the Government.

**Mr. WALSH:** The hon. member for Maryborough says, "All the Government." I am not going to judge that situation, because after hearing the attitude adopted by the A.L.P. on this question I am sure that the National Parks Association will be after its scalp just as much as it is after the Government's scalp. The A.L.P. will get no change out of that one. But it was amazing to hear a Country Party member get up in the House and say, "I don't care. Make any land available as long as it will grow spuds and pumpkins, or even billy-goat weed, or a few flowers." He does not care as long as it is growing something.

To compare a country such as the U.S.A., which has a population of 180,000,000, with a State that has a population of 1,500,000 shows an irresponsible approach. As members of Parliament, we should ensure that the natural features of the land are preserved for the people who will live here hundreds of years after us. If we reached the stage where we were dependent upon the utilisation of national parks for the purpose of feeding a starving population, we should have to face up to the realities of the situation and make the national parks available. But I hope we are a long way away from that. The comparison of the hon. member for Whitsunday with the U.S.A. serves no useful purpose here, because we are in charge of the natural assets and natural resources of the State and we must ensure that future generations can say that the legislators of today did their job well.

When the hon. member for Whitsunday was asked how far the little township of Airlie was from Shute Harbour, he said, to use his own words, "From 5½ to 6 miles." What a frightful distance to travel in a

motor-car on a bitumen road! If that township is developed and there are freehold lands there, why cannot all these particular residential sites be encouraged round the township of Airlie, which is such a short distance from Shute Harbour?

The Government cannot find any justification for its action from that point of view. I concede that from the point of view of the establishment of boat-sheds, caravan parks, and tourist parking areas that would enable the humble people to travel with their families from Proserpine and to park their cars at this spot, there is justification for the excision of part of the area. However, we would then be making the facilities available to people who cannot afford to buy these freehold areas or build homes in the locality.

The hon. member for Whitsunday drew an absurd comparison between this area and Mackay Harbour. There is no relationship whatever between the two areas. He went on to talk about shops and cafes and the 20 or 30 residences that were built at Mackay Harbour. That is perfectly true, but he did not tell the House—in any case most hon. members would know it—that all that happened at Mackay Harbour was that some sand-dunes were pushed over and levelled to enable the building of these facilities—a cafeteria for people who visited the area, including waterside-workers—and residences for the officials associated with the bulk-loading facilities. None of the natural vegetation had to be destroyed. As I say, a heap of sand was pushed over and put in the right place so that those buildings could be erected.

I can see no justification for this proposal and I hope that the Government, in the future, will resist these agitations that develop in areas—whether they come from local authorities, chambers of commerce, or any other source—to make any part of our national parks available for residential purposes.

Going further south—although, I take it, still in the hon. member's electorate—to lovely spots along the coast like Newry and Seaforth, with their lovely beaches, it is a strange thing that no development has taken place in those areas. But because some people want to pick this choice little spot overlooking Shute Harbour so that they can have it to themselves for future residential purposes, the area is to be excised from a national park. It does not in any way serve the great majority of the people of Proserpine—it does not lend any great facility to tourists going into the area—so what is the justification for proceeding with the proposal? As I say, there are many thousands of acres that could be made available for residential purposes within reasonable distance of this place, without in any way tampering with the scenic aspects of Shute Harbour.

Going further down the coast, as the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity must know, there are lovely little spots like Hillsborough overlooking the sea. They are beautiful spots, but that does not justify the Government in pursuing this policy. If the Minister could say, "A very considerable proportion of this area lends itself to agricultural development, and could play a big part in the economy of the nation", there might be some justification for it. But that is not so.

I know that the Minister agrees that the very difficult nature of the country is such that it lends itself to nothing more than exploitation by the man who can afford, firstly, to buy the freehold, and secondly, to build a house. He did not indulge in the silly rubbish spoken by the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, who spoke about working-class men being given a chance to get these allotments. The Minister for Agriculture and Forestry has studied the map before him. He knows only too well that it is not an area in which working-class people are likely to take an interest. If there is any proposal for the development of Shute Harbour it should be on the basis of caravan parks and other facilities that are pertinent to tourist development in national parks. This sort of thing has come up too frequently in the House. From now on I sincerely hope that the Government will adopt the attitude that it will resist any pressure, particularly in respect of the Whitsunday Passage area, that will lead to further desecration of large areas of national park.

Somehow or other I think that the Minister is not happy about the proposal. (Government laughter.) I think I know the Minister well enough to realise that he takes a great interest in the State's natural assets. As Minister for Agriculture and Forestry the obligation is on him to see that none of these areas—large or small—is destroyed. The hon. member for Whitsunday spoke about the wallabies, snakes, and goannas on an area of 400 acres that he knew. All that is perfectly true, but I am just wondering what is going to happen to the wallabies, snakes, and goannas in the brigalow belt when the bulldozers start operating. I am very serious in my opposition to the proposal, so much so that I intend to divide the House on it.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE** (Bowen) (2.38 p.m.): The Minister's motion has turned out to be very important. It includes a principle that has been hotly criticised by the previous speaker. The debate has disclosed some peculiar thinking on the part of hon. members opposite. It has brought to light something that I intend to criticise very strongly at a later stage. I refer to the use of pressure tactics by an outside body in an attempt to bring influence on a matter on which it is the prerogative of Parliament to decide. We are dealing with an area of land containing almost 50,000 acres, bordering and almost surrounding an inlet known as Shute Harbour. I have known the area for 30 years.

I have sailed along the shores and landed on its beaches. The great difficulty associated with the area has always been the inability to take advantage of its beauty. That was because the only way of approaching it was by boat. People could not stay there. They had to rush back to Cannon Valley or Mackay to get extra petrol and food if they wanted to stay there more than a day or two. The attitude of some speakers in this regard reminds me of the person who owns a valuable jewel and keeps it locked up in a bank vault. After all, what is the basic use of national parks? It is to preserve some natural beauty—some particular sector of the Australian bush or countryside—and we should provide facilities for the people to enjoy it.

The area to which the Shute Harbour Road was built was a closed book to everybody. Not many people were able to get there to admire its beauty. The Minister's efforts have been to open up this huge area not only to the local people and neighbouring people, but also to people in other parts of Queensland and Australia, so that they can enjoy the beauties of Whitsunday Passage. Surely the cost of 500-odd acres is a small price to pay for opening up this area. In addition, the Minister proposes to add another 1,000 acres of much more scenic countryside.

The Shute Harbour area is the southern end of the Coral Coast, which runs approximately from the mouth of the Proserpine River to the northern headland of Port Denison, where I live. Included in this coastline and the neighbouring islands is most of the more beautiful part of what is known as the Barrier Reef region.

This harbour was developed to enable the less wealthy people to go in and see something that is unique. In addition to approximately 38,000 tourists a year, since the building of the harbour and the construction of the road many hundreds of local people have taken advantage of being able to go there. Every Sunday, hundreds of cars can be seen there. It is a very popular drive from my own town. It is also a popular drive from Proserpine and Mackay, and even from as far away as Ayr. Many working people nowadays have their own boats, which they take with them on trailers. Many of these people stay in the area Saturday night and all day Sunday. As there is no properly organised camping area, there is a great danger of unregulated fires getting out of control and destroying some of this carefully preserved area.

**Mr. Aikens:** How will the establishment of a township stop that?

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** All the speakers and the interjectors seem to be labouring under a grave misapprehension as to the type of development that is to take place there. The hon. member for Whitsunday outlined some of the applications. By far the

majority—something over 100—were for boatshed sites. The people who make use of the waters adjoining the national park would like to keep their boats there to save taking them to and from their homes and running the risk of damaging them. Other developments will include the ordinary little shops to supply visitors to Shute Harbour, as in other little beach and tourist resorts up and down the coast. There you can buy food and petrol and get your supplies of hot water and all the other little things that go to make the enjoyment of a picnic area just so much better.

The Minister has made very clear the nature of this country. I know that some of the previous speakers—the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Mackay, and the hon. member for Bundaberg—have visited this place. They know that the area proposed to be excised is a type of Australian countryside of which there are thousands and thousands of square miles. There is nothing about it of a beauty peculiar to a national park. It is just a bit of Australian bush, and the Minister has been very careful in meeting the need to provide amenities in the area and to increase its usefulness by deliberately choosing the site.

I should like now to refer to some of the comments of previous speakers. The Leader of the Opposition admitted that he had visited the place and had carefully inspected it in the company of local residents who could show him very clearly the benefits to be derived. With some reluctance and reservation he agreed that what the Minister has put forward was sensible, sane, and sound.

I agree with the hon. member for Bundaberg that one is either for or against such a proposal. One should not be a reluctant dragon about it. As he has inspected the place, I do not see any reason for his reluctance to give the proposal whole-hearted support.

So with the hon. member for Mackay, who also viewed the area closely in company with the hon. member for Whitsunday and me. I am sure he can have no doubt that the area to be excised will not in any way damage the beauties of the national park—it is a suitable area to provide these amenities—and yet he says it is under pressure that he supports the Minister. I am quite sure that he is thoroughly in favour of it, and I cannot understand why he should qualify his approbation with this reference to pressure.

The hon. member for Bundaberg criticised quite severely the hon. member for Whitsunday, within whose area this national park is. In particular, he made a great mouthful of the fact that the hon. member for Whitsunday mentioned the possibility of two small agricultural farms. The hon. member for Bundaberg exaggerated that statement until, listening to him, we felt that here was opening a vista of a large new agricultural settlement. He did say that he was in favour

of caravan parks, motels, picnic places, look-outs for sightseers, and boatsheds. Indeed, that is the sort of thing that will go to make up this area.

As the Minister has pointed out, the amount of land on which it is possible to build houses is very limited. It consists of 2 acres here, 3 acres there, and so on. To speak of the filching of large areas of residential land for the fortunate few able to afford it, to the disadvantage of the poor working-man who is not able to share in the provision of these amenities, is, of course, quite absurd, especially to those who know the area.

**Mr. Walsh:** You get the Minister to confirm that it is not available for residential development. You will not do that.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I am sure that the whole reason behind the backing and filling by hon. members on the opposite side, and the hon. member for Bundaberg, is that they froze this land as a national park in 1936, and, come hell or high water, it should stay frozen. It does not matter what changes take place in the world of tourism or enjoyment; these national parks are reserved areas, sacrosanct and petrified in the state that they were in in 1936. I am afraid that very often we get indications that this attitude controls a good deal of their thinking on other matters. It is just another indication of the classification of their thinking.

Reference has been made to the fact that people who want to use Shute Harbour should not live six miles away at a place called Airlie. I just do not know why they stop at Airlie, because two or three miles closer to Proserpine is Cannon Valley. If it is to be said, "Why stay at Airlie? Why not stay at Cannon Valley?" why should we not go the whole hog and say, "If you want to use Shute Harbour, you should live at Proserpine," because it is not many miles from Cannon Valley. After all, the reason for opening up all these places is to make it possible for people to enjoy themselves there. Time is limited at week-ends, and people want to get to the place of enjoyment as quickly as possible so that they can spend as long as possible there. I do not know why the suggestion should be limited to people living at Airlie and should not include those living at Cannon Valley or Proserpine.

I want to deal now with what is, to me, a very serious development in the excision of small portions of national parks. I believe, as I am sure all hon. members do, that it is the duty of Parliament to consider very carefully every matter that comes before it and for members to make up their minds on the facts presented and on their knowledge of the particular subject, and arrive at a decision according to their own good judgment. In this case, hon. members have been bombarded with circulars from the National Parks Association and with letters from

people of whom we have never heard in an attempt to pressurise us in our consideration of this particular matter. I shall refer to the source of this pressurisation and read from a circular that was distributed by the National Parks Association, part of which was referred to yesterday by the hon. member for Whitsunday. In the circular, every member of the National Parks Association is called upon, as his or her duty, to write a letter of protest to, or phone, his local State member of Parliament. I have no quarrel with that, because I believe that every constituent has a right to make submissions to his member of Parliament.

**Mr. Walsh:** At least the Association has you on the defensive.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I am not on the defensive; I am on the attack. Members of the Association are called upon to write letters to the editors of "The Courier-Mail" and of their local newspapers—and I have no quarrel with a person who likes to see his name at the bottom of a letter in "The Courier-Mail" writing to the newspapers. The circular then asks them to urge all their friends and interested organisations to do the same, and goes on to say—

"Public reaction is gauged by newspapers from the volume of letters received on matters of public interest. Even if your letter is one of those not published it will serve a good purpose."

Where are we getting to when an organisation deliberately attempts to influence public opinion by a carefully-organised spate of letters to the newspapers? It is an attempt to get public opinion behind the particular barrow that the Association is pushing, an attempt that is not based on facts or on the justice or strength of its case. It is a carefully organised attempt to pressurise members of Parliament. I object to being pressurised. I know that members of the Opposition are used to it, but I for one will uphold the independence of members of Parliament in studying each matter that is put before us and in arriving at a conclusion. I regard this action as reprehensible. This Association may be a very worthy body, but it is self-appointed. We are an elected body of people who have to account to our constituents for our actions, just as the Proserpine Shire Council and its members, who are also elected and who supported this decision, have to justify their actions. For a self-appointed body to go to the length of pressurising this Parliament, I believe, and state quite openly, is completely reprehensible. I hope that the Minister will take note of that particular point.

**Mr. Davies:** What action do you suggest should be taken?

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** If this organisation is merely misguided, as I believe it is, it should take note of the attitude of at least one member of the Parliament to its pressure tactics.

**Mr. LLOYD** (Kedron) (3.1 p.m.): Many comments have been made on this matter but the Leader of the Opposition gave the House a very clear definition of the attitude towards it of the Australian Labour Party Opposition. I think he gave a reasonable survey of all matters and circumstances that would be involved if the Government were to excise this area of 580 acres from a national park area.

I do not think it is essential to go through all his remarks, nor do I think it is necessary for me to repeat many of his statements. However, I will say that many people in this country have perhaps a false impression of what national park areas were originally meant to be.

I believe that national parks were originally so declared for a specific purpose, namely, to protect flora and fauna and the natural beauty of a site from any encroachment by private enterprise, or people operating for profit. I think if we maintain that principle we will be protecting the real and basic principle in the establishment of national parks.

Another reason for their establishment was that history has proved that in many countries of the world the destruction of trees has brought with it the destruction of the land itself. In many cases the land itself, not only its beauty, has been completely destroyed. That is a point that must be considered.

I have some objection to the manner in which this proposal has been presented by the Minister in comparison with the presentation of a similar proposal in relation to Hayman Island. On that occasion we at least had the advantage of having before us the opinions of many public servants, including the Conservator of Forests, who were concerned in the matter.

**Mr. Madsen:** If you had been here yesterday you would not make that statement.

**Mr. LLOYD:** On that occasion we had documents before us. On this occasion we have no authority or opinion. All we have is the Minister's speech. On the previous occasion we had before us documents giving the opinions of the Conservator of Forests and of many other people.

**Mr. Walsh:** In fairness to the Minister, I think he was quite open and frank. He said that a committee had reported.

**Mr. LLOYD:** I agree that he was frank. I think he is always open and frank in matters that are debated.

**Mr. Madsen:** I quoted the essentials yesterday.

**Mr. LLOYD:** I agree, but at the same time quotations are not in the same category as the documentary evidence that was produced on the previous occasion.

The hon. member for Bundaberg said that we on this side were in support of the motion. Never at any time have we supported the excision of land from a national park area which would destroy its real purpose. We will never do that. On the other hand, we are vitally concerned with the development of the State. We are vitally concerned with whether there is merit or demerit in any proposal that is put forward. We endeavour to keep an open mind.

**Mr. Aikens:** You are having two bob each way?

**Mr. LLOYD:** Not at all. On the previous occasion there was obviously the handing over of a large area to a very big company—an Australia-wide company, a more or less Government-created monopoly. I refer, of course, to Ansett-A.N.A. In that case we argued against the excision of land from a national park. As I have already said, the real purpose behind the creation of national parks is the retention of the natural beauty of the State's flora and fauna. At that time it was a matter of handing over an area of land to a large company. I think we were entitled to argue against it. We opposed the proposal violently and voted against it. On this occasion we have to consider what is right and what is wrong. What is the proposal on this occasion? Firstly, 800 or 900 acres are to be included in the national park reserve. Secondly, 580 acres, which sounds a great deal to me, is to be excised from it. Our argument is not so much against its excision but that it is taken from the control of the Conservator of Forests and apparently handed over to the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation. Am I right in that?

**Mr. Madsen:** Yes.

**Mr. LLOYD:** The simple question is not what is to happen to the land but whether, for developmental purposes, it should be taken away from the administration of the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry and handed over to the tender mercies of the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation.

**Mr. Madsen:** That is in accordance with the Act.

**Mr. LLOYD:** It is in accordance with the Act, but what happens to the land after it is handed over to the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation is dependent on Government policy. Never at any time would anyone on this side consider that land that is excised from a national park, part of the beauty and valuable assets of the State, should be handed over to private enterprise for profit-making purposes. Never at any time would we consider or agree to that. On this occasion the argument has been put forward that the land will be used to create a tourist attraction. The hon. member for Bundaberg said that he would have no argument at all against the excision of the land if it were used for developmental purposes, whether it was for growing produce or any other industrial purpose—

**Mr. Walsh** interjected.

**Mr. LLOYD:** I do not think there is any great argument about this matter. The hon. member for Bundaberg said that if this land was to be taken from the control of the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry and used for developmental purposes, either for growing crops or for any industrial or manufacturing concern, he would have no argument against it.

**Mr. Walsh:** I am not in favour of anything being excised for manufacturing and industrial purposes.

**Mr. LLOYD:** Let me take from my argument reference to manufacturing and industrial purposes. I think the hon. member for Bundaberg said that he was not against the utilisation of this land for the construction of roads. I shall mention a few of the uses the hon. member for Bundaberg stated. He mentioned boatsheds, roads, and several other purposes. He said he would have no argument against those uses, but has he any argument against the construction of motels and hotels?

**Mr. Walsh:** Yes.

**Mr. LLOYD:** Our argument is that you cannot differentiate between whether it is for the growing of crops or for other developmental purposes. If you have an industry that is of some advantage to the State—the tourist industry—and that is helping to develop the State, what is the difference between that industry and some other industry that might be postulated as an industry that is helping to develop Queensland? On this occasion the Minister came forward with a plausible argument on the development of the tourist industry in this area.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. Aikens:** A shocking exhibition from a former Speaker.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** If the hon. member for Brisbane continues to talk in a very loud voice—

**Mr. Mann:** I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, but I was not speaking.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** The hon. member has been continuously talking on the front bench.

**Mr. Mann:** I beg your pardon, but I was not speaking.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** The hon. member has been talking to members on the back bench.

**Mr. Mann:** I beg your pardon, but I was listening to the people on the back bench.

**Mr. LLOYD:** The hon. member for Bundaberg said that the construction of roads and the provision of amenities, so that families could enjoy the tourist attractions at Shute Harbour, would get a favourable reception from him.

The Minister told us what is to happen to the 580 acres. The method of the use to which that 580 acres is put could be a matter for argument between members of the Opposition and himself and members of the Government. It has been said that part of the land will be sold on a freehold basis and used as residential sites. Possibly a lot of the land could be used for the construction of businesses to provide the amenities about which the hon. member for Bundaberg spoke.

We on this side of the House do not believe that if land is taken from a national park reserve it should be used for freehold purposes. We believe that where land is excised—this is not contained in the motion but it is the policy of the Government—and is at the tender mercies of the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, who can decide the nature of its tenure—

**Mr. Aikens:** That is a puerile quibble, and you know it.

**Mr. LLOYD:** It is not puerile. If there is to be some gain to the State by the excision of this land, I urge the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry to discuss the matter with his colleagues, and insist that when he loses control of land to the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, the Government retain full control over it. In the past we have seen many cases where private enterprise has taken over land from the Crown and used it for profit-making, destroying all its beauty in the process. That could happen here. If the Government retained control and gave conditional leases to people wishing to develop tourist resorts, I would have no argument against it. At least the Government would retain full control.

**Mr. Walsh:** The local authority should have control of those lands to provide the amenities.

**Mr. LLOYD:** This is purely and simply transferring the control of the land from the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry to the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation. It then becomes Government policy as to what it intends to do with the land when the Minister for Public Lands controls it, and when it is excised from the national park. The Government has the full responsibility, once the land is taken over by the Minister for Public Lands, to ensure that none of its beauty is destroyed and that all existing attractions are retained. The only way to do that is to grant a special lease to those who want to exploit the tourist attractions of the spot, whether they want to use it for residential purposes, for business purposes, for the creation of tourist amenities, or for building boatsheds. That would ensure that the tenure remains under the strict control of the Government and that none of its beauty is desecrated, to use the word of the hon. member for Bundaberg. If control is relinquished, the responsibility rests with the Minister and the Cabinet.

**Mr. Campbell:** What is the difference between freehold land at Conway Park and freehold land at Everton Park?

**Mr. LLOYD:** Everton Park was never a national park. I do not know how many national parks the hon. member for Aspley has visited, but I should like to see Everton Park a national park. It could make quite a beauty spot in Brisbane with Kedron Brook flowing through it and with a weir constructed by the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation—that could come about—but we are talking about existing national parks. While we have this land declared a national park, a beauty spot and a scenic area with tourist potential, the Government should maintain strict control and supervision of any tenure granted over it when it is transferred to the Minister for Public Lands. If the Government fails to retain that control and allows it to be desecrated, it must accept responsibility for it. Meanwhile it is up to the Minister for Public Lands and the Government to determine what happens to the land on transfer. There is ample opportunity for the Government under its land policy to retain full control and supervision; if it fails, it is answerable to the people of Queensland.

**Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (3.19 p.m.):** In this debate we have heard a typical example of casuistry, sophistry, and dissimulation from the Opposition. The other day we heard, metaphorically speaking, the Leader of the Opposition running all over the place like a piccaninny with a tummy-ache. Today we heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Kedron, say that he opposed, and his party opposed, the transfer of land from a national park at Hayman Island to Ansett-A.N.A. Incidentally, so did I, just as I am going to oppose this. "But," he said, "we opposed that motion because the land was to be transferred to one particular exploiter. We, the Labour Party, are in favour of this particular measure, however, because the land is to be transferred to a group of exploiters." He went on to develop the argument that the Labour Party was quite happy with the measure as long as the Minister for Public Lands, to whom the land was to be handed over, granted only perpetual leases, because his party is opposed to freehold tenure. I remind the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that much of the land handed over to Ansett-A.N.A. on Hayman Island was perpetual lease, and he opposed that.

**Mr. Lloyd:** No.

**Mr. AIKENS:** Yes. Only a portion was freehold; much of it was perpetual lease. In the years that I have been in this Chamber I have always made my position abundantly clear. With commendable brevity, I have always stated clearly and unequivocally where I stood. I am opposed to this measure because I believe in the sanctity of national parks. I am not in the least convinced by any resolution carried by

the Proserpine Shire Council, or any other local authority. I served for many years on local authorities in this State and I know the ease with which they can succumb to the influence of pressure groups. I am not suggesting that the Proserpine Shire Council has succumbed to such an influence on this particular matter, but that is quite possible.

What is to happen if this motion is passed? It will be passed, as hon. members of the Australian Labour Party will once again troop across the Chamber to vote with the Tories, as they usually do on any particular measure. If they do not move quickly enough the hon. member for Brisbane will again say, "Get going, mugs," and they will get going as usual.

When this motion is conveyed to the appropriate authority and the land is excised from the national park and handed over, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition so truthfully said, to the tender mercies of the Minister for Public Lands, allotments will be thrown open for selection, probably by perpetual-lease tenure, and on the 580 acres will spring up, as the hon. member for Bowen said, a township of houses, shops, galvanised-iron shanties, sly-grog joints, and all the usual impedimenta of seaside areas.

After all the available allotments have been taken up, does anyone in this Chamber really believe that that will be the end? Sooner or later someone who has missed out on getting an allotment in this township will start an agitation. That agitation will grow and there will be demands for the throwing open of more allotments and, if necessary, the excision of additional land from this national park. These things have a snowballing effect; they never stop.

I ask the hon. member for Brisbane not to leave the Chamber as I shall soon have some comments to make about him.

**Mr. Baxter:** He will be back.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I hope he comes back.

As I say, it will not be long before the 580 acres is found to be quite insufficient for the needs of all who wish to indulge in the exploitation and spoliation of this area of national park.

This has been a remarkable debate. The Australian Labour Party has been having "two bob each way", and it has been all the more remarkable because of some interjections by the hon. member for Brisbane when the hon. member for Bowen was speaking. We all know of the feelings that have existed for many years between the hon. member for Brisbane and the hon. member for Bundaberg, yet we heard the hon. member for Brisbane calling out to the hon. member for Bowen, "Wouldn't you like to have the ability and intelligence of the hon. member for Bundaberg? Wouldn't you like to be as good a man as he is?" I am beginning to wonder if the hon. member for Bundaberg is already halfway back into the Australian Labour Party, or that section

of it that is dominated by the hon. member for Brisbane. I shall not pursue that matter further. I can see you getting ready to call "Order", Mr. Speaker, but I thought I should draw the attention of the House to that amazing exhibition on the part of the hon. member for Brisbane.

**Mr. Thackeray:** What has that to do with the Bill?

**Mr. AIKENS:** It apparently has a lot to do with the hon. member for Brisbane, because he made the interjection; I did not. I did not prompt him to make it or tell him to make it. He made the interjection of his own volition, and I thought I would make a rather temperate comment on it.

**Mr. Dewar:** Does he ever make any interjections that you tell him to make?

**Mr. AIKENS:** No. No-one takes much notice of me. Very few hon. members have to put up with such browbeating and truculence as I am subjected to. Unfortunately, I seem to be rather malleable, and I succumb to that sort of thing.

However, on this motion I can say without hesitation and without equivocation that I am against it. If a division is called for, I propose to vote against it, and I propose to watch with my usual hilarity those who always refer to me as "Tory Tom" trooping across themselves to vote with the Tories.

**Mr. DAVIES** (Maryborough) (3.26 p.m.): We have just heard an example of the cheapest sophistry that one could hear in any Parliament. The statements that were referred to as being made by the hon. member for Brisbane were not made by him.

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

**Mr. Bennett:** You can't cop it when it is your turn.

**Mr. Aikens:** You will have to cop something in a minute, if you don't shut up.

**Mr. Bennett** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. AIKENS:** The hon. member for Maryborough said that I made a mis-statement on the interjections by the hon. member for Brisbane. They were clearly made by him; they were heard by everybody in the House.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I remind the hon. member for Townsville South that the expression "shut up" is not Parliamentary language.

**Mr. Aikens:** I substitute "subside" for the words "shut up".

**Mr. DAVIES:** The hon. member for Bundaberg has indicated in this debate that he is attempting to get some cheap notoriety out of the motion before the House. I ask those who are interested in the debate to read the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in which they will find clearly set out the views of the Opposition on this motion. It is not

necessary that we should agree with everything in the motion; but, looking at it from a broad point of view, in the interests of everybody generally, the Leader and the Deputy Leader have declared that it will receive our support.

I had the privilege recently of seeing the area under discussion and inspecting it very carefully. It is a magnificent tourist area that should become world famous. Although the Barrier Reef is wonderful and is given most of the publicity, not enough is made of the general beauties of the area. In my opinion, the time will come when this area will be world famous and one of the world's greatest tourist playgrounds. Therefore, when a motion such as this comes before us, making provision for the amenities needed to increase the number of people visiting the area, we should consider it very carefully.

I admit that 580 acres sounds rather a big area. Despite the difficulty of the country, I wonder whether the area to be excised could be decreased. At the same time, I realise that it is probably a matter of opinion. The mountains rise almost sheer from the water's edge for several hundred feet, and there is no possibility of building streets, and so on.

The argument used by the hon. member for Bundaberg about the working man buying a seaside allotment is completely haywire, because, as a result of increased valuations, the working man cannot afford to buy a waterfront allotment in any seaside place. Maryborough's seaside resorts have a waterfront of some 8 or 9 miles, recognised as one of the best seaside places in Queensland.

**Mr. WALSH:** I rise to a point of order! The hon. member for Maryborough is obviously endeavouring to misinterpret my remarks. I made no reference to the right being given to working men to buy these allotments; the Minister made that reference and I ridiculed the suggestion.

**Mr. DAVIES:** To complete what I was saying, in the area that I have referred to not one allotment on the whole length of that coastline can be bought by a working man; prices are very much in excess of what working men can afford. That is unfortunate, but it is a different argument and on a different matter.

I simply wanted to add those few remarks to the debate. I do not want to repeat anything put forward by the Leader of the Opposition or his Deputy. Their cases are set out to be read, but I want to emphasise that, although I as an individual member do not wholly agree with some aspects of this proposal, because of the magnificence of this area and its tourist attraction we must view it from an entirely different angle to the acquisition of an area from any other national park.

Following the remarks of the hon. member for Bundaberg, I emphasise that we are conscious of the fact that the area that is to be excised may be rather large, but

if the Government desired to excise any further area it would have to submit the proposal to Parliament—I think I am right in saying that—and the matter would then have to be given further consideration by the Opposition.

Mention was made of the value of the Barrier Reef Association, of which Mr. Brooks is chairman. I must say that that gentleman is doing an excellent job as chairman of the Barrier Reef Association, and when the hon. member for Bowen was speaking I was very interested to note that evidently the opinion of the Association is very highly regarded. On this question, much notice has been taken of their opinion.

For the various reasons mentioned, it is essential to have a settlement at this spot because of the tremendous trade in the several tourist centres involved, but one aspect I did notice was that this Government is not always prepared to take notice of the advice of the Association. I noticed the other day—and this is linked with the same area—that Mr. Brooks protested against the removal of silica sands from Whitehaven Beach solely for monetary gain. He said—

“We consider that this will ruin one of the finest tourist attractions in the Whitsunday area.”

The Government acts on one basis at one point, and, on the other, they are going to ruin one of the finest tourist attractions in the area. No-one can convince me, whether silica sands are taken from below tidal level or otherwise, that it will not ruin that spot. Mr. Brookes has lived in the area for many years and must know what he is talking about and, on behalf of the managers of tourist centres in the area, he condemns the action. I am afraid that that undertaking may be linked with this excision and I hope that the Government will not in any way extend the purpose of this proposal to assist any Japanese interest that may be working in this locality. I can well understand the wounded feelings of Mr. Brooks and others who know the spot best—gentlemen for whose work we must have a great admiration.

We realise that difficult conditions operated at Cannonvale, some 3 miles away from this area where the jetty is to be. We know the jetty was washed away in 1958 and that the northerly winds hit this area and that, in any case, when small boats were taken out—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member seems to be taking us on a tour of the Whitsunday Islands. I ask him to confine his remarks to the amendment before the House.

**Mr. DAVIES:** As a matter of fact, the jetty being washed out was one of the reasons used by the Minister for wanting development at this centre. The jetty was washed away in 1958 during a cyclone. The Opposition realise that that was one of the important points raised by the Minister.

We are aware of the conditions when northerly winds are blowing. This magnificent area is one of the finest in the State and the natural place for the development of the base, which will be of such great assistance. We realise that these magnificent areas in our national parks are of no use to the public unless they are given the opportunity to get into them. Roadways must be built; tracks must be made. Great credit is due to those who have built tracks on some of the islands. Unless one wanted to gamble with his own welfare he would not dare to enter that area at the present time. Therefore something must be done to throw it open so that the people can get to know the area from practical experience, not merely from reading about it in books dealing with the geography of the State. It is essential to have this base.

Personally, I disagree with the Government if it is going to hand over any of this land as freehold. I have no objection to the man in the city owning a freehold block but in the case of land in a national park I hope that full notice will be taken of the remarks of the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I emphasise the comments of the Deputy Leader that he hoped that the Minister would be faithful to the word he had given in the House that every care would be taken of the timber in the area, even in the areas he is going to hand over to any person. There is valuable timber there and we do not want to see it removed. Notice should be taken of every tree that has to be felled, because once a tree is felled rubbish always seems to grow in its place. Every safeguard must be taken to preserve the area in its natural state, apart from the making of the roadways and pathways and the construction of whatever amenities are necessary for the development of what is going to be one of the most famous tourist attractions in the world. For those reasons we are agreeing to 1.2 per cent. of the total area being excised for what we regard as a unique and very wonderful tourist area in this State.

**Mr. MULLER** (Fassifern) (3.38 p.m.): At times it can be said with a good deal of truth that you gain a great many more coupons by remaining silent. No doubt that can be said on this occasion. On the other hand, there are times in your life when your conscience just will not allow you to retain your seat. As perhaps I am the real culprit in this matter and the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry is getting the criticism, I feel it is my duty to give the House the background or the origin of this move. Unfortunately, judging from their remarks, many speakers do not know the locality. The present jetty or harbour—however you might like to refer to it—is between Cannon Valley and Airlie. It is not at Airlie—Airlie is further round the point. If hon. members were there in bad weather—it does not need to be rough weather—I can assure them it would be enough to frighten them.

**Mr. Davies:** What place are you referring to?

**Mr. MULLER:** Where the old jetty was—the one they were using. I have had the experience of unloading passengers off the boat. It was almost impossible to do it. As you were helping the women there was always the danger they would drop into the water. In fact, it happened again and again. In my time as Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation I was shown this beautiful spot at Shute Bay. I could not help but feel the need to do something about it. As hon. members know, funds were limited for work of that kind, but I felt so strongly that I put it to the Government at that time that something should be done quickly. The best use of those island resorts could not be made unless there was a reasonable approach to them, and in the wet season of the year—the autumn months—they closed down for three or four months.

After inspecting the place, I put a proposal to the Government. I am sure that Minister will not mind my saying this, but there were no funds to do the job at that time, and, as I had surplus money in another department, I recommended that that money be used to go on with the job, and suggested at the same time that we might do something about meeting some of the cost, although it would only be a fraction of it, by using some of the land in the area.

Mention has been made of the reason for taking so much land. I did not make up my mind at that time how much land we required. There has been much talk this afternoon about what it will grow and what it will not grow. Most of it will grow rocks, and nothing more. It is just rough country, and you can do nothing with it. You would have to put a surveyor on the job until you made up your mind how much you would take.

Happy Bay is on one side, Shute Harbour on the other, and this point is in the middle. Mention was made, I think by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, of freehold land. There is quite a bit of it around that bay, and if you cut across the point from one bay to the other, over the hills, it would be hard to say how much land you would require until you had actually done the job.

I have the highest regard in the world, and I have tremendous appreciation, for the work done and interest shown by the National Parks Association in jealousy guarding our national parks. The Minister need only mention taking a square yard and they are at him like tigers in an effort to retain it. It is really a question of the conception of what a national park really is. That argument has been advanced this afternoon, but let me mention our national parks. First, take those that are close to our own door. There is the Lamington National Park, and the Cunningham Highway Park. Roads run right alongside them, and officers of the Forestry Department build winding tracks to make it possible for people to gain access to the tops of the mountains.

In that way people get the benefit of a national park, by being permitted to use it and to get about on it.

We have something similar in the Whitsunday Islands. Before anything was done in this matter, I consulted the Barrier Reef Islands Association and it was 100 per cent. behind the proposal. I was told that we could not develop those islands fully until we provided reasonable access to them. What happens on those islands? A small portion of them is held by lessees. They develop part of them. The Forestry Department is cutting tracks on the islands—Lindeman Island, South Molle Island, Long Island—I forget the names of the others, but hon. members know them. They are all of the same order. A small portion of them is reserved for the use of lessees who do the catering and provide amenities for visitors, and these tracks to the mountains are built. If you do not have that township, the amenities and facilities will not be provided, and then nobody would visit the islands. If the tracks are not built, nobody would get the benefit of the parks.

Conway Park contains an area of something like 49,000 acres. Most of it is rough, rugged, and steep. Probably a goat or a snake could not get over much of it, but because of the provision of this road, and the township that will follow in time, people will be able to worm their way into the park and enjoy its beauty.

It has been said that this move will open the way for vandalism. If vandals were going to destroy the parks, why do they not destroy the parks close to Brisbane? I know some people do—some will destroy anything—but the National Parks Association and officers of the Department of Forestry are down on them like a ton of bricks when any damage is done, so, if it is possible to control and administer national parks in other places, it is possible to do so in Conway Park.

One point should not be lost sight of, and I mention it to the members of the National Parks Association, who are good friends of mine. I assure them I will do all I possibly can to assist them in this great objective. But I assure the House that if this proposal had not been handled in the way it has been, there would not have been any road. I was told at that time, "There is nothing wrong with the road but we do not want to sell any land." This afternoon the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, "If you are going to open it up, for heaven's sake do not open it up as freehold but as perpetual lease." There is no difference between perpetual lease and freehold. A perpetual lease goes on for ever and ever exactly the same as freehold.

**Mr. Lloyd:** I said special lease with conditions.

**Mr. MULLER:** There are limitations there, too, I suppose. But all kinds of ideas were thrown into the ring. When I first

took up the matter I had interests in Proserpine and I think it was the Proserpine Shire Council who made the approach, although I would not like to pin it on them because I am speaking more or less from memory. An approach was made at that time, "Now you have got quite a lot of beautiful land on the hillsides and the mountainsides. Why not open up farms of 15 acres and 20 acres? The farmers could grow fruit and vegetables and all that kind of thing." That was turned down flat and activities were confined to the road and a bit of land that might be used for residential purposes. I claim that you cannot make a success of this without provision for people to live there, for holiday-resort facilities and for a take-off point for people to go to the islands. As time goes on, when people visit the place and see for themselves what it means, they will appreciate the wisdom of the move. To try to explain it to people who have never seen it is a different matter altogether.

This proposal is not analagous with that of Hayman Island. I still feel very sore about passing over land on Hayman Island to private interests. I think it was quite wrong. It established a precedent and we could well be obliged to give land to other people in the same way. This is a completely different matter, and the people who are complaining very bitterly now knew right from the outset that this was to be done.

If I had not made that promise, perhaps I would not have risen to speak this afternoon; but I felt it was my duty to give the whole of the facts of the case. Nobody was kept in the dark. People were told. The National Parks Association was told. The Barrier Reef Islands Association was told. The Proserpine Shire Council was told. Everyone interested in the area was told what was intended. If I had remained in office I would have had the job of moving the motion. So I felt that I could not remain silent; I had to give the background of the case.

**Hon. O. O. MADSEN** (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Forestry) (3.49 p.m.), in reply: I listened with pleasure to the hon. member for Fassifern. Every word he said is absolute fact. I appreciate his few words because perhaps he could speak on the matter with greater authority than I.

I wish to compliment the Leader of the Opposition on his reasoned speech. Of course, I am not able to ascertain what he meant when he said that he reluctantly agreed but, having visited the area, he was able to confirm in his own mind that what the Government was doing was certainly the sensible approach.

In my opening remarks I endeavoured to draw a mental picture of the area but, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Fassifern, it is necessary to see the area to appreciate the position. What surprised me most was the attitude of the hon. member for Carnarvon to the fact that only such

a small portion of this area can be used. I feel that he has perhaps the greatest example of this in his own area, where small orchards are being carved out among rocks.

**Mr. Hilton:** Small orchards? Big orchards.

**Mr. MADSEN:** And big ones, but I could take the hon. member to some that are very small. That is almost a perfect example of what is to be done in this case under similar conditions. We have excised an area of 580 acres, but only a small part of it can be used. It can be seen from the maps that there are these small areas where we feel that something can be done. There are three peninsulas, and a look at the map will show a sort of range extending out on each of them.

On the subject of there being 100 allotments, I venture to say that no-one at this stage could make even a guess at the number. A road is to be constructed, and it will be necessary to take many levels. The whole area may have to be terraced. One thing, however, is certain in my mind, and that is that it must all be planned. That is the only way in which full use can be made of what is there, which is not a lot.

I was rather surprised to hear references to looking after the working man. It seems to me that hon. members on this side of the House are doing most of that. We are going to give the working man an opportunity to drive to this area where, from this wonderful lookout, he can see the beauty of the Whitsunday area, even if he cannot get an allotment. At least the people, instead of bandicoots, rock wallabies, and goannas, will be able to use and appreciate the area. It was following the common-sense approach by the officers of the various departments who made the report that the Government decided to do what has been put before the House. Let us have the motel, the caravan park, and picnic areas, as we see them in many of our national parks today.

I am sure that I speak for all the members of the Government when I say that I am very jealous of the rights of ordinary men to the use of the foreshores along our ocean beaches, or anywhere else. I like to see that they have opportunities to share in the enjoyment of them.

**Mr. Walsh:** We would like to see them in jobs.

**Mr. MADSEN:** It is good to be in a job, but, at the same time, a man needs to have a pretty good job today to be able to take his family about and pay for their board and all the other necessities. It is almost beyond the reach of most of us. I am very much in favour of areas that provide these facilities for the man on a moderate income.

**Mr. Lloyd:** It may provide a few jobs.

**Mr. MADSEN:** It is possible that a few jobs will be provided. Building the road will require labour, as will also the landing of those commodities that will be needed there and the provision of services that will be expected.

I am very pleased that the Leader of the Opposition inspected the area, because he told us very bluntly that had he not done so he probably would have taken a very different view of the proposal. I think that his approach to the motion was excellent.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to special leases of these areas being granted. I do not know whether it was for 12 months, two years, or what particular time, but one can almost see the bag huts and tin humpies growing out of the area.

**Mr. Lloyd:** With conditions applying to the leases?

**Mr. MADSEN:** A special lease is a special lease.

**Mr. Lloyd:** That is your responsibility.

**Mr. MADSEN:** If people are to be induced to invest money, we must give them security. If we did not provide these amenities, one could well imagine a person leaving Proserpine and seeing a notice board on the side of the road saying, "Bring your own water," or, "Bring your own eats," or, "Don't forget to take your own tucker." This is a wonderful picnic ground, a wonderful scenic area, and a road and jetty are provided. Surely these other amenities are all part and parcel of it, as the Leader of the Opposition acknowledged in his remarks. That is the sensible approach. I am sorry that every hon. member cannot have the opportunity of seeing the area, because even a person who was blind in one eye and half-blind in the other could see that these additional amenities are needed.

**Mr. Walsh:** Why not withdraw the proposal until we have all had a chance of going up and having a look at it?

**Mr. MADSEN:** I am afraid that it would not have the desired effect on the hon. member for Bundaberg, so nothing would be gained in doing that. Fortunately, we have enough hon. members in the House who are big enough in politics and in other matters to make a fair decision.

I assure the House that this matter has not been treated lightly by myself, the Government, or the officers of the various departments who have inspected the area. Yesterday I quoted the words of the Surveyor-General, which the hon. member for Kedron said that we did not have.

**Mr. Walsh:** You did not quote the words of the Conservator of Forests.

**Mr. MADSEN:** If the hon. member insists, perhaps I should do that. He said—

"The report submitted by Mr. Muir has my endorsement."

Of course, Mr. Muir was at the on-the-spot conference on 22 February, 1962. Does the hon. member for Bundaberg need to hear any more? That is the opinion of one of the people who took part in the conference with other members of the department on the spot. I did not want to have to disclose that, but the hon. member asked for it. Surely he does not want any more than that. No-one is more zealous in guarding our national parks than the Conservator of Forests and the other officers of the Forestry Department, but many of the national parks were declared years ago and often followed defined lines, such as the boundary of a portion for subdivisional purposes, a river, a road, or something of that sort. Have we reached the stage at which, if we want to move a boundary from one side of a rock to another, it must not be done, and the line that was established years ago must stand regardless of what might happen? I certainly support the National Parks Association in their ideals, and I am somewhat disappointed that we cannot agree on the present issue. On the other hand, I want to say in the presence of the Premier and my Government colleagues, that we will be most zealous in avoiding the excision of any part of a national park. I do not want anyone to believe, however, that regardless of circumstances we will not do it if we think it is necessary. Provision has been made in the Act to do it, and I can assure hon. members that if there is a set of circumstances that warrants it, we will do it. The legislation that I refer to was introduced during the term of the present Government and the very fact that this section was placed in it to ensure that the matter be brought before Parliament surely demonstrates the sincerity of the Government in providing that these matters are given ample consideration. Nothing has been said in the House to alter my opinion or that of the Government. I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition is satisfied and is giving this proposal his support. In doing so he has not departed from good common sense. I submit the proposal to the House.

Question—That the motion (Mr. Madsen) be agreed to—put; and the House divided.

Resolved in the affirmative under Standing Order No. 148.

## CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING SOCIETIES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

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

**Hon. T. A. HILEY** (Chatsworth—Treasurer and Minister for Housing) (4.6 p.m.): I move—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Co-operative Housing Societies Acts, 1958 to 1961, in certain particulars."

Broadly, the objects of the Bill are—

Firstly, to further facilitate the early functioning of a society;

Secondly, to provide the Governor in Council with discretionary power to prescribe increased limits of advances having regard to the locality in which it is proposed to carry out the construction of dwellings;

Thirdly, to prohibit the soliciting of fees or commissions in regard to the procurement of finance from a society for home building.

The Bill also contains a minor machinery amendment deleting mention of an adjourned formation meeting of a society. Last year's amending Act removed the necessity for holding such a meeting.

Hon. members will recall that, under a previous amendment, the formation procedure of a society was simplified by dispensing with the second formation meeting. To further facilitate matters it is proposed to delete the present provision whereby a co-operative housing society is obliged to pass a special resolution at a meeting held subsequent to its formation meeting to permit of its borrowing in excess of £100. As the law stands, a society is required to convene a meeting to ratify, by special resolution, the acceptance of a loan the amount of which was already known and advised at the formation meeting.

Experience in this State has shown that whilst the initial meeting to form a co-operative housing society is well attended, similar attendance at subsequent meetings is difficult to obtain. It would seem that once applicants are accepted as members of the society, many of them are not interested in attending subsequent meetings dealing with purely formal matters.

Whilst the previous amendment dispensing with the second formation meeting did much to alleviate the management's difficulty in this regard it was then considered prudent to retain the provision requiring a further assemblage of members of the society for the purpose of passing the special resolution authorising the raising of the loan in a particular amount.

However, in light of further experience, it is now proposed to remove the statutory obligation to hold the "special resolution" meeting. Societies will be advised to pass a resolution at their initial meeting authorising the borrowing of a specific amount and to include reference to such resolution in the statement submitted to that meeting.

The proposed amendment will be welcomed by society executives, as it will further assist in the smooth functioning of a co-operative housing society in its early stages. I mention as a point of interest that the Victorian Government has recently amended its relevant legislation by dispensing with both the second formation meeting of a society and the meeting convened to pass the special resolution. The Victorian amendments bring them into line. That is what we are proposing to do. The first step we took some 12 months ago; we are taking the second step today.

**Mr. Lloyd:** Don't you think that having the special resolution at the initial meeting might affect the success of the group? If the first meeting is held and the special resolution to borrow is allowed at the first meeting, it is possible some of the group will fall out later.

**Mr. HILEY:** On the contrary. There is only one honey that brings the bees around the hive, and that is the prospect of money and the chance of getting a home. At present, what happens is that you get a bunch of people together and they say, "It would be a good idea for us to form a co-operative building society." In faith and trust and hope and charity they join, but under the present procedure they cannot pass the resolution to enable them to borrow £50,000 or £100,000 from such-and-such a lender. Most people are told it is coming; otherwise they would not be there.

**Mr. Lloyd:** You missed my point.

**Mr. HILEY:** Try to explain it to me.

**Mr. Lloyd:** Previously there were three meetings before the special resolution was carried?

**Mr. HILEY:** That is right.

**Mr. Lloyd:** What was the purpose of having the three meetings originally?

**Mr. HILEY:** We copied our Bill from the Victorian precedent. We found that the three meetings were a needless impediment to the people charged with organising the building society. As a result we dropped out part of the burden; we made it simple and telescoped it. This allows them in one meeting to form the society, appoint the officers, and pass the borrowing resolution. If they did not pass the borrowing resolution and had no money, the building society would become merely a bit of paper. The only purpose of a building society is to have money so that its members can build homes. It has all been telescoped into one single administrative act—one meeting—based on the Victorian precedent. Previously three separate meetings were required.

At the first meeting, every intending borrower comes along because he wants to join the society, but when notices are sent out asking borrowers to attend the second meeting to ratify what was done previously, they say that they have gardens to dig, or stop home and look at T.V. or something, and are not interested in going to a formal meeting. Then when they are asked to attend the third meeting to pass the special resolution to borrow money, which they were told was in the pipeline when they agreed to join the society, they do not turn up. The position has arisen where meetings have been adjourned and the secretary has had to ring up and ring up, begging and imploring people to come along so that there will be a quorum at the meeting.

There is no problem getting everyone along to the first meeting; you cannot keep them away. The trouble is to get them along to the second and third meetings. This measure simply telescopes the procedure.

**Mr. Lloyd:** Suppose there are 50 members in a co-operative group at its first meeting, and after they pass the resolution and it has been in operation for a month or two, 20 of the 50 members pull out?

**Mr. HILEY:** This is one of the most popular movements, and I know of no case where a person who wishes to drop out cannot find somebody agreeable and ready immediately to step into his shoes.

The Bill also provides that the Governor in Council, by Order in Council, may approve of a society making, at any place or locality specified in the Order in Council, higher advances than those generally prescribed.

Hon. members will appreciate that in remoter areas costs are higher than in the handier centres. Consequently, the advance limits presently prescribed might not be enough to enable a borrower at such a place to acquire a home of a standard comparable with those obtainable in established areas unless he pays a fantastically high deposit.

The question that brought this to my notice particularly was that the mining company proposing to develop Weipa is particularly keen to avoid the situation where its housing development is on a tenancy basis. As soon as the staff settle down and find they are suitable for the job, and that the job suits them, it wants to be in a position to deal with the staff on a home-ownership basis.

As an indication of housing costs in remote places, I point out that at Rum Jungle a workman's cottage costs something to the order of £8,000 to build. While a house at Weipa may not cost as much as that, it certainly will cost a good deal more than one in a suburb of Brisbane or Ipswich or Gympie, or any other town handy to the capital. It was obvious that to apply the limit for Brisbane and Gympie and similar places to Mt. Isa and Weipa would mean that a purchaser would have to put his hand in his pocket for a deposit of, in some cases, thousands of pounds. I realised the possibility of creating an undue pressure by applying generally the limits in places close handy with results that could be inflationary and encourage people to pay more for a house than they could afford.

**Mr. Dean:** What is the limit now?

**Mr. HILEY:** It depends on the valuation. I will have the exact figure ascertained and will present it at the second-reading stage.

To equate the matter, the Government considers that limits should be capable of alteration in respect of such areas or localities as may be specified by Order in Council. Where we strike a housing need in a remote area we will be entitled to arrange for the prescription of a special higher limit to operate in that place and that place only. That will mean that working people in those areas will not have to find this great, heavier deposit. They will still be able to preserve the same relativity.

**Mr. Lloyd:** All they will have to do is repay the amount of money advanced.

**Mr. HILEY:** Do not forget it is worked out in proportion. It is true that housing costs in Mt. Isa are a good deal higher than here, but so are wages.

The provision involves a realistic approach to a recurring problem in a State as vast as Queensland and possessing such a developmental potential.

Finally, and very importantly, it is proposed to prohibit persons from representing, by advertisement or otherwise, that they are able to arrange or obtain finance for a prospective borrower from a co-operative housing society. As hon. members know, there is a general prohibition in the law of the land against what are known as procurement fees.

**Mr. Lloyd:** Secret commissions.

**Mr. HILEY:** Yes, and secret commissions. We have considered it wise to provide a direct warning within the framework of the Act. I am not altogether sure that the existing law would cover all the types of variants that people might devise. So this provision is calculated to provide some measure of protection for home-builders from this form of exploitation and to prevent the practice from developing in the co-operative-housing system of home finance.

**Mr. Dean:** That is still going on. It goes on at the present time.

**Mr. HILEY:** I should like a good example of it. I would dearly love to catch somebody.

**Mr. Thackeray:** I had a case recently and when I referred to your remarks on "Hansard" and came to you, you soon reversed the tables.

**Mr. HILEY:** That is right, and now we are putting it fair and square in the legislation.

The provisions of the Bill are reasonable and practical and they should assist both departmental and society administration. They have been considered in a general way by the Co-operative Housing Advisory Committee and I am sure that they will be welcomed by housing and building societies in Queensland as providing progressive improvements in an Act which, although not introduced till 1958, has already resulted in finance to the extent of nearly £7,000,000 being provided for homes in Queensland.

One of the most pleasing things to the Government in the co-operative-housing society movement is that each year it gains greater momentum. We were fearful when we started that we would be breaking in what can best be described as a team of "rookie" directors and "rookie" officers, because no-one had had any real experience. That was one of the reasons why these protective measures were originally inserted. After four years, the State is fortunate in now having a great number of people who have served as directors and

become acquainted with the problems in the movement, and who not only know the procedures to be followed but have also discovered the traps, the pitfalls, and the dangers to be guarded against. There have also grown up a number of capable and experienced secretaries who have gathered round them well-trained and experienced staffs. The movement today is able to cope with further development and extension with infinitely greater solidity and strength than was possible in the early, formative years. I want to say that it heartens me to find, against that background, that each year more money is being made available. If the pace of increase is not as fast as some as impatient as I would like, each year still breaks the record of the previous year, and in this financial year the support in the months of July and August is comfortably ahead of that for the corresponding period last year. It looks as though it will be another good year, and a better one than the last, for co-operative housing.

**Mr. Windsor:** The £7,000,000 would account for 2,000 homes?

**Mr. HILEY:** It could be a little more.

That outlines the provisions of the Bill, and I commend it to the Committee.

**Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (4.22 p.m.):** I think that we on this side of the Committee can safely say that, when the co-operative-housing legislation was introduced, we supported it whole-heartedly. We had quite a few worries about the administration of the law as it existed. We realised that many problems would arise from time to time, and that inspections of homes, the types of homes to be built, the standards to be conformed with under local authority, Housing Commission, or War Service Homes law, might not apply to homes built by co-operative building societies. We realise that, because of those things, many problems could exist. There was the danger of secret commissions, with solicitors or real-estate agents acting under a retainer system with certain co-operative building societies so that all the work of the societies would be channelled through to those solicitors or agents.

We supported the measure because we realised that it was essential that this State should have the opportunity of using every avenue available for home construction. At the time of its introduction, there was a limit on advances of 80 per cent., or about £2,750, I think, to prospective home-builders. That in itself confined building to certain sections of the community. There has been some progress over the four years, and the advance is now 90 per cent., with a limit of, I think, £3,500.

There is still one aspect with which we are concerned, and that is the large amount of interest that it is necessary for co-operative building societies to charge many young couples. For instance, very few young people in the community are now entitled to avail

themselves of the 3½ per cent. interest charge offered by the War Service Homes Division on housing loans. The demand on the Queensland Housing Commission will increase year by year, but the amount of finance available will be limited. If there are now 10,000 people who want to build houses through the Housing Commission, in five years' time there might be 20,000. Will the amount of money allocated to the Commission be increased to meet that demand? We doubt whether that can be done. The number of people requiring finance through co-operative building societies will increase continually as the years pass, and I believe it will increase rather rapidly in five or 10 years. Where a society borrows money from a bank at 5½ per cent. interest, it has to charge 6 per cent. interest to the people borrowing money from it. The burden of interest will increase considerably, and it will weigh very heavily on the young people in the community in a few years.

The Treasurer said that it is all relative. I suppose that is true. But I think it is oversimplifying it a little to say that the increasing burden of interest charges and costs of construction will be relative to the wages received. I know that the State Government does not dictate financial policy, and I think it should eventually be the aim of the Commonwealth Government to reduce the burden of interest charges imposed on young people in the community. Something similar was done immediately after the last war, when Mr. Chifley introduced a scheme under which money was advanced on a *crédit foncier* basis to building contractors and building societies through the Commonwealth Bank at a lower rate than ordinary bank interest. It would be of great advantage if the Commonwealth Government reintroduced a scheme of that type for the housing of young couples, but I understand that only the Commonwealth Government could do it.

There are several features of the Bill against which we cannot argue. One of the problems worrying us is the imposition of secret commissions and charges. In some cases a solicitor has a retainer from a co-operative building society, and young couples joining the society are told that they must go to that solicitor to have their paperwork done. I hope that the legislation prohibits that practice.

**Mr. Hiley:** One tried that, and he is out of circulation.

**Mr. LLOYD:** It must have come to the Minister's attention. However, I am not certain that it does not go on in a quiet way that is very difficult to discover. The Treasurer said that he is providing for it in the legislation. This will be a legal deterrent, which is a much better deterrent than a mere statement by the Treasurer that if he discovers any cases he will take action. I believe that the Registrar who administers the Act should look very carefully into all these matters.

I think all hon. members will appreciate the need for differing advances and limits on

advances in various parts of the State. To take the extreme example used by the Treasurer, it may cost £4,000 or £5,000 to build a house at Weipa, whereas at Maryborough, where timber is available locally, a similar house may cost only £2,500. That already operates in many parts of the State. In Brisbane, for instance, it might cost £4,000 to build a home that in Maryborough might cost only £3,000. That is happening in many parts of Queensland at the present time. It happens in close proximity to Brisbane so when home-seekers in different parts of the State wish to borrow, the fact that different limits of advances are necessary should be appreciated.

The interest problem, of course, has not been overcome. The interest charge does not vary with the limit of advance. If one is borrowing the limit of £3,000 in Brisbane and paying 6 per cent, the borrower of £6,000 at Weipa still has to pay 6 per cent. This does not answer all the problems but it does cover one need in various parts of the State.

In relation to the other matters, I believe there is special legislation on the first meeting and, from the questions that I asked of the Treasurer and his replies, it appears to be all right.

**Mr. Duggan:** One of the reasons for the questions was that I talked to him privately.

**Mr. LLOYD:** That is so. We will look at that particular section.

There may have been some reason why there were originally three meetings. The Victorian Parliament must have considered the matter when it introduced the original legislation. The explanation given by the Treasurer seems to be quite reasonable, but we will look closely at the Bill. Unless there is something in it that calls for argument, I do not think there should be much dispute.

**Mr. SMITH (Windsor)** (4.32 p.m.): On the matter of the three meetings, as one of those who has had considerable personal experience of the need for there to be, at first three, and then two meetings, I whole-heartedly endorse the action of the Treasurer in bringing down a measure that will do away with the second meeting. Societies at this stage have £3,000,000 involved in Queensland and from time to time we found that the third meeting was very difficult to convene. It was a source of constant anxiety that we would not get a quorum at the third meeting. It was often difficult to get one at the second. Then legislation was brought down allowing for one of the three meetings to be dispensed with. We welcomed that but I can say quite honestly, on behalf of my co-directors, that this proposed amendment is by far the most salutary we have encountered. One gets at the first meeting a number of people who are anxious to undertake home-ownership either by building or buying. One of the original requirements was that not fewer than 21 days

must pass after the initial meeting before the advance could be made. That meant that many borrowers, anxious though they were for their homes, had an enforced delay of 21 days, which, of course, is not so bad in the case of a person who desires to build a home. However, when someone is going to enter into an ordinary contractual relationship for a house already erected that he desires to buy, 21 days' delay can be crucial to his plans.

I prefer to see these moneys made available for the building of houses because, in the course of loan transactions over quite a number of these houses, I have seen some shocking examples of building. The wall joists which, according to specifications should be 18-in centres, far exceed that. Wall joists and floor joists would far exceed the stipulated centres, and the materials used in some of the houses submitted to us are far from desirable. We might be unduly cautious but we regard the specifications of the Housing Commission as an excellent indication, and we use them as a barometer. I should say that there are still operating in and around Brisbane a number of builders whose idea of what should be minimum specifications does not measure up to what the building trade requires.

**Mr. Hiley** interjected.

**Mr. SMITH:** I am very sorry indeed for the people, particularly the young married couples, who purchase those houses. It is a peculiar thing but when people go to buy a small item for the kitchen—say, a refrigerator—or a motor-car, they take a great deal of care. In the case of a motor-car they will take it for a run, open the doors, look all round it, and spend some time on examining their proposed purchase. But when they are buying a house, which is probably the most costly single purchase they will ever make, they are talked into buying it by slick-talking salesmen. They very quickly sign on the line and buy something that in later life they must live to regret. Many of those badly-built houses could never give anything like a commensurate return for the amount the purchasers have put into them.

I did not, of course, rise to criticise the building contractors who are building homes in Brisbane. Most of the builders we have had dealings with build sound houses. Nevertheless, some do not.

On the subject of the three meetings, I assure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and those of his members who are in the Chamber, that this proposal to abolish the need for three meetings is an excellent one, and I commend the Treasurer for it.

Motion (Mr. Hiley) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

#### FIRST READING

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

The House adjourned at 4.38 p.m.